BETIER TERMS DEBATE

SPEECH DELIVERED BY OPPOSI-TION LEADER J. A. MACDONALD

POSITION OF LIBERAL PARTY AUTHORITATIVELY DEFINED

********* Below will be found a verbatim report of the speech delivered by . J. A. Macdonald, leader of the

liberal opposition, in the "better terms" debate which took place in the provincial legislature on Monday, March 25. It authorita-tively states the position the liberals of this province assume on this most important questions.

I was glad to note Mr. Speaker, that my honorable friend disclaimed any intention of making the subject of better terms for British Columbia a party question. I could not help noting that towards the close of his very able address he did make reference to the political aspect of the case, and did claim that certain liberal newspapers in this province made reference to his mission and to his conduct at Ottawa, which he considered objectionable. Now if I re member aright, Mr. Speaker, before any references were made to his conduct there by the liberal press, his own press correspondent, whom he had taken to Ottawa with him had sent out reports reflecting on the liberal members of the inter-provincial conference, and it was but natural that the liberal newspapers should have taken occasion to comment and should have taken occasion to comment on my honorable friend's with-drawal from the conference.

The very nature of our demands, Mr. Speaker, makes it absolutely essential that we should even overlook the mistakes which our friends either in the house or out of the house may make in reference to a question of this kind. When I say mistakes I mean that I regard it as a mistake that either one party or the other should make reference to this question in a partizan spir-it, and I can call upon my honorable friend the premier to bear me out when I say that by our actions as well as by our words the Hberal party house, and the liberal party in the pro-vince has shown a spirit above the spirit of partizanship, have adopted with hetter terms an attitude which is purely the province, and which excludes alto together any party interest. We did that two years ago when the resolution, which has been referred to by my hon orable friend, was before the resolution which was prepared by mem bers on this side of the house, accepted by my honorable friend and received the ous assent of every liberal mem ber. If any better evidence were required of the non-partizan attitude o the members on this side of the house do not know where it could be found, and so far as what took place during the time my honorable friend was at the conference and after the close of that conference, and during the recent campaign which took place in this province concerned, I think liberals can claim that we did not make this a party issue

But I think that it can hardly be that the speech which my orable friend made on his return from Ottawa in this city of Victoria was free from taint of that kind. I think it is only necessary. Mr. Speaker, to read tha speech to see from beginning to end a studied effort to make it appear the the treatment which the people of British Columbia had received at Ottawa was unfair, and that that unfair treat ment came not from the conference, but from the dominion government. I say that that was the unfortunate feature of that speech, and I believe that same attitude—which was not always a frank and sincere attitude-was assum-

ed by my honorable friend, and that frankness and sincereity were not always shown by him in dealing with this because we found that on every platform on which he spoke during the campaign, while he took care to point out that the amount which had been sug sested by the conference as sufficient to meet British Columbia's special claims was the paltry sum of \$100,000 a year for a period of ten years, he said nothing t the fact that the subsidy for which we had agreed at the time of the union-the subsidy of \$35,000 a year for government and legislation, had been in-creased by seven hundred per cent that is to say increased from \$35,000 to the sum of \$150,000 a year.

He said nothing of that, and I believe

at all events the effect, I will not say his intention, but the effect of what was said by him and other conservative during the campaign was sufficient to lead the people of this prov-ince to believe that all the other provinces of the dominion government were prepared to give to the province of Brit-ish Columbia was this sum of \$100,000 for ten years, ignoring altogether the fact that the additional sum above menloved was granted with the unanimous consent of all the other provinces and with the concurrence of my honorable riend the premier. He was in the conference when this additional grant of \$115,000 a year was made to British Co-

lumbia, to be paid forever.

But as I said in prosecuting the claims of British Columbia for better terms at Ottawa, let us put aside all these mat-ters—let us forget, and I am prepared to orget-the attitude which was assumed by my honorable friend on his return from Ottawa, the attitude which he asned during the campaign, and the fact that he appealed to the people of this province on this question of better terms-appealed to the people of this province to assist him, to sustain him and his government against those on this side of the house, who had loyally stood by him when the resolution was introduced and passed in this house, and who had placed in his hands by us the very resolution upon which he went to Ottawa to deal with the question of better terms. I say I am even prepared to

forget that in the recent campaign he of forgotten how we had loyally stood the province and stood by him when had forgotten how we had I the matter was up two years ago. He had forgotten that we had put aside party politics and had given him a clean sheet when he went to Ottawa. We enabled him to say. "I am representing the whole province of British Columbia, am here representing the liberal party, and every other party, and all the people

of Bitish Columbia.".

