

1907-8 WAS THE GREATEST YEAR IN HISTORY OF CANADA'S TRADE

Foreign Trade Increased \$25,818,940 in Spite of Alleged Financial Stringency

Bank Deposits Last Month Alone Increased \$12,000,000 — Government's Restrictive Policy Considerably Reduces European Immigration

OTTAWA, Ont., April 22.—For the fiscal year ending with last month Canada's total trade reached the record figure of \$438,280,291, an increase of \$25,818,940 over the corresponding twelve months of 1906-7.

The imports for the year totalled \$208,373,886, an increase of \$18,008,940. Exports totalled \$229,906,405, an increase of \$7,810,000.

The customs revenue for the year increased \$5,614,281, the total being \$58,620,737. The largest increase in domestic exports was in agricultural products, which totalled \$66,069,939, as compared with \$49,544,327 for the preceding twelve months. Exports of manufactures totalled \$58,467,124, an increase of \$2,228,075. Exports of the mine totalled \$3,177,138, an increase of \$3,000,982. Fisheries exports remained practically stationary, totalling \$13,867,288. A large decrease is shown in exports of animals and their product, which reached only \$55,101,260 last year, as compared with \$71,671,074 for the preceding twelve months. Exports of the forest totalled \$44,170,470, a decrease of \$1,652,796. For the last month the imports totalled \$50,962,023, a decrease of \$6,789,844. Exports amounted to \$13,672,086, an increase of \$2,442,080.

The tariff-bank statement issued this afternoon shows an increase in deposits with Canadian banks during the month amounting to a little over \$12,000,000. Deposits with branches outside Canada increased from \$60,821,197 at the end of February, to \$67,047,119 on March 31st. Call loans on stocks and bonds advanced by branches elsewhere than Canada increased from \$47,090,259 to \$52,098,292.

The immigration department reports that the total immigration for the first three months of the present calendar year was 27,144, as compared with 42,948 for the same three months in 1907, showing a decrease of 14,804. The British immigration was 8,944, as compared with 20,822, a decrease of 11,878. The continental immigration was 6,819 as compared with 11,690, a decrease of 4,870. The immigration from the United States was 11,380, as compared with 9,622, an increase of 1,758.

The immigration for the last fiscal year ending with last month was 68,489, made up of 120,122 British, 83,975 continental, and 58,332 from the United States. For the corresponding twelve months the immigration was 222,702, made up of 109,966 British, 59,473 continental, and 53,263 from the United States. The increase for the twelve months was 39,767.

Mr. Paquet, who supported Mr. Monk's idea of abolishing the bonus, expressed regret that emigration to the United States had weakened the agricultural interests, particularly of Quebec. Repatriation was a question of supreme importance he considered. He also thought there should be a greater effort to bring agricultural classes from Britain and parts of France and Belgium. The present immigration

laws were good, he thought, but were defeated in its application, as there was really no direct control over the Bonus, and this was the difficulty. At the same time he believed this country was getting a better class of immigrants than the United States.

Mr. McIntyre (Strathcona) could not understand the attitude of the opposition. It was admittedly in the interests of the country to secure immigration of as good a quality as possible. But the opposition's idea apparently was that the best way to increase business was to cease taking any steps to bring that about. He could not agree with Mr. Monk that the bonus system was really responsible for bringing undesirable immigrants or that all the blame lay at the door of the Dominion government. The Ontario government, for instance, was spending money on colonization and immigration, having contributed \$58,000 for that last year and having secured votes this year for the same purpose of \$58,000.

Last year that government gave under this head \$7,000 to the Salvation Army immigration work, and this year had increased that vote to \$10,000. Was Ontario's inspector of public charities fair in trying to lay the blame on the Dominion government for the bringing in of undesirable, and were the opposition members of the commonsense in adopting practically the same attitude? Should there not be taking into consideration the ease with which the trouble, reports of which were he thought exaggerated, could be traced to public charities that sent to Canada many people whose resources were not sufficient to tide them over a period of stress and trial that might be theirs in some particular instance?

