

from Montmagny was that we were discriminating, that this government did not spend sufficient money particularly in the countries of France and Belgium. That they have made no endeavour to get these people was practically his cry. Let us take the per capita cost in 1905-6 as regards nationalities. Great Britain and Ireland contributed to this country in that year 76,796 immigrants at a cost of \$148,000. That made a per capita cost of \$1.75. The United States contributed to our immigration tide 47,919 at a cost of \$248,000. That made a per capita cost of \$4.28. France and Belgium contributed 2,754 immigrants at a cost of \$15,000 making a per capita of \$5.44. All the other countries sent us 41,595 immigrants at a total cost of \$88,000 or a per capita cost of \$2.11. It seems to me that we have gone to the trouble of spending more per capita on France and Belgium than we have on any other country in the civilized world.

Mr. LAVERGNE. Does the hon. gentleman include, advertising, printing, commissions, bonuses, and the administration here in Ottawa?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. Everything.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I do not know where my hon. friend got his figures.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I can tell my hon. friend where I got my figures. I got them from the immigration department. There is another point I wish to bring up on this national phase of the question. We have been told that the best immigration agents are the contented settlers. We will admit that. They write home and bring their friends in great numbers. Any one who has lived in the west knows that quite well. But, I have some peculiar statistics to consider now. I went to the trouble of getting the statistics as to nationality as shown by the last census with regard to the city of Montreal, and I found that in the city of Montreal there were at that time only 43 souls in 10,000 that were French born. I looked up the national statistics of Alberta as they appeared in June 1906 and I found that we had 47 native Frenchman to every 10,000 people. Forty-seven native French in Alberta as compared with 43 in the city of Montreal! They have all the attraction of the same language, they have all the attraction of their friends writing for them and all these inducements to come to Montreal and yet our statistics show us that they seem rather to be repelled than attracted. Another statement made that I would like to correct was that there was a discrimination in railway rates against the Canadians. Is it the business of this government to move the people within the country? Is it the business of this government to change the population from the province of Quebec to the province of Alberta? Are we to waste our immigration fund in transporting the people from one part of the

Mr. W. McINTYRE.

country to the other? Is not our immigration fund for the purpose of bringing immigrants to this country? We found in one breath an hon. gentleman arguing that not enough population was coming to Quebec and in the next breath we have the same hon. gentleman arguing that we have not facilities to carry the people out of Quebec.

I do not wish to take up very much more time because we have wasted most of this day with a rather unimportant subject. But I notice that unimportant subjects are the kind that the hon. member for Montmagny likes to take up the time of the House with. I notice that in regard to the great subjects that would naturally involve the two sides of this House we do not find the hon. member for Montmagny taking a very active part, but when some little racial question comes up we find the hon. member for Montmagny very prominent. I may be pardoned if I give my estimate of the manner in which these matters are taken up as a member of this House. As I read my history, Mr. Speaker, the time was when this country was divided into French and English colonies. They had an opportunity in those days to draw to themselves their compatriots. They had in those days the opportunity of formulating the kind of laws which they thought would suit their particular religion or race. They drew to themselves their particular race and their particular co-religionists. They tried for 150 years, yes, more, the French on the one hand and the British on the other, to build up a country, but what was the result? The great minds came from these colonies and they formulated the theory that if we were to ever become a great country we must bury our racial differences and also our religious differences. They formulated that wonderful piece of legislation known as the Confederation Act which gave liberty of conscience and liberty of race, so to speak, to every nationality that should seek our shores. That was the condition, that was the law that made this Canada as Canadian as possible. Without it we would still have been French colonies or English colonies inland and by the sea-board. Sir, we were taught a lesson by that legislation which probably was none too well learned by individuals, but the men that breathed the breath of that broad loyalty and who promoted that legislation made it possible for the teaching of the sentiment to correspond with the legislation, and I claim, as I stated a short time ago that when a man takes the oath of allegiance and becomes a citizen of this country it ill becomes another citizen to stand up and call him a foreigner.

It was the idea of these wise men who saw ahead probably further than we see, who read into the future possibly better than we can; it was their idea that we should live together, one beside the other regardless of our