And I say, notwithstanding that, and notwithstanding this, he used this ques-tion of better terms as a weapon to strike those who had loyally stood by him, I am prepared to leave it out of the question and discuss this question on its merits. I was criticized for a statenent made in Vancouver during t e elecion that British Columbia had no legal claim against the dominion of Canada. made the statement that the terms agreed upon by the people of this proving a greed upon by the people of this proving their representatives had been substantially carried out—that so the right to ignore the conference; that far as that contract was concerned, a contract which we have embodled in a did not take the position that he ought no assertion that there has been any failure on the part of the dominion in carrying out its legal obligation. It has never been maintained that we have

nas never been maintained that we have a tenable legal claim against the domin-ion for better terms.

If we have such a legal claim, Mr. Speaker, then it was the duty of this government to bring that claim into the courts of the country and the empire, and obtain justice for the province of British Columbia.

I only mention this question of the legal aspect of the case, so as to clear the ground and let us come to a clear understanding, Mr. Speaker, of the nature of the demands which we are making upon the dominion of Canada.

I take it, therefore, that there is no

dispute between the gentlemen on the other side of the house and the gentlemen on this side of the house with regard to the nature of those claims. We have no legal claim based upon a breach of the terms of union. Therefore, our claim, as it has been put in the memorandum submitted to the dominion government by the recent Prior government, and adopted by my honorable friend, in the case for British Columbia, which he submitted two years ago—the basis of our claim is this, that we have a moral and sound constitutional claim for better treatment from the dominion of Canada. (Hear, hear.)

And I agree, Mr. Speaker, with that declaration. I agree that we have a moral, and I believe we have a sound constitutional claim for increased sub-sidies arising out of our peculiar geographical position, our topographical position, and the great costs of public works in this province. And not only that, but we have a claim upon the ground which I believe has never been pressed either upon the conference or upon the dominion government, I be-lieve we have an unanswerable constitutional claim against the dominion, and claim, too, Mr. Speaker, which is not based upon cirticisms of our public men of 1871

What is our claim at the present time, as set forth in the memorandum submit ted by my honorable friend? It practically amounts to this, that in 1871 we had a set of public men in office in this province who could not foresee what has nappened since that time with regard to the opening up of the resources of this province, who could not see the great cost of construction of public works, the cost of administration, and the cost of civil government, and the cost of carrying on the system of education of this province. That is the charge, practically which is made against our representa-

tives in 1871. We go down there asking for better terms on the plea that our own public men in 1871 did not know what they were about, and made a very bad bar

But there is a far stronger plea to ish Columbia. In 1871 when we entered the union, the average customs duties exacted from the people was some seventeen and a half ner cent. There was no reason to suppose-and was not, in fact, in the minds of the framers of the term of union—that a change would be made in the fiscal laws of Canada, which would double the amount that we were at that time paying into the dominion treasury. Any yet this came about. It came about with n seven or eight years after the union—we find that while we were paying seventeen and a half per cent into the dominion treasury on the goods which were imported from abroad at that time and certainly that might reasonably have been expected to continue, because there was no agitation on at that time to increase the duties we find that in seven years those duties were increased, doubly increased, to an average of at least 35 per cent and remain so up to the present time.

Now, is that not a good constitutional

ground? Is that not a dignified and fair ground upon which to appeal to the dominion for better terms for British Columbia, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that had that been pressed upon members of the conference, had it been shown that while protection and high duties was a good thing for the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec, which are manufacturing provinces, that they are getting all the benefit practically from protection, that their goods are manufactured in their own province, and that they are, therefore, not paying the duty on imported goods; that we, on the other hand, are not a manufacturing province, up to the present time at all events, and perhaps shall not for some time, had it been shown that we must either import our supplies from foreign markets or must bring them from the eastern pro-vinces over a railway haul of three thousand miles a different result would have

ury, as the matter rests now, we are paying six million a year, surely that is a ground we can appeal on, on moral and constitutional lines to the dominion government and to the dominion par-liament, to give us back some fair proportion of the customs duties we are paying into the dominion treasury. But that appeal has never been made;