Mr. McIntyre (Perth) resumed the debate on Mr. Monk's amendment made on motion to go into supply against bonus book agents for immigration. In the course of his remarks Mr. McIntyre said that while he had no particular prejudice for or against a bonus rather than taking Monk's view of abolishing it altogether, he would double or triple it if by so doing Canada could get the very best that the greatest countries in the world could offer. An effort had been made to induce immigrants to come throughout the country that bonuses were paid on all immigrants. This was an entirely erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

While it was unfortunately true that there was an entire erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

Mr. Paquet, who supported Mr. Monk's idea of abolishing the bonus, expressed regret that emigration to the United States had weakened the agricultural interests, particularly of Quebec. Repatriation was a question of supreme importance he considered. He also thought there should be a greater effort to bring agricultural classes from Britain and parts of France and Belgium. The present immigration

LIBERAL IMMIGRATION POLICY DEFENDED

Western Members Insist Upon Encouragement of Desirable Settlers on the Land

OTTAWA, April 22.—The commonsense today got back to the great question of immigration and Mr. Monk's proposal for the opposition that the volume of newcomers should be reduced by curtailing payments of bonuses to booking agents who send men to Canada.

The question has been debated previously this session, but chiefly by members of the opposition. Today Liberals were heard from in the persons of Mr. McIntyre of Ontario and Mr. McIntyre of Alberta. Both wanted more immigrants and favored bonuses to them.

Dr. Paquet of L'Islet confessed the conservative Quebec view against strangers and against bonuses.

Ralph Smith was told that there are six steamship companies on the Pacific coast receiving bonuses for service to China, Japan, New Zealand, Mexico and the Canadian and American coasts. The government was not aware that any of them had encouraged immigration of Orientals against the legislation of the country. However, if a company did so, the government would regard it as incompatible with the subsidy act.

Mr. Monk was told by Mr. Oliver that of the 1,782 immigrants landed at St. John from the U. P. R. steamer Montreal April 5, 98.3-5 per cent. passed inspection, 19 destined for Canada and 7 for the United States were detained. It has not been decided how many will be deported.

Mr. McIntyre (Perth) resumed the debate on Mr. Monk's amendment made on motion to go into supply against bonus book agents for immigration. In the course of his remarks Mr. McIntyre said that while he had no particular prejudice for or against a bonus rather than taking Monk's view of abolishing it altogether, he would double or triple it if by so doing Canada could get the very best that the greatest countries in the world could offer. An effort had been made to induce immigrants to come throughout the country that bonuses were paid on all immigrants. This was an entirely erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

While it was unfortunately true that there was an entire erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

Mr. Paquet, who supported Mr. Monk's idea of abolishing the bonus, expressed regret that emigration to the United States had weakened the agricultural interests, particularly of Quebec. Repatriation was a question of supreme importance he considered. He also thought there should be a greater effort to bring agricultural classes from Britain and parts of France and Belgium. The present immigration

laws were good, he thought, but were defeated in its application, as there was really no direct control over the Bonus, and this was the difficulty. At the same time he believed this country was getting a better class of immigrants than the United States.

Mr. McIntyre (Strathcona) could not understand the attitude of the opposition. It was admittedly in the interests of the country to secure immigration of as good a quality as possible. But the opposition's idea apparently was that the best way to increase business was to cease taking any steps to bring that about. He could not agree with Mr. Monk that the bonus system was really responsible for bringing undesirable immigrants or that all the blame lay at the door of the Dominion government. The Ontario government, for instance, was spending money on colonization and immigration, having contributed \$58,000 for that last year and having secured votes this year for the same purpose of \$58,000.

Last year that government gave under this head \$7,000 to the Salvation Army immigration work, and this year had increased that vote to \$10,000. Was Ontario's inspector of public charities fair in trying to lay the blame on the Dominion government for the bringing in of undesirable, and were the opposition members of the commonsense in adopting practically the same attitude? Should there not be taking into consideration the ease with which the trouble, reports of which were he thought exaggerated, could be traced to public charities that sent to Canada many people whose resources were not sufficient to tide them over a period of stress and trial that might be theirs in some particular instance?

