

refuted that argument, and it would have been very difficult for him to do so, because in a moment I shall read his own words, which were stronger than my hon. friend's, a far stronger condemnation of the policy which he is himself trying to enact and impose on the people of Canada to-day.

The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) has stated that, with regard to immigration, it was no more a question of bringing all sorts of people, but a question of bringing the best class of people. The minister has not denied the fact, he has simply tried to prove that under the present order in council he is doing that. This was one of the few points in the speech of the hon. member for Montmagny which the minister tried to discuss, and I will prove that the minister is entirely wrong in regard to it.

The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) stated that after the government had denounced the North Atlantic Trading Company's contract, they had failed to announce their future policy, and had adopted this order in council whilst parliament was in session, and did not even consult the representatives of the people here assembled to give instructions to the government. The minister has not denied the fact, and the fact remains; and here is a radical change in our policy, the enactment of a principle contrary to the very policy of the government, as announced and propounded last session; and that change has been made in this session when parliament was sitting, when it would have been the easiest thing possible for the minister to consult the representatives of the people. I wish one of the colleagues of the minister were here, I wish the Minister of Marine and Fisheries were here, so that he could repeat those words of denunciation which he thundered so eloquently against the Conservative government because, forsooth, they had dared to purchase one million of dollars' worth of arms in Great Britain while parliament was in session. Is this another one of those principles for which the Liberal party attacked the Conservative government, but which they now advocate?—with this difference, that in the case to which I refer it was simply a question of the expenditure of money, whilst in this matter it is a question of a change of policy, a change of attitude on the part of the government, contrary to the attitude which they took last year; and without consulting parliament, whilst the representatives of the nation are assembled here, they meet in a closed chamber and frame a policy which they announce to the country, and say that we must support it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Do we understand that the hon. gentleman goes back on his record concerning payment for arms in 1895?

Mr. BOURASSA. No, I denounced it in 1895, and I denounce it to-day, whether done by a Conservative government or by a Liberal government. Now one of the arguments used by the hon. minister was this: He said, we are devoting most of our energies and spending most of our money in the British islands because we have found that it is the best field for immigration, and because the people of Great Britain, knowing that Canada is a desirable place to live in, want to come here. Sir, if the people of Great Britain want to come to Canada, what is the use of giving \$5 a head to booking agents to send them here? But let us accept the argument, let us suppose it is necessary to have agencies in Great Britain to bring over a desirable class of immigrants, is that a reason for passing an order in council to induce people to come from Norway, Sweden, Holland, Denmark, Hungary, Russia, France, Belgium and Switzerland? If the argument of the minister is good, if the government have changed their policy because circumstances have changed and circumstances have changed in such a way that the people of Canada are entitled to see that their money is well employed by spending it in Great Britain, then why has the government adopted an order in council that allows them to spend money in foreign countries where it is so difficult to carry on a propaganda? Now on this question of propaganda, the hon. gentleman says that the order in council is far different from any past order, because according to the present order in council nothing will be paid to agents who work against the laws of the country in which they are operating. Either this restriction in the order in council holds good or it does not. If it holds good, then this order in council is nothing but a copy of the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company, because in that contract the government introduced the very same clause that the agents of the North Atlantic Trading Company were not going to do anything contrary to the law of the nations in which they were operating. If the North Atlantic Trading Company's contract was a bad one, because it brought those agents into conflict with the laws of the land in which they were operating, this order in council is equally bad because it is based on the same principle; it is the same policy, except that here you are dealing with individual agents instead of with a company.

Now with regard to this aspect of the question, I am open-minded, I am ready to be convinced that it is better to deal with agents than to deal with a company. But I am surprised that that argument should come from the minister, because last year when he announced to the House that the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company was to be cancelled, what did he say? He referred to some writings or some letters from Sir

Charles
have a
compa
the ho
enume
ing li
divid

Now,
other
to ind
show.
years
Atlant
dividua

To w
dividua
lantic
booking
their p
down it
do. An
ed by p
main q
gaged I
Canada,
ter con
did who
sending
the pur
individu

Here
ister li
we had
compa
agents,
to pay
Circum
but it s
gentle
for mod
with th
other m
if the
is the
as they
the poll
instead
cunstar
to pay
would
has not
someve
he style
from M
but he
the circ
terial m
the inde
berta, I
minister
terior fr

The n
only to
circumst
years w
they hav
gument
gard to
applies
all coun