and not the government merely of the province or the conservative party; I there is not a word in the proceedings there is not a word in the proceedings of conference, there is not a word of argument along that line in the special case which my honorable friend sub-mitted to this house two years ago, there is not a word along that line in the special memoranda which my hon-orable friend submitted on the 9th of October last to the conference, nor is there a line in the letter which he wrot on the 13th reiterating the claim which was the claim of British Colum-bia and the grounds upon which these claims were based.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was glad to note

contract which we have embodied in a did not take the position that he ought statute of the United Kingdom—there is to have appealed to the dominion for to have appeared to the dominion for this special treatment, that he was not quite right in submitting it to the conference. That attitude taken in his speech seems highly inconsistent with the resolution we are asked to adopt, because in that resolution the attitude which my honorable friend takes is that this question of better terms for British Columbia, based upon exceptional circumstances, ought to have been dealt with by the dominion government, and night not in any way to come before the ought not in any way to come before the conference. If I understand him aright, he is not taking that position today. Because we find that by his own words in his own report to the lleutenant-governor, laid on the table of this house only a few days ago, he precluded him-self from taking that position.

It is quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that ing, I believe, of the conference on the 9th of October, to submit to the con-gerence, and left with the conference his memorandum setting forth not only the inst terms that British Columbia asked for in the Quebec resolution, but the special terms which we ask for owing to our exceptional position and circum-stances. In that resolution he sets all these forth. He also sets forth a request for arbitration. And that quest of arbitration, Mr. Speaker, I propose to deal with a little later. Therefore, I take this to be true, and

in looking at the history of the applications for better terms, by the different provinces since confederation, I find that up to 1887 applications were made by nearly every province in the dominion for better terms, of one kind or another Those applications were always made and always dealt with by the dominion government without reference to a con-ference. But in 1887, there seems to have been a change; there seems to have been a change in the manner in which these questions were to be healt with and from that time on to the present time we find that the general readjust-ment and the treatment to be accorded

Now, the conference which was held in 1887 confirmed the principle distinctly that there should be a general rearrangement, including all the provinces, and that that general rear-

It seems that nothing was done upon

the recommendations which were made by that conference. And if I were desirous, Mr. Speaker, of bringing politics into this matter I could point out that the government which was in power in 1887 when those resolutions were adopted, and when they ought to either have been acted upon or rejected, was the conservative, and of the premiers that conservative, and of the premiers that were in that conference, I think three out of four of them were conservatives. could point this out in passing-although it has nothing really to do with the merits of the matter—but it shows that as far as dealing with provincial subsidies by a conference is concerned, nd so far arrangements should be permanent and final, that idea emanated not from the liberals but from conservatives, both the dominion and in the provinces, My honorable friend had some prece

lent in his favor when he sub special claims of British Columbia to the conference for their approval and for their support. Because we find in 1903, colonel Prior, then premier of the province of British Columbia, writing o the chairman of the conference held in 1902 made use of these words. He

said: "I fully realize that without the co-operation and good will of the other provinces it would be difficult to impress upon the dominion authorities the justice of what we

Now, he was referring there to special onditions, not to the general redistri-

To show that the position was disinctly taken by the premier of British Columbia, when you, sir, were attorney general four years ago, the position was umbia could only hope to secure this pecial recognition which she was asking for, through the co-operation of the other provinces. So that I have no criticism to offer the course pursued by my onorable friend when on the very first day—I believe the very first sitting— of the provincial conference last October, he submitted the case of British Columbia to the conference, and thereby inited them to deal with it as should think fit. Now, surely, my honorable friend could hardly take this position, that he would submit his case to the conference and ask their recommenheen obtained.

Now, the effect of the fiscal legislations, and if those recommendations which we are appealing, of the dominion parliament to which we are appealing, of the dominion parliament to which we are appealing, of the dominion parliament to which we are appealing, of the dominion parliament to which we are appealing, of the dominion parliament to which we are appealing, of the dominion parliament to which we are appealing, of the dominion parliament to which we are appealing, of the dominion parliament to which we are appealing, of the dominion parliament to which we are appealing, of the dominion parliament to which we are appealing, of the dominion and say, "I have submitted my case to the conference, I have come here with and say, "I have submitted my case to the conference, I have come here with the proper tribunal to deal with British Columbia's claim for better terms was the dominion parliament, and the dominion parliament, and the dominion parliament alone, then he should not contention, and that arises from the objectionable words eliminated.

