

House that, in bringing up this question, we are not impelled by any spirit of antagonism to the other provinces, but simply because we believe that there can be no possible sympathetic co-operation among the different provinces until equal justice is meted out to all. All we intend ever asking this House and pressing on the government is simply that the contention submitted by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) namely, that an impartial tribunal should decide whether we have a case or not, should be acted upon.

Leaving that matter, I propose to say a few words on the Oriental question. Some time ago the right hon. First Minister differentiated between the various races which confront each other on the Pacific coast. He drew broad lines of distinction between the Japanese, the Chinese and the Hindoos. To-night, however, he includes them in the one common expression; but there is this distinction to be noticed, and it is one which I have always endeavoured to appreciate. I am no hide bound partisan, I am quite ready to acknowledge that we are all working for the good of Canada in our various ways, although we cannot all see alike, and I do not take the ground that nothing hon. gentlemen on the opposite side can do can possibly be otherwise than wrong. We must admit that there must be many measures entitled to approval, no matter from what side they may come. As regards the Hindoo phase of this question, I believe that the action of the government, was the only right and practical one, namely, to send their accredited representative to the imperial authorities in order to arrive at a solution of that question, which was different from the others in this important respect that it affected British subjects. That is a difference which is fundamental, and I trust on some future occasion to try and convince the House, that the only possible solution of this question will be found in convincing thoughtful and earnest men on both sides that the stand we take is not a narrow or provincial one but one eminently just and in the national interest. I know the opinion exists that out in the west we are a little hot tempered and not so judicial as we should be in our discussions on this matter, and we shall have to convince hon. gentlemen by logical appeal to their reason, that the views of the west are sound. You must not think, Mr. Speaker, that because we come from British Columbia and have to face conditions there which are rather acute, we are necessarily local or provincial in our views. We claim—and I think rightly—that we are not only British Columbian to the bottom of our hearts but also Canadians in the broadest sense of the word and Imperialists in the truest significance. May I add that in my own personal experience, speaking to men in the old land and following the more recent articles in the

Mr. BURRELL.

leading papers and reviews of Great Britain, the thoughtful opinions of the mother country have become fundamentally changed on the question of the influx of the Oriental race.

The day is coming, even if it has not come already, when, as it is put by one of their prominent men, it is recognized more and more every day to be the duty of the home government and the imperial authorities, no matter what conditions they have to face in other parts of the world, to stand by even the most distant and smallest portions of the British empire to build up a nation that should be Anglo-Saxon in race and tradition. I would like to add a word, because the Prime Minister seemed to imply that in one riding at least—I do not know whether he intended to include them all—the telegram in reference to the problem of exclusion by the leader of the opposition was one of the reasons why British Columbia had gone Conservative, as it were coming in under a false promise or a piece of hypocrisy. Let me assure him in the most emphatic way that, speaking for myself, not once did I say—though I expressed my sympathy with the exclusion movement as I do now—that the leader of the opposition had pledged himself to that policy, although it may be my view that not only he but other members of the House will come to that opinion. I treated the case on its merits, and the contest resulted, as I knew it would, against the former member for Yale-Cariboo, because he, in common with other members who represented—or rather misrepresented—British Columbian constituencies had ratified that treaty without a word of protest in regard to it. I can quite understand that some hon. members opposed will retort—in fact I knew this retort was made—that our leader and other members of the Conservative party also supported the ratification of that treaty, and did not lift up their voices in protest against it. I recognize that. It is perfectly true, and it may possibly be that there are two reasons for it. I am not imputing bad motives or casting slurs when I say that it is certain that the Conservative party were misled by hon. gentlemen opposed as to assurances from Japan with regard to this matter, and also by the exaggerated ideas of the importance of the trade with Japan, which, I believe, is not going to be as large as some people seem to think. Then, again, with regard to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and Conservative members generally, I can quite understand that no man who has lived altogether in the east and has not come into daily contact with the conditions that face the people of the west, can possibly grasp the true significance of this oriental question to the people of the Pacific coast. I am sorry to add also that hon. gentleman opposite, and eastern members, generally do not avail themselves of their