

the facts, if we may believe the reports of the department. What is the advantage of having appointed Mr. Preston, if we have 3,000 fewer immigrants now that he is full-fledged as our representative, and has spent nearly \$5,000 in a year? The fact is, we have had to provide a place for Mr. Preston, as for hundreds of others since hon. gentlemen opposite came into office, and I think that is the only excuse that can be given for his appointment at all.

Now, I wish to read from a little history of the Doukhobors about the circumstance under which they left Russia. They wanted to get the same privilege in Russia that they get in this country—to be exempted from military service. But, the Russian government said: No; if you are going to stay in this country, you will have to do as the rest of us have to do; you will have to perform your share of the duties falling upon the whole body of citizens. When they got leave to go, they had to sign a document, which I will read:

That they leave the frontiers of Russia at their own expense; and that before leaving they sign an agreement never to return within the borders of the empire, understanding that in the case of non-compliance with this last point the offender will be condemned to exile to remote places.

That shows in what esteem they were held in their own country. I venture to say that Russia was very glad to get rid of them, because they had been a source of great trouble. They had been asked to comply with the laws of their country, and they refused. Of course they suffered by reason of refusing. You may say that their suffering was for conscience sake. But, it is very strange to me that men take these fads, and seem to be entirely unable to reason out what their duty is or what they should do as citizens of a country. These people have had to sign an agreement never to go back to Russia under penalty of being banished from that country. I am afraid we shall have to take very strong measures with these people, more especially if they persist in their views of marriage. We cannot tolerate the idea of a free-love association in our midst. I do not think the people of Canada, under any consideration, will submit to anything of the kind—that a man can live with a woman for a time, then banish her and leave his children illegitimate. This seems to me outrageous. The authorities of this country ought to insist upon these people complying with our laws or leaving the country.

Now, this government tells us that the only kind of people they are bringing in are farmers and farm labourers. Last year, in the committee, we went into an investigation of the number of immigrants that came into this country, and, outside of the Doukhobors and Galicians—and I might say that the Galicians have had to be fed by the government, if the reports of the newspapers

are true—the number of immigrants has been comparatively small. The great trouble has been that the government has ignored quality and looked altogether to quantity. Now, what we want is quality more than quantity; and if we can have only one, let us have quality; if we can have both so much the better. But, leaving out the Galicians and Doukhobors, we received, in 1899, about 10,000 or 11,000 that might be considered desirable immigrants. This year we have not had the pleasure of having any of the officers of the department before us to give evidence on the subject of immigration. We are in hopes that, before the estimates on immigration are taken up, we shall have the privilege of having two or three of these gentlemen before us to give us information if they can, which will enable us to discuss the estimates properly. I find that, in 1899, about one in four of those who were brought into the country settled on the land. In 1900, the proportion was about the same. As to expenditure, we find that, taking into account the appropriations they have asked for the coming year, \$445,000, this government has spent in immigration in five years, \$1,524,074, as against \$876,369 that was spent by their predecessors. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say: We get a great many more than our predecessors did. But, if you have only brought so many more people to the country to loaf around the towns and cities instead of going on the land, I do not see where you have benefited the country. I am afraid, when we come to look for those you are supposed to have got, you will have a good deal of difficulty in finding them. I have here several resolutions passed by the Congress of the Trades and Labour Councils of Canada for several years. These are the people who represent the working classes of this country, and who, I presume, have a good knowledge of their condition. It is true that this government, and the Ontario government, have taken care of two of the most prominent members of those organizations, and in one way have shut their mouths; nevertheless, I think the views set forth in these resolutions are those held by the working-people throughout this country. I will read first a resolution passed in 1893:

Moved by Mr. O'Donoghue, seconded by Mr. Glockling,—

An hon. MEMBER. Who is he?

Mr. WILSON. I believe Mr. O'Donoghue is in the Department of Labour in Ottawa, and Mr. McGlockling has been given a comfortable government situation in Toronto.

—that this Trade and Labour Congress, composed of regularly elected and credentialed delegates of bona fide labour organizations throughout Canada, having a knowledge that for years past, and at the present time, the labour market of the Dominion has been and is constantly overcrowded in all its branches, mechanical and manual; be it therefore resolved, that the ex-