Then there is only one other branch of our contention, and that arises from the dominion parliament alone, then he should not ment of money which we pay into the norderence of issa, and if he really contended, and if he really contend

would take. That is certainly the posi- up a point of rantage for his province. tion that he would be entitled to take. But if that be true, is the converse But if that be true, is the converse not also true, that if the recision of the conference were against him, if they refused to make recommendations as favorable to the province of British Columbia as we could hope, then he would reject that verdict, and go to the dominion authorities and say. "I have the whole of the other premiers against methey have decided only to give the province of British Columbia one hundred thousand donars for ten years. I claim that I am entitled to a great deal more. that I am entitled to a great deal more. I refuse to recognize that they have any authority to deal with this question at all, and I now come to you and ask you to act in the face of the resolution, which my own action has succeeded in extracting from that conference." Surely my honorable friend cannot take that position. Surely, for the honor and dignity of British Columbia he will not take

that position.

Having submitted his claims to the conference, he was bound to take notice of the findings of that conference, and the dominion government were bound to take notice of the finding of that conference. Therefore, when he submitted,

and I must contess that, speaking for myself only, I think it eminently proper that readjustments of provincial subsi-dies should first be discussed by provin-cial conferences of this kind. All the provinces are interested. All the provinces are members of that family which constitute this great dominion, they are partners in this young nation of ours; and it is only reasonable and natural that they should be consulted in matters that affect the mutual interests of all members. And that seems to have been the idea in the mind of our public men ver since 1887.

Now, I am not quite sure what my

conorable friend wants us to do when he asks us to vote for this resolution. Does he want us to affirm that he was right in submitting the claims of Brit-ish Columbia to the conference? If he wants us to affirm that he did submit he claims of British Columbia, we are prepared to do so, because the records show that that was the position he assumed. He says, and he says very truly, that on the 12th of October, when the conference was in joint session, when sir Wilfrid Laurier and some of the other federal ministers were present, he took the position that the claims of British Columbia for special treatmen should be referred to arbitration. And n his resolution he makes the statement which I am quite sure on reconsideraion he will modify-this is the state nent that he makes: "And whereas, in oursuance of the said resolution the said Hon. Richard McBride submitted such memorandum to the dominion govern-ment setting forth the claims of British

Columbia for special recognition."

Now, the proceedings of the conference three days before this show that he submitted these special claims to the onference. That will be found, Mr. Speaker, on page 19, I think, of the report, which was placed before this house the other day. I am now reading from to each province has been a matter the official record, and this is what was which our public men in the dominion said: "The Hon. Mr. McBride submitted which our public men in the dominion and the provinces thought proper to refer to a conference.

> mated discussion which my honorable friend speaks of, lasting three or four days, took place, and at the time that Mr. Whitney, on behalf of the province of Ontario, did the same thing, my hon. friend clearly submits his memoranda to the conference and asks the conference to consider this question of special terms to British Columbia. Then, two or three days after that, the matter having been considered by the conference in the meantime, sir Wilfrid Laurier makes the following statement with regard to the attitude upon this question of reference o arbitration

> Now, there is a distinct statement that

sir Wilfrid Laurier refused to consider the request of British Columbia for a reerence to arbitration—then the letter is set out, which shows that no such resal took place.

This is what the premier of Canada says: "The British Columbia proposal comes entirely within the chief purpose of this conference. If this conference, after hearing Mr. McBride's argumen's in support of his contention, reached the conclusion that an arbitration should take place, through a commission for the purpose of dealing with the claim of British Columbia that world oversit he British Columbia, that would present the matter to the dominion government in a new light, and, while I am not prepared to express any final opinion, I can say at once that such a recommendation from the conference would have great weight with us, and we should feel bound to give it further consideration."

And yet my honorable friend puts in

this recital that his request for arbitra-tion was refused by sir Wilfrid Laurier. say that he surely will consent to strike that recital out. Now, what was the attitude of my

honorable friend on this ques ion of arbitration? I see his chief organ, the Colonist, the other day said that he sub-mitted the question of British Colum-bia's terms to the conference on the sugestion of sir Wilfrid Laurier; and that t was reasonable to expect that the premier of British Columbia would not sregard the advice tendered by the remier of Canada. I would not expec that either, unless the premier thought that by submitting the case of British

lie was bound at that stage to take either one stand or the other; he was bound to elect, he had two courses open to him, either to go before the dominion government and insist that so far as these special terms were concerned, the dominion government alone and the dominion parliament, alone should deal with these or he could take the other. minion parliament alone should deal with these, or, he could take the other course. I do not care whether it was at the suggestion of the premier or Canada or not, or at the suggestion of any other person, he was there to press the rights of British Columbia, and if he choose to take that advice, if he thought that advice good then, and took his chances before the conference, then I say that, he cannot in justice to his manhood, and in justice to the honor and dignity of the province of British Columbia, when he finds the conference against him, say this conference against him, say this conference against him, say this conference and no business to deal with this greence had no business to deal with this green the conference and first time done for arbitration?

