

ing them home to their native country. That certainly is something which is not to our advantage. It is something which ought to be checked. In every municipality in Canada, before even a pedlar of any description can ply his trade, he has to pay a license. In like manner every transient labourer coming into Canada should be required to pay a certain tax so as to indemnify slightly our own people for the loss of employment that they have to suffer through this foreign competition; and certainly it is our own people, who are trying to bring up their families in this country and build up our institutions, whose interests we should specially safeguard. Those alien labourers who come here without any intention of becoming British subjects, who have not the slightest intention of living and growing up amongst us, should be made to pay a tax on coming in. There is another class which should not be permitted to come in unrestricted. I refer to the ticket-of-leave men, the hooligans and the hoodlums who have been taken hold of by charitable societies and sent to this country in large numbers, and who make the people of the old land, the honest British born people residing in this country, blush at the thought of having to recognize these degenerates as hailing from the same land. These people should not be allowed to come into this country. We should insist on every man we admit having a clean bill of health and character. There is another class to which I wish to refer, and in doing so I shall quote an advertisement which has been given me and which is being largely circulated in eastern Assiniboia. This circular was sent me by one of the constituents of the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), and I am told that thousands of them have been scattered throughout that constituency. I understand also they are soon to be published generally throughout the Northwest. Many years ago, when I was still in my teens, I heard Barnum say that he would rather be condemned by his opponents than praised by them; and throughout my life I have heard numerous evidences of the truth of that saying. I take therefore this circular as a complimentary advertisement. It gives a quotation from some remarks I made during the present session. It is headed: 'Col. Sam. Hughes, the Conservative member for Victoria and Haliburton, occupies one of the front benches in the House of Commons,' and then goes on as follows:

Speaking in the House of Commons on April 8, 1908 (see 'Hansard,' page 6438), on a Bill to amend the Immigration Act, Col. Hughes said:

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Take the case of a Hindu who comes here from Hong Kong, you may send him back on the steamer and he may not be allowed to land at Hong Kong. I do not think this will help the matter. Why does the hon. minister not bring in a law

Mr. SAM. HUGHES

covering that aspect of the case? This will exclude any man coming from any country other than that of his birth or adoption. Personally I would much prefer a Hindu who has served the empire in the armies of Great Britain to a galvanized Yankee who has been an anarchist in his own land and has come to the United States where he has done his best to disrupt that republic, and who, if he crosses over to Canada, seeks in many instances to disrupt the established laws of the Dominion. I must say that a Hindu who has served in the British army and has had the discipline of a soldier is much more likely to make a good citizen of Canada, much more likely to upbuild the welfare, morality and dignity of this country than many of the class of animals who are imported—

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No 'order' about it. Many of these are not worthy the name of human beings. But these people are admitted, while soldiers who have served in the British army are excluded, not allowed to land and turned adrift.

I was about to say that I am surprised, but on reflection I am not surprised at anything some of these gentlemen would do. In one sense, however, I am surprised that even the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) would have the hardihood to stand up, even in the remote parts of his own constituency, and there cast the stigma on the honest intelligent American settler of suggesting that there could be possibly, or that any one could dream there could possibly, be any relationship or connection between him and the class of American anarchists or galvanized Yankees, as they are termed in their own country. But after the prominence which these gentlemen of the Liberal party have given the Jacksons and the Wagners and others of that class—criminals and fugitives from justice—who were proven guilty of all sorts of offences in the calendar—after the prominence these men have received at the hands of certain members of the Liberal party, I am not surprised at anything our hon. friends opposite might do. But these gentlemen will find that they have shot wide of the mark in endeavouring to show the honest sturdy American citizen of our west that he is a galvanized Yankee and an anarchist. The attempt of these gentlemen to convince the enterprising American citizen that he is an anarchist or that any one in his senses could suspect of him of being one, will only recoil on themselves. The class I had reference to is that class of men who invaded the Dominion and never contributed to the revenue except in the way of excise on whisky and tobacco, who never turned a hand for the benefit of one honest law in the Dominion—men who were driven out of the United States largely for the benefit of that country. These were the men of whom I was speaking, men whose hand is against everybody, and who recognize no law. These are the class we do not want.