

British Columbia. Well, Sir, some five years ago Japan invited the nations of the earth to a world's fair. We were urged to take part in that fair, and we did so. Just before the fair was concluded we were deluged with petitions coming from all parts of Canada asking us to make a treaty with Japan in order to obtain, if possible, a share of the immense trade that would develop with that country in the future. We negotiated a treaty and laid it before parliament. It was received in this House without a word of dissent or criticism. Our friends opposite were eager for it. But we knew there was a difficulty, and that difficulty was with respect to Japanese immigration. At that time we had an understanding with the Japanese government, accomplished through the Japanese consulate here, to the effect that the Japanese government themselves would undertake to restrict their own immigrants. Unfortunately, after the treaty had been ratified there was an influx of Japanese immigration into British Columbia, as if the treaty had superseded the understanding. We sent one of our colleagues to Japan to protest. He had no difficulty in getting the Japanese authorities to agree that they would respect the understanding we had entered into with them, and that they themselves would restrict immigration from Japan to this country. The matter came up for review in this House. We presented our policy to the House, and it was not accepted by the opposition. The opposition held, on the contrary, that instead of having a treaty we should take the matter into our own hands and restrict all Asiatic immigration. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition moved this resolution :

That this House, whilst expressing its profound appreciation of the friendly intentions and courteous assurance of the Japanese government, and whilst declaring its sincere desire for the most cordial relations with the Japanese people, desires, nevertheless to record its strong protest against a policy under which our wage earning population cannot be protected from destructive invading competition, except by entreating the forbearance and aid of a foreign government.

We did not endorse these views, for the obvious reason that if the object were to restrict Japanese immigration to Canada, and if that could be done either by legislative enactment in this parliament or by friendly action on the part of the Japanese government themselves, we would prefer that it should be done by the voluntary action of the Japanese government. I would ask the leader of the opposition, Why should we—I will not put it on the ground of international comity but on the ground of our own self interest—Why should we hurt the feelings of a friendly nation when that nation was willing to do what we wanted her to do? Sir, this was the posi-

tion we took, and the position was so strong that I was not at all surprised when I saw my hon. friend the leader of the opposition accept that position, both for himself and for his party, at the opening of the last general elections. At that time I was not surprised to see that the opposition had come to our way of thinking. In that debate I used these words, speaking of the Japanese government :

If they fail to carry out this understanding that we have with them, then we shall have the power ourselves to put an end to the treaty. But that will be done only in the last resort, only when every method of conciliation has been exhausted, only when every other means has been tried and failed.

This was so reasonable a proposition that I was not at all surprised that my hon. friend, at the opening of the campaign, practically accepted it. I do not say that my hon. friend announced his acceptance to the people. But he had an ambassador to the people of British Columbia who spoke for himself and the party to which he belongs. One of the candidates in British Columbia was a gentleman whom I am very glad to see in this House—as the constituency has to be represented by a Tory, though I would much prefer to see it represented by a Grit—I mean the constituency of Vancouver. The gentleman who now represents the city of Vancouver, and whom I see before me, accepted the nomination, but accepted it with some compunction, some hesitation. In order to be absolutely sure of his ground, and before finally committing himself, he came east to interview the leader of the opposition, and obtain from him certain pledges in respect to this question and another one. In a speech delivered in the city of Vancouver by Mr. Cowan, the Conservative candidate, on the 1st of October last, as I find it reported in the 'News-Advertiser,' he used this language :

I went east and have returned, and I speak with the authority, not only of the leader but of that party that will, after October, control the destinies of Canada.

My hon. friend referred to my own attitude upon the question, with which he could not agree. But still, after having blamed myself and the government for the policy we had pursued in respect to Asiatic immigration, he went on to define what was the policy of the Conservative party :

But I have this message of my leader to impart to you, and it is made not only on his behalf but on behalf of the great Conservative party throughout Canada, that if that *modus vivendi* spoken by Mr. Lemieux is not lived up to by Japan, that circumstance will oblige that great party to abrogate the Japanese treaty.

Well, I fail to see what difference there is between the policy of my hon. friend and the policy of this government as de-