The thick columbia the conference and first time done in the following proposal"; so that the dominion in the following the suggestion to those words were used for the first time by that conference and Mr. Whitney in the last % years, or during alove been during that fact in a clear from the green the domi

then why did he go before the conference at all? Was he playing a part in a farce? Was it a farce that he was acting there, saying, "if your decision is against us, I am not going to accept it?" speech, that the opening up of new sections in the local part of the against us, I am not going to accept it?"

Now, every gentleman of the legal profession in this house will know that in a court of justice such an attitude would never be tolerated for a moment. And seeker, I do not think it is the opening. be the worst of it, turn round and say,
"No the conference had no right to deal
with this question at all, I repudiate its olution." I do not apprehend that my honorable friend will have the assurance to stand before the people of British Columbia and assume a position of that

kind. Now, as to the question of arbitration.

are our claims based upon? First the geographical position of the province of Bri.ish Columbia. Does it require a board of arbitration to come to British Columbia to find out that British Columbia is stuwesterly side of Canada? Is there anything to arbitrate there? Does it require a commission of arbitration of enquiry to come to British Columbia to prove to the people of the east that British Co um-bla is a mountainous country, that, as was stated by one of the sta esmen of Canada 20 years ago at least, that British Columbia is a sea of mountains? Is there anything to arbitrate about that? Is it not known and admitted, and was it not admitted in the very resolution proposed by Mr. Whitney, that we are situated in a peculiar position geographically, and that the physical features of the country were such as we caim they are? There is nothing to arbitrate upon those subjects. Now, is there anything to arbitrate about the cost of public works, the cost of gov-ernment the cost of education, the cost of the administration of justice in this province? Are those subjects not matters of statistics, which can be found right in the public accounts from year to year. They are to be found there and to be found there alone. And they were brought to the attention of the conference—the recent the attention of the conference—the recent conference at Ot.awa. This is purely a Matter of statistics, purely a matter of the house have just as strong objections going through the public accounts of this province and finding out to a cent, no. dress and in the proposed legislation, as approximately, but to a cent, the cost of civil government in British Columbia, and finding out to a cent the cost of public works in British Columbia, because the amount expended on public works, roads and bridges is a matter that is settled by

claimed that we have paid some nineteen what was said by Mr. Whitney at the rein justice to his manhood, and in justice to the honor and dignity of the province of British Columbia, when he finds the conference against him, say this conference had no business to deal with this question at all. (Opposition applause.)

And he took part in the discussion before the conference on the question of the submission to arbitration. He voted upon that question. In other words, if his position is that he should not have sone before the conference at all, and is not bound by the position taken there, then why did he zo before the conference. province in the dominion. And see what that involves. Then, so far as this quis, ion of arbitration is concerned, while I am only expressing my own opinion that it is I can tell this house that he ought to have members of this house the objections which occur to me to this method of settling the

never be tolerated for a moment. And every lay member of this house, Mr. Speaker, will know that in the ordinary business of life the man who has two courses open to him and is brought face to face with an election between one course and the other, when the interests of other people are concerned. face to face with an election between one course and the other, when the interests of other people are concerned, and accepts thee one course, he is bound by that election, and cannot afferwards, when he receives what he considers to tion of the province comprised in the be the worst of it, turn round and say, "No, the conference had no right to deal with this question at all, I repuddate its action, notwithstanding that I argued the case before it, took part myself in the proceedings, and voted upon the resolution." I do not apprehend that my side of the subsidies and other fixed the commendation of his fellows for having the assurance. revenue.

