

Charles Tupper, saying that it was better to have arrangements of that kind made with companies than with individual agents, and the hon. gentleman took credit for the government in the fact that they were now paying bonuses to a company and not to individual booking agents. He said:

Now, to whom did our hon. friends on the other side pay the bonuses? They paid them to individual booking agents—so their letters show. To whom did this government pay in the years preceding the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company? They paid to individual booking agents.

To whom do they pay now? Not to any individual booking agents, but to the North Atlantic Trading Company, a collective interest of booking agents. And do they get value for their payments? Judged by the standard laid down in the letter of Sir Charles Tupper, they do. And any man of common sense, not warped by political bias, will agree that that is the main question. . . . I know they are engaged in the business of booking emigrants to Canada, and I know that they work under better conditions to-day as a company, than they did when they worked as individuals, and are sending more emigrants to Canada. That was the purpose of the change from payments to individual agents to payments to this company.

Here we have, in the words of the minister himself last year, the statement that we had better adopt the policy of paying a company than of paying individual booking agents. Now the minister says it is better to pay individual agents than a company. Circumstances change, says the minister; but it seems to me that the mind of the hon. gentleman is changing quite too fast, even for modern times and modern circumstances, with the development of electricity and all other means of rapid manifestations. Now if the hon. gentleman would show us what is the difference between the circumstances as they existed last year when he preferred the policy of paying bonuses to a company instead of individual agents, and the circumstances of to-day which make it better to pay to agents instead of a company, we would not be so much mystified. But he has not deigned to inform us. He has in a somewhat satirical manner pointed out what he styles the inaccuracies of my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Arnaud Lavergne), but he does not deign to tell us what were the circumstances which allowed his ministerial mind not only to change so much from the independent mind of the member of Alberta, but to change so greatly from the ministerial mind of the Minister of the Interior from 1906 to 1907.

The minister has told us very often, not only to-day, but on previous occasions, that circumstances had changed in the last few years with regard to immigration. I admit they have, but in what way? The very argument which the minister made with regard to immigration from the British islands applies to a large extent to immigration from all countries. I think every one in this

House will admit that the main change which has occurred to warrant a modification of our immigration policy is that Canada is better known to the world to-day than she was some years ago. Canada's trade is better known, her agricultural and mining resources are better known; and therefore if that basic change of circumstances means anything with regard to our immigration policy, it means that the time has come when we should stand upon our dignity as a nation and step out before the world, instead of advertising our country through more or less questionable agencies as a patent medicine vendor advertises his nostrum and invites all sick and ailing people to come and be cured. Sir, the minister has taken pride in the fact that under this order in council he was discriminating with regard to the class of immigrants which were coming in, and he read the words which I will read again.

The immigrants for which this government offers a bounty and bonus or a prize to booking agents, are:

Farmers, farm labourers, gardeners, stablemen, carters, railway surfacemen, navvies, or miners, who have signified their intention of following farming or railway construction work in Canada, and female domestic servants.

That is a pretty broad ground. Let us come to the facts. How will this operate? You have a booking agent in London or you have ten or twenty of them. You have so many in Liverpool, in Amsterdam, in Hamburg, in Antwerp, in different parts of Europe. According to what the minister says in regard to immigration work in foreign countries, to which this order in council applies exclusively, they are not allowed to go outside of their offices to canvas immigrants. They must stay there until the immigrant comes to buy his ticket. I have very grave doubts, once this inducement is offered to a booking agent to make so much money per head of all the people he may ship to Canada, whether he will confine himself to the letter of this order in council or whether he will not put himself in the sad position, as stated by some ministerial supporters, of committing suicide or going to gaol. I have my grave doubts as to whether these booking agents, immediately you offer them this inducement, will stay in their offices. But let us suppose that they stay in their offices. Let us suppose that they conform to the letter of this order in council. What will be the result? Here is a man in Hamburg who does not know what tramp or other person will come from Prussia or Silesia to his office to get a ticket for the United States or elsewhere. The agent has only to sell him a ticket to Canada to get \$2.50 and he will say to him: Of course you are a railway worker or a navvy, here is your ticket for Canada and you will make a declaration that you are going there to work at