Mr. McIntyre (Perth) resumed the debate on Mr. Monk's amendment made on motion to go into supply against bonus book agents for immigration. In the course of his remarks Mr. McIntyre said that while he had no particular prejudice for or against a bonus rather than taking Monk's view of abolishing it altogether, he would double or triple it if by so doing Canada could get the very best that the greatest countries in the world could offer. An effort had been made to induce immigrants to come throughout the country that bonuses were paid on all immigrants. This was an entirely erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

While it was unfortunately true that there was an entire erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

Mr. Paquet, who supported Mr. Monk's idea of abolishing the bonus, expressed regret that emigration to the United States had weakened the agricultural interests, particularly of Quebec. Repatriation was a question of supreme importance he considered. He also thought there should be a greater effort to bring agricultural classes from Britain and parts of France and Belgium. The present immigration

laws were good, he thought, but were defeated in its application, as there was really no direct control over the Bonus, and this was the difficulty. At the same time he believed this country was getting a better class of immigrants than the United States.

Mr. McIntyre (Strathcona) could not understand the attitude of the opposition. It was admittedly in the interests of the country to secure immigration of as good a quality as possible. But the opposition's idea apparently was that the best way to increase business was to cease taking any steps to bring that about. He could not agree with Mr. Monk that the bonus system was really responsible for bringing undesirable immigrants or that all the blame lay at the door of the Dominion government. The Ontario government, for instance, was spending money on colonization and immigration, having contributed \$58,000 for that last year and having secured votes this year for the same purpose of \$58,000.

Last year that government gave under this head \$7,000 to the Salvation Army immigration work, and this year had increased that vote to \$10,000. Was Ontario's inspector of public charities fair in trying to lay the blame on the Dominion government for the bringing in of undesirable, and were the opposition members of the commonsense in adopting practically the same attitude? Should there not be taking into consideration the ease with which the trouble, reports of which were he thought exaggerated, could be traced to public charities that sent to Canada many people whose resources were not sufficient to tide them over a period of stress and trial that might be theirs in some particular instance?

Mr. McIntyre (Perth) resumed the debate on Mr. Monk's amendment made on motion to go into supply against bonus book agents for immigration. In the course of his remarks Mr. McIntyre said that while he had no particular prejudice for or against a bonus rather than taking Monk's view of abolishing it altogether, he would double or triple it if by so doing Canada could get the very best that the greatest countries in the world could offer. An effort had been made to induce immigrants to come throughout the country that bonuses were paid on all immigrants. This was an entirely erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

While it was unfortunately true that there was an entire erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

Mr. Paquet of L'Islet confessed the conservative Quebec view against strangers and against bonuses.

Ralph Smith was told that there are six steamship companies on the Pacific coast receiving bonuses for service to China, Japan, New Zealand, Mexico and the Canadian and American coasts. The government was not aware that any of them had encouraged immigration of Orientals against the legislation of the country. However, if a company did so, the government would regard it as incompatible with the subsidy act.

Mr. Monk was told by Mr. Oliver that of the 1,782 immigrants landed at St. John from the U. P. R. steamer Montreal April 5, 98.3-5 per cent. passed inspection, 19 destined for Canada and 7 for the United States were detained. It has not been decided how many will be deported.

Mr. McIntyre (Perth) resumed the debate on Mr. Monk's amendment made on motion to go into supply against bonus book agents for immigration. In the course of his remarks Mr. McIntyre said that while he had no particular prejudice for or against a bonus rather than taking Monk's view of abolishing it altogether, he would double or triple it if by so doing Canada could get the very best that the greatest countries in the world could offer. An effort had been made to induce immigrants to come throughout the country that bonuses were paid on all immigrants. This was an entirely erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

While it was unfortunately true that there was an entire erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

Mr. Paquet, who supported Mr. Monk's idea of abolishing the bonus, expressed regret that emigration to the United States had weakened the agricultural interests, particularly of Quebec. Repatriation was a question of supreme importance he considered. He also thought there should be a greater effort to bring agricultural classes from Britain and parts of France and Belgium. The present immigration

laws were good, he thought, but were defeated in its application, as there was really no direct control over the Bonus, and this was the difficulty. At the same time he believed this country was getting a better class of immigrants than the United States.

Mr. McIntyre (Strathcona) could not understand the attitude of the opposition. It was admittedly in the interests of the country to secure immigration of as good a quality as possible. But the opposition's idea apparently was that the best way to increase business was to cease taking any steps to bring that about. He could not agree with Mr. Monk that the bonus system was really responsible for bringing undesirable immigrants or that all the blame lay at the door of the Dominion government. The Ontario government, for instance, was spending money on colonization and immigration, having contributed \$58,000 for that last year and having secured votes this year for the same purpose of \$58,000.

