

because of some reference he made to the devolution of the duties of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) upon the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman), I distinctly understood him to say that, from his point of view, he did not attach very much importance as to whether a certain proportion of the ministers came from one province or the other, but would look rather to the fitness of a minister than to the province from which he might happen to come. I do not think therefore that the imputations passed upon these gentlemen this afternoon were deserved, and I can say this the more freely because a little later on I intend pointing out that I do not concur in the terms of the resolution as it goes somewhat beyond what I would be prepared to support in this instance.

A somewhat sneering remark was made with regard to the attitude of my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) concerning the use of the French language in this country. As far as the statutes are concerned, I have not the slightest hesitation in supporting the position he took. I would like to point out to the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) that if the French version of these statutes had been prepared in the first instance and the English version would not be ready for some three months later, probably we would have heard something from the English speaking provinces, and perhaps the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre), if he happened to be a member of the bar, would not look at the situation in the very philosophical light he was inclined to bestow on the converse situation this afternoon. As far as the two languages are concerned, both are, under the law of the country, to be used in the preparation of the statutes and the debates of this parliament, and I can see no good reason why it was departed from in the instance alluded to. Those of us, whose mother tongue is English, if we were two millions in this country among a population of over four million French, might perhaps be quite as susceptible as my hon. friends have proved themselves to be during this session and previous sessions on that point. I have thought fit in all fairness to express this view because neither one of these two gentlemen will have the opportunity to speak again in this debate. I have therefore taken this opportunity to say what I think may well be said in fairness and justice to them with regard to the imputations which have been cast upon them.

I was impressed with the baldness of this resolution when my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) moved it. But its somewhat bald and abrupt wording was explained afterwards when it was shown to consist of two sentences taken from two speeches of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). It could not therefore be expected to be in precisely that form

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

which would command the adhesion of a majority in this House.

Let us look at it for a few minutes and see what it involves. It declares that the payment of bonuses on immigrants has a tendency to bring a less desirable rather than a more desirable class of people into this country. That was the utterance of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) some few years ago before he was a minister of the Crown. I do not think that sentence expresses a principle in which I would be inclined to confer. It does not seem to me that the payment of bonuses in itself has any tendency to bring in a less rather than a more desirable class of people into this country. That would depend altogether on the way you work it out. If without the payment of bonuses you permit people to come in indiscriminately, if you use every possible means by advertising and otherwise in any particular country from which immigration is not very desirable, you might, without a system of bonusing at all, increase the tendency to bring in people who are not desirable. On the other hand, if you use the system of bonusing, you might attach to it such conditions as would not tend to bring in undesirable people. It seems to me that that portion of the resolution is of so bald and inconclusive a character that I for one would not be inclined to commit myself to supporting it.

Mr. BOURASSA. Does my hon. friend not think that the moment you pay a bonus to an agent in a foreign country, over whom you cannot have the direct control that should be exercised, the result of that system will naturally be to defeat your purpose of selecting immigration, and you will encourage the agent, through his own self-interest, to look rather to the number than to the character of the immigrants?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would not think so necessarily, and I shall come to that point a little later on and endeavour to satisfy my hon. friend that there is at least another way of looking at the matter.

Before going into that, however, I would like to call the attention of my hon. friend from Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) to his observations this afternoon with regard to the qualities of foreign immigrants. I do not think that the expression 'foreign immigrants' was used in this debate to characterize those people who have taken the oath of allegiance. It was intended to distinguish between those born under the British flag, and those not born under that flag. The hon. member for Strathcona was particularly severe, in that connection, in commenting upon what has been said here today. Now, I have here some expressions with regard to certain settlers in the Northwest. I quote them, not because I approve of what is said, for I am bound to say that, from my observation of the Galicians in