Now, what does that mean? It was a

new district, had been opened up within the past few years, was a widerness ten or fifteen years ago, and yet we find that the fiscal laws since 1871. But that is no unanimous that the question of British Columbia it was contributing to an arbitration by way of commission, my honorable friend then proceeded to lay the claims of British Columbia—that is to lay the materials and arguments and all the data which he had co lected—before the conference and asked them to recommend some substantial grant in British Columbia's favor. He took two or three days arguing the case before the conference and asked them to recommend some substantial grant in British Columbia's favor. He took two or three days arguing the case before the conference and asked them to recommend some substantial grant in British Columbia's favor. He took two or three days arguing the case before the conference and asked them to recommend some substantial grant in British Columbia's favor. He took two or three days arguing the case before the conference and asked them to recommend to the days arguing the case before the conference and asked them to recommend to the fiscal taws since 1871. But that is no reason why we should not give my honorable friend credit for the fight which he macount it was paying in. And what was true of the country of Kootenay was true also of the stant that in future this fight must be kept up for better terms for British Columbia's favor. He took two or three days arguing the case before the conference and asked them to recommend the friend on the total true of the same of the fiscal taws since 1871. But that is no reason why we should not give my honorable friend credit for the fight which he macount it was not reason why we should not give my honorable friend credit for the fight which he macount it was not reason why we should not give my honorable friend credit for the fight which he macount it was not reason why we should not give my honorable friend credit for the fight which he macount it was not reason why we should not give my honorable friend credit for the fight which he amount it was not reason why we should not give my honorable friend credit for the fight which he amount mend some substantial grant in Bullish Columbia's favor. He took two or three days arguing the case before the conference. Does he wish to take the position now, that having submitted all his data, having submitted all his arguments, and having taken part himself in the conference, he has not bound himself by the deficient's case which asserts that the prohaving taken part himself in the conference came to 3 Bound in this way, that he could not honest y ignore their conclusions. The other premiers were against him; the other premiers were against h

do not believe, Mr. Speaker, when we are assembled here, dealing with the affairs house to another statement contained in the preamble to this resolution, and which I believe my honorable friend will modify when his attention is called to it—he says: "And whereas, that said request for such competent tribunal was refused by the Rt. Hon. sir Wilfrid Laurier."

do not believe, Mr. Speaker, when we are findings of the conference. I think that findings of the conference. I think that of the principle of the conference. I think that of the principle of the conference. I think that of the principle of the conference. I think that with the fact, statements which shouse. I do not emanal: from this house. I do not emanal: from this house should go on record for a mitted, then it must be admitted that the dominion government ought to pay some better the feet of proceeding upon false lines attention to the findings of that conference that is not entirely fair. And whereas, that asid request for such competent tribunal was refused by the Rt. Hon. sir Wilfrid Laurier."

Now, what is there to arbitrate? What is there to arbitrate, Mr. Speaker? What are our claims based upon? First the the words contained in that address, that the words contained in that address, that this readjustment should be "final and unalterable." And I must affirm that we on this side of the house object to the in clusion of those words in that address, and in the act proposed to be passed. Not because the inclusion of those words have any legal effect, because no legislation, as you know, Mr. Speaker—no legislation is final and unalterable, even if it were declared to be so in the legislature itself. clared to be so in the legislature itself Our legislation is amended from day to day, and from year to year; what we pass one year, we amend and correct in an-other. And the same is true of the domin-ion parliament; the same is true of the im-perial parliament. So that even if the act which it is proposed to pass, amending the British North America act, contains this clause, saying that this shall be final and unalterable, it cannot be binding in ef-fect, because it would not bind any future But I think it is objectionable, not from

a legal standpoint, but from a moral one Because it might be said, when any o the provinces apply for better terms again, conditions having changed perhaps—it might be said there is a declara ion that these terms shou'd be final, and you mus show us very strong grounds indeed before we can interfere with legislation containing is only adopting the words used by the conference in 1887, whi e they have simply repeated the words used by that confer-ence, and while they are simply pursuing