Last year that government gave under this head \$7,000 to the Salvation Army immigration work, and this year had increased that vote to \$10,000. Was Ontario's inspector of public charities fair in trying to lay the blame on the Dominion government for the bringing in of undesirable, and were the opposition members of the commonsense in adopting practically the same attitude? Should there not be taking into consideration the ease with which the trouble, reports of which were he thought exaggerated, could be traced to public charities that sent to Canada many people whose resources were not sufficient to tide them over a period of stress and trial that might be theirs in some particular instance?

Mr. McIntyre (Perth) resumed the debate on Mr. Monk's amendment made on motion to go into supply against bonus book agents for immigration. In the course of his remarks Mr. McIntyre said that while he had no particular prejudice for or against a bonus rather than taking Monk's view of abolishing it altogether, he would double or triple it if by so doing Canada could get the very best that the greatest countries in the world could offer. An effort had been made to induce immigrants to come throughout the country that bonuses were paid on all immigrants. This was an entirely erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

While it was unfortunately true that there was an entire erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

Mr. Paquet, who supported Mr. Monk's idea of abolishing the bonus, expressed regret that emigration to the United States had weakened the agricultural interests, particularly of Quebec. Repatriation was a question of supreme importance he considered. He also thought there should be a greater effort to bring agricultural classes from Britain and parts of France and Belgium. The present immigration

laws were good, he thought, but were defeated in its application, as there was really no direct control over the Bonus, and this was the difficulty. At the same time he believed this country was getting a better class of immigrants than the United States.

Mr. McIntyre (Strathcona) could not understand the attitude of the opposition. It was admittedly in the interests of the country to secure immigration of as good a quality as possible. But the opposition's idea apparently was that the best way to increase business was to cease taking any steps to bring that about. He could not agree with Mr. Monk that the bonus system was really responsible for bringing undesirable immigrants or that all the blame lay at the door of the Dominion government. The Ontario government, for instance, was spending money on colonization and immigration, having contributed \$58,000 for that last year and having secured votes this year for the same purpose of \$58,000.

Last year that government gave under this head \$7,000 to the Salvation Army immigration work, and this year had increased that vote to \$10,000. Was Ontario's inspector of public charities fair in trying to lay the blame on the Dominion government for the bringing in of undesirable, and were the opposition members of the commonsense in adopting practically the same attitude? Should there not be taking into consideration the ease with which the trouble, reports of which were he thought exaggerated, could be traced to public charities that sent to Canada many people whose resources were not sufficient to tide them over a period of stress and trial that might be theirs in some particular instance?

Mr. McIntyre (Perth) resumed the debate on Mr. Monk's amendment made on motion to go into supply against bonus book agents for immigration. In the course of his remarks Mr. McIntyre said that while he had no particular prejudice for or against a bonus rather than taking Monk's view of abolishing it altogether, he would double or triple it if by so doing Canada could get the very best that the greatest countries in the world could offer. An effort had been made to induce immigrants to come throughout the country that bonuses were paid on all immigrants. This was an entirely erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

While it was unfortunately true that there was an entire erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

Mr. Paquet, who supported Mr. Monk's idea of abolishing the bonus, expressed regret that emigration to the United States had weakened the agricultural interests, particularly of Quebec. Repatriation was a question of supreme importance he considered. He also thought there should be a greater effort to bring agricultural classes from Britain and parts of France and Belgium. The present immigration

laws were good, he thought, but were defeated in its application, as there was really no direct control over the Bonus, and this was the difficulty. At the same time he believed this country was getting a better class of immigrants than the United States.

PAY FROM GOVT. HARD TO COLLECT

Engineer Testifies to Liberal Economy

Now He Demands His Pay in Advance for Government Work

OTTAWA, Ont., April 22.—E. H. Van-valet, civil engineer, Montreal, gave evidence before public accounts committee this morning as to the work done for the public works department in connection with the dam at St. Andrew's Rapids, near Winnipeg. He first made a study of the rapids in 1901, but did not enter upon the work until 1906, other matters of importance having intervened. At the end of April, 1906, he started for Europe to visit and investigate works at dams similar to that which he required at St. Andrew's Rapids. There was nothing just like the work on this side, he said, until he had seen the work at St. Andrew's Rapids. His terms for the work on the rapids included \$50 for this trip. The last sheet of his plans was filed with the department in April, this year. As a result of what he was able to learn on his trip he estimated the work on the dam and bridge will be completed cost \$30,000 less than under original plans. The payments to Mr. Vanvalet for his plans to the end of last year were \$10,982, in addition to \$500 for the trip. He is also entitled to \$5,000 when the work is finished. Witness, who has been doing work for the department since 1889, said that in addition to the St. Andrew's Rapids he had made for the department plans for a \$350,000 freight shed at Quebec. On this he had received \$3,000 and had still against the department a claim of \$9,000.

