

ister has referred to the fact that in the province of British Columbia the elections were fought largely on a question of principle, and, if I understand him aright, he expressed his gratification at that fact, a gratification in which we can all share. I do not know whether I can infer from his remarks that in the other provinces the elections were not conducted on questions of principle. If so, I assume that the right hon. gentleman referred to the Liberal conduct of the campaign as well as the Conservative. At one time the right hon. the Prime Minister stated that he would be guided on the great question of Oriental immigration by the sentiments of the west; but, if I remember aright, he said he would be guided by the views of the Liberals of the west. I think that is a rather narrow view. He should have said that he would be guided by the views of the people of British Columbia, not the Liberals only.

In regard to the hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the address, I can join with my leader in complimenting those hon. gentlemen. I admit that I was not able to follow the seconder of the motion, although I recognized his grace and eloquence as a speaker. The mover of the address spoke at great length, and in the course of his speech stated that he was an agriculturist, but having been myself an agriculturist for about a quarter of a century, I may be pardoned for saying that his remarks did not smack very much of the soil.

There are four matters which were prominent in the elections that took place recently. They are essential matters of principle, and I propose to touch on them very briefly. In saying that they are essentially questions of principle, I am citing the words of the right hon. the First Minister himself; and I may add that this description of them has been proved accurate, especially in my own case and in my own constituency, where I had the difficult task of contesting a deferred election with the government well in power. And I think I am warranted in saying that the result of that election was a very clear illustration of the triumph of principle over expediency. The four questions which were chiefly debated in the province of British Columbia—and I refer especially to my own campaign, representing as I do, by far the largest constituency in the whole Dominion—were the so-called Election Act, Bill No. 115, known out west as the Aylesworth Bill; the question of better terms; the question of the Oriental or Japanese immigration; and the administration of public affairs, especially in connection with the civil service.

As regards the Election Bill, which was prominently discussed in our campaign, and which to some extent defeated our opponent because of the attitude he took on

that measure last session—with regard to that Bill I shall not say anything because the members of this House who sat here during months while that measure was under discussion, must have had a surfeit of it. I shall only say that proof has since been given in a very marked way that the election laws of British Columbia are absolutely fair to both Liberals and Conservatives. The attempt to abolish our provincial franchise excited very strong feeling in our province; and I am glad to have this opportunity of expressing to my honoured leader and the rest of the Conservative party my appreciation of the gallant fight they put up to retain to the province of British Columbia its own franchise. In connection with this Election Bill, we have had some debate on the question of the deferred elections in Yale and Cariboo and Comox-Atlin and Kootenay. Let me say most emphatically, speaking from personal knowledge of the large constituency of Cariboo, that there was absolutely no justification for the postponement of that election, and that it was generally known, throughout the length and breadth of my constituency, to have been postponed for the sole purpose of getting a seat in this House for a man who had not the slightest chance of obtaining it without the advantage of insidious appeals to public patronage.

The question of better terms has been dealt with to some extent by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) and I shall merely touch on it briefly. In 1904 the question of better terms to British Columbia was the subject matter, to a large extent, of the campaign at that time. We were favoured with various expositions of that subject, and one of the most extraordinary was given by a gentleman who, I believe, is about to speed westward in the hope of representing a constituency which a member of this House has gratefully relinquished. I refer to the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman). On one occasion, when speaking on the question of better terms, Mr. Templeman expressed the view that one large sample of better terms would be given British Columbia when a Liberal administration was restored to power. Well, I fear the better terms will come very late in the day if it is to come in that shape.

Referring to the Prime Minister of British Columbia, (Mr. McBride), the right hon. the First Minister said he was a very astute man. Well, he is not only astute but something very much stronger and bigger. On the question of better terms, he took a broad, sane view; and in handling the matter as he did he impressed his view, not only on the Conservatives, but on the majority of the Liberals of British Columbia. When dealing as I hope to do, at length with this question later on, I propose to endeavour to impress on this