Now, I trust that the government has one so, and I can tell this house that have done so. Whether the protest will side of the house have failed to use ou best efforts to prevent something which

might prejudicially effect the interest the province of British Columbia. Mr. Speaker, I think I have said all can usefully say upon this resolution. Th resolution is at best an academic one. I loes not ask this legislature to app a course proposed for the future; it asks the legislature to-what shall I saypat my honorable friend on the back for what he did at Ottawa last October? simply asks this house to confirm his tions and to say that he did the proj ter terms for British Columbia. I am quite sure that when he went into that con-

ing done his best. But I do not think that the really strong

ought not to be accepted as a final set ilement. (Applause.) But I say from this time on it should be the business and the duty of my honorable friend, to see that

the resolution proposed by my honorable friend, it contains, as I have pointed out statements which are not in accordance with the fact, statements which should plain terms, should the conference come to the conclusion that arbitration is the proper thing, that would place it in a new light before him and his colleagues, and that they would give it their further consideration. I may say that this resolution emanating from a legislative body such as tis, to be read, as it will be, by the premiers, by the confrers of my honorab friend at that conference, and by the mem-bers of the dominion parliament—I say it ought to be entirely fair, and free from

And let me say, there is another recital in that resolution which is not in accord ance with facts. My honorable friend reclies that in despite of his protest the conference proceeded to consider the claims of British Columbia—in despite, Mr Speaker, of his protest. Well, his own report to the lieutenant governor shows the self brought the matter before the confe ence, argued it, as he tells us today, for two or three days, and fought the battles of British Columbia for better terms f two or three days; and yet he says in h resolution that despite of his obje dealing with the conference at \$11, conference proceeded to deal with the question. The very first sentence almost in my honorable friend's report to lieutenant governor, says: "I took every opportunity to place."

And yet in his resolution today he says they proceeded to consider that in spite

Now, I think my honorable friend in hi statement in the course of his speech says that he always impressed upon his conference of the conference that he was not as I take it, to be bound by the proceedings of the conference. Now, had m honorable friend really considered that statement before he made it? He goes into the conference, submits his case and then says: "I am doing this without proinen says: "I am doing this without pre-judice. I am asking you to decide it, but I am withholding my assent from the de-cision you come to."

If that was the position my honorable

friend took, then instead of prot

af er the resolution to then by a written ded ference, have said; without prejudice to the Columbia; I have con not going to submit to conference, I reserve t to say whether I will a or not." If he had to and he doubtless would ent of undertaking which he pursued for t My honorable frien 1 o when it is too late to that kind.

BURNED IN T

DISASTROUS FIRE F TODGI AG

San Francisco, Apri 4-

TWENTY INMATES (AS MANY MORE

burned to death and 20 c fire which destroyed an 17th and Connecticut morning. The injured wing classes and were asle when the fire started. It be aroused the fames sp out dead and dying. Pe hotels in the vicinity runtance of the buried victi n rescuing many of the ing timbers. Ambu and essed and auton into service and the vic Potrero emergency ho

The fire which destroy hotel is believed to have kitchen and had gained gr 100 lodgers in the build like paper, and most of their lives were caught and to death. So rapidly d that it was impossible t way of rescue and ever apparatus arrived the bl burning and the firemen to place ladders against ple in the very top stor of rescue W. A. Cole, thrown from a ladder a be badly hurt. The majo ed were hurt in leaping windows. A number of w them are believed to have exact number of dead car tained, but the proprietor reported as saying that I One of the women who to be Mrs. Welpe, wife An adjoining lodging was were 45 men sleeping in the but all of them are belie caped. The property lo

ALL ENDORSE COLONIAL PREMIERS

RECENT SP DEALING WITH QUES

London, April, 4.—The ed at Ottawa recently b Laurier, the Canadian pr ence to Canada's attitu colonial conference, has a deal of attention in colo Sir Joseph Ward, the

Zealand, in an interview, ier Laurier was only ecl and others had said all a preferential trade. Sir William Lyne, and customs for Australia he agreed entirely with a that anything he might

ter of preference w hearty support. Dr. Jameson, premie Frederick Robert Moore tal, and other leading Lord Strathcona, lord sioner for Canada, said: "I take that what is

Canada is now in such a there is no necessity to asking favors from the

Without regard to part

Canadians will accept gl premier has said and a utterances." ********

DEFEAT ROOSEVE Washington, April said at the White H that the president there is a movement feat his policies in the gress and in the next convention. It is dec the Hearst-Harriman of five million do which to carry on its o

opposition to the pres bine it was stated a House, first leaked of ner here attended by anti-Roosevelt republ weeks ago. A friend Roosevelt, who was a carried the news

SALE OF C.Y. RANC Taber, Alta., April 4—T two and a half miles nort been sold for over a quar do lars, to parties whose yet been divulged. The p of 38,000 acres and broug acre. As high as 40,000 hea been on the ranch at one dersood that the property Berstood that the prope ections to farmers.