To Mr. Pardon, Mr. Gervais and other Liberal members Vanvalet said that for fifteen years he had been acting as engineer for the C. P. R. and had constructed thousands of bridges between St. John, N. B., and British Columbia for that company. He is also consulting engineer for the city of Montreal, the Bank De Paris and other private concerns. His charges to the government, he said, were on the same basis as those he had his first government work in 1889, and the same as those of any other client, such as the Bank De Paris for instance, voluntarily paid considerable amounts in advance for his work. This he positively insisted upon in the case of doubtful clients.

Mr. Northrup, who conducted the examination, asked Mr. Vanvalet if he considered the government a doubtful client.

Witness answered in the affirmative and later explained that he had spent three years of his time drawing plans for the department of harbor sheds at Montreal, and for this had never received a cent. A petition of rights which he had filed in the matter had, however, been dismissed, but he had made up his mind not to do any more work for the government unless he was paid in advance.

J. B. St. Laurent, assistant to the chief engineer of the department, said that the only work done at the dam and bridge at St. Andrew's Rapids, which were essential in connection with navigation of Lake Winnipeg, was between 1890 and 1892. During that time the department had acted wisely in sending Mr. Vanvalet to Europe, where he was unanimously in favor of the world of the required work. He was present. Witness estimated that the preparation of plans by Vanvalet would cost between \$4,000 and \$5,000.

Mr. Paquet, who supported Mr. Monk's idea of abolishing the bonus, expressed regret that emigration to the United States had weakened the agricultural interests, particularly of Quebec. Repatriation was a question of supreme importance he considered. He also thought there should be a greater effort to bring agricultural classes from Britain and parts of France and Belgium. The present immigration

laws were good, he thought, but were defeated in its application, as there was really no direct control over the Bonus, and this was the difficulty. At the same time he believed this country was getting a better class of immigrants than the United States.

Mr. McIntyre (Strathcona) could not understand the attitude of the opposition. It was admittedly in the interests of the country to secure immigration of as good a quality as possible. But the opposition's idea apparently was that the best way to increase business was to cease taking any steps to bring that about. He could not agree with Mr. Monk that the bonus system was really responsible for bringing undesirable immigrants or that all the blame lay at the door of the Dominion government. The Ontario government, for instance, was spending money on colonization and immigration, having contributed \$58,000 for that last year and having secured votes this year for the same purpose of \$58,000.

Last year that government gave under this head \$7,000 to the Salvation Army immigration work, and this year had increased that vote to \$10,000. Was Ontario's inspector of public charities fair in trying to lay the blame on the Dominion government for the bringing in of undesirable, and were the opposition members of the commonsense in adopting practically the same attitude? Should there not be taking into consideration the ease with which the trouble, reports of which were he thought exaggerated, could be traced to public charities that sent to Canada many people whose resources were not sufficient to tide them over a period of stress and trial that might be theirs in some particular instance?

Mr. McIntyre (Perth) resumed the debate on Mr. Monk's amendment made on motion to go into supply against bonus book agents for immigration. In the course of his remarks Mr. McIntyre said that while he had no particular prejudice for or against a bonus rather than taking Monk's view of abolishing it altogether, he would double or triple it if by so doing Canada could get the very best that the greatest countries in the world could offer. An effort had been made to induce immigrants to come throughout the country that bonuses were paid on all immigrants. This was an entirely erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

While it was unfortunately true that there was an entire erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

Mr. Paquet, who supported Mr. Monk's idea of abolishing the bonus, expressed regret that emigration to the United States had weakened the agricultural interests, particularly of Quebec. Repatriation was a question of supreme importance he considered. He also thought there should be a greater effort to bring agricultural classes from Britain and parts of France and Belgium. The present immigration

laws were good, he thought, but were defeated in its application, as there was really no direct control over the Bonus, and this was the difficulty. At the same time he believed this country was getting a better class of immigrants than the United States.

