

is false. The view I take is this: That in the development of a nation regard must be had for all conditions; regard must be had to the past and to the future as well as to the present, and care must be taken that the present exigencies of interested people are not to control. I am in favour of a strong and well directed and well controlled policy of immigration, and I think I could prove from the words of the Minister of the Interior in the past, that he agrees with me. I hold that the best immigration agent is an agent you have not to pay or hire to do your work; I hold that the best and the most patriotic and the most business-like immigration agent is the contented settler, who being satisfied with his lot in this country will write home to his relatives and friends to join him in this happy and fertile land. Instead of spending so much money in favour of steamship companies, and railway companies, and booking agents, and land speculators, if you took a little more care that the settler coming to Canada is properly treated from the time he lands until he reaches his future home; is not robbed on the way; is not intercepted by the land speculator; is not intercepted by the agents of the very same men who have enforced this immigration policy upon you;—you will have a much better immigration system than the system which is costing you so much at the present day.

If you look to the settler, from the time of his arrival until he settles on his holding; if you make him satisfied with his life in Canada; if he finds that Canada is a land of law and justice, a land which looks after the farmer and the settler, which prevents the speculator and the railway company from crushing him, he will be far more satisfied than if you paid \$2.50 to a Hamburg Jew to ship him to Canada—and let God take care of him when he gets here. If you would take the large sum of money you are now spending in Europe in paying these booking agents or their steamship companies, or these secret organizations like the North Atlantic Trading Company, and devote it to the development of the transportation facilities of Canada, so that the settler would find the best and cheapest means of sending out his farm produce, that he might not be at the mercy of the elevator company or the railway company which you incorporate and which you protect, and if you would also cheapen communication so that the settler could get his manufactured goods at a better price than he gets them to-day, then that settler would write home, he would tell his friends and relatives in the British Islands, in France, in Belgium or in Germany—that Canada is a land where railway corporations and land speculators do not control the government and the law, that Canada is a country where trade flourishes and a man can buy and sell without paying tri-

bute to monopolies of any kind—and that contented settler, writing with enthusiasm to his friends of his new home, would be a far more effective immigration agent than any of your Hamburg Jews or secret organizations.

Now, with regard to the question of discrimination let me at once point out that the discrimination urged by my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) was not as between English and French immigrants, as the Minister of the Interior, in an effort to make a cheap point, would have had the House believe. The hon. minister tried to put in the mouth of my hon. friend words which he never uttered; he tried to impute to him sentiments which are foreign to him. The hon. minister tried—as many like him have tried for ten years past, on my own account—to make it appear that my hon. friend from Montmagny was seeking to raise racial distinctions as between the English-speaking and French-speaking population in this country. The accusation is no more true in this case than it ever was before. What my hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) asked the Minister of the Interior to do was to formulate and carry out a policy based upon the very nature of the Canadian people, a policy that would encourage English and French immigrants as against those from other countries. Is this again 'Little Canadian'? Is this 'mere sentiment'? I say, Sir—quoting from the words of the Minister of the Interior—we must take facts as they are; we must accept history as it is. This country was settled and founded by the French and conquered by the English. After the feuds of many years these races have agreed together to found a vast Canadian nation. But, Sir, it never was in the minds of the founders of this nation, it never was in the minds of the fathers of confederation, the men whose names these present so-called Liberals are so fond of invoking, that in order to be broad—or even in order to make land speculators rich—we ought to change a providential condition of our partly French and partly English country to make it a land of refuge for the scum of all nations. That idea, I say, never entered the mind of any patriotic Canadian, whether Conservative or Liberal, whether British or of French descent. It is an idea worthy of those 'big' men who now try to teach breadth of mind and loftiness of patriotism to others. The idea of the founders of this nation was that the double current of our national and mental activity should go on, that the British civilization and the French civilization should be maintained in this country, and not that we should give the better half of our continent to people who have nothing in common with us—nothing in common with us in history, nothing in common with us in blood, nothing in common with us in education or econ-