Mr. McIntyre (Strathcona) could not understand the attitude of the opposition. It was admittedly in the interests of the country to secure immigration of as good a quality as possible. But the opposition's idea apparently was that the best way to increase business was to cease taking any steps to bring that about. He could not agree with Mr. Monk that the bonus system was really responsible for bringing undesirable immigrants or that all the blame lay at the door of the Dominion government. The Ontario government, for instance, was spending money on colonization and immigration, having contributed \$58,000 for that last year and having secured votes this year for the same purpose of \$58,000.

Last year that government gave under this head \$7,000 to the Salvation Army immigration work, and this year had increased that vote to \$10,000. Was Ontario's inspector of public charities fair in trying to lay the blame on the Dominion government for the bringing in of undesirable, and were the opposition members of the commonsense in adopting practically the same attitude? Should there not be taking into consideration the ease with which the trouble, reports of which were he thought exaggerated, could be traced to public charities that sent to Canada many people whose resources were not sufficient to tide them over a period of stress and trial that might be theirs in some particular instance?

Mr. McIntyre (Perth) resumed the debate on Mr. Monk's amendment made on motion to go into supply against bonus book agents for immigration. In the course of his remarks Mr. McIntyre said that while he had no particular prejudice for or against a bonus rather than taking Monk's view of abolishing it altogether, he would double or triple it if by so doing Canada could get the very best that the greatest countries in the world could offer. An effort had been made to induce immigrants to come throughout the country that bonuses were paid on all immigrants. This was an entirely erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

While it was unfortunately true that there was an entire erroneous idea, the proportion on which they were paid being small. This was not, however, an essential question; the real point was the success or otherwise of the government's policy and for his part he thought it had been successful.

Mr. Paquet, who supported Mr. Monk's idea of abolishing the bonus, expressed regret that emigration to the United States had weakened the agricultural interests, particularly of Quebec. Repatriation was a question of supreme importance he considered. He also thought there should be a greater effort to bring agricultural classes from Britain and parts of France and Belgium. The present immigration

laws were good, he thought, but were defeated in its application, as there was really no direct control over the Bonus, and this was the difficulty. At the same time he believed this country was getting a better class of immigrants than the United States.

Mr. McIntyre (Strathcona) could not understand the attitude of the opposition. It was admittedly in the interests of the country to secure immigration of as good a quality as possible. But the opposition's idea apparently was that the best way to increase business was to cease taking any steps to bring that about. He could not agree with Mr. Monk that the bonus system was really responsible for bringing undesirable immigrants or that all the blame lay at the door of the Dominion government. The Ontario government, for instance, was spending money on colonization and immigration, having contributed \$58,000 for that last year and having secured votes this year for the same purpose of \$58,000.

C. P. R. AND C. N. R. MECHANICAL EMPLOYEES PREPARING TO CALL GENERAL STRIKE

SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN DIED WEDNESDAY IN LONDON AFTER A LONG AND TEDIOUS ILLNESS



SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN.

LONDON, April 23.—Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, former British Premier, died at 9.15 o'clock this morning at his official residence in Downing street. The end was peaceful.

The cause of Sir Henry's death is officially given as heart failure.

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman resigned the office of Prime Minister on April 5, suggesting in his letter to King Edward, who was sojourning at Biarritz, Herbert H. Asquith, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and then acting premier, as his successor. Mr. Asquith was summoned at once by the King and received the appointment a few days later. Sir Henry was born September 7, 1836. He was the youngest son of the late Sir James Campbell, of Strathcarron, Forfarshire, a little more than a year ago. Dr. Burnet, who was Mr. Campbell-Bannerman's personal physician and who had been in constant attendance during his long illness, said that Sir Henry's death was due to heart failure, but all persons were barred from approaching the house by a cordon of police from Scotland Yard nearby.

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's final illness dates from February 12, when he last appeared in the House of Commons and moved the closure of the Scottish Land Bill, although he had been ailing since November 13, 1907, when he participated at an entertainment in honor of Emperor William at the Guild Hall. On November 14, after addressing a political meeting at Bristol, he was seriously stricken with heart weakness, and later influenza was added to his heart trouble, bringing on his fatal ailment. The ex-premier fully appreciated his condition and realized that his recovery was improbable. He offered to give up office some time before he formally resigned, but the only few invalids have been the object of so much solicitude and attention as was bestowed upon Sir Henry, there having been a constant stream of callers at his Downing street residence, including King Edward, who visited him on two occasions, Queen Alexandra, the Dowager Empress of Russia, the Prince and Princess of Wales, and many prominent men in public life.

It is understood that the ex-premier was opposed to a public funeral and it is believed that he will be buried without ostentation beside the body of his wife at Meigle, in Perthshire, Scotland. David Lloyd-George, Chancellor of the Exchequer, on receiving the news of Sir Henry's death, said: "I never met a great public figure since I have been in political life who won so completely the attachment and affection of the men who came in contact with him."

More than two months did not come a surprise. Although the doctor's bulletins had not declared his condition critical, that fact was perfectly understood and the public had been expecting the announcement of his end at any hour during the past fortnight. The news came in the form of the following bulletin at 10.30 o'clock this morning:

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman passed away at 9.15 o'clock this morning. The cause of death was heart failure.

(Signed) R. W. Burnet.

In the death chamber where the ex-premier breathed his last, were his niece, Mrs. Campbell, who had acted as Sir Henry's hostess since the death of Lady Campbell-Bannerman, a little more than a year ago. Dr. Burnet, who was Mr. Campbell-Bannerman's personal physician and who had been in constant attendance during his long illness, said that Sir Henry's death was due to heart failure, but all persons were barred from approaching the house by a cordon of police from Scotland Yard nearby.

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's final illness dates from February 12, when he last appeared in the House of Commons and moved the closure of the Scottish Land Bill, although he had been ailing since November 13, 1907, when he participated at an entertainment in honor of Emperor William at the Guild Hall. On November 14, after addressing a political meeting at Bristol, he was seriously stricken with heart weakness, and later influenza was added to his heart trouble, bringing on his fatal ailment. The ex-premier fully appreciated his condition and realized that his recovery was improbable. He offered to give up office some time before he formally resigned, but the only few invalids have been the object of so much solicitude and attention as was bestowed upon Sir Henry, there having been a constant stream of callers at his Downing street residence, including King Edward, who visited him on two occasions, Queen Alexandra, the Dowager Empress of Russia, the Prince and Princess of Wales, and many prominent men in public life.

It is understood that the ex-premier was opposed to a public funeral and it is believed that he will be buried without ostentation beside the body of his wife at Meigle, in Perthshire, Scotland. David Lloyd-George, Chancellor of the Exchequer, on receiving the news of Sir Henry's death, said: "I never met a great public figure since I have been in political life who won so completely the attachment and affection of the men who came in contact with him."

The death of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman after a lingering illness of

Railway Officials Say, However, That Time is Inopportune for the Workmen

Dispute is Over Recognition of Unions and Their Wage Schedules—Traffic Dull—The Considers Act

MONTREAL, the employees of the elements of the Canadian Northern R. into shape to call a over both systems in of the present dispute of the unions and their reached by peaceable means decided upon the C. P. R. that they will not be great. H. H. Vaughn, assistant to president, who has charge of chancery department, stated today the men could not pick a more unite time for themselves for a strike business was exceptionally dull. Many of the men were, it is being kept on merely because the employees did not like to lay off their employees and wanted to keep their staffs together awaiting better times. But they could easily afford to have their shops partially shut down for a time without inconvenience, since they had many more engines than the traffic demanded. At the same time there were thousands of mechanics all over the country looking for jobs, so that it would not be hard to replace strikers, as the mechanics said. The C. P. R. was simply standing pat and taking no steps to improve what the men were doing. They prepared to strike up to the end of the month, but the unions that on May 1st it would cease to deal with them or to recognize their wage schedules. The men here are all joining the new federation under the lead of officers from Winnipeg, and as soon as the Montreal unions are all in line the organizers will go East to get the unions of the whole of both systems ready to present a united front in case of battle. Before a rupture comes, however, an appeal will be made for a board of arbitration under the Lemieux Act, which will delay any possibility of a strike until well on in June.

The immigration department reports that the total immigration for the first three months of the present calendar year was 27,