

ed to British institutions as you claim, and that the simple fact of having so many British flags hoisted on schools and elsewhere is going to make them British? Are you sure, when you discriminate against the farmers from Quebec, Ontario and the maritime provinces going to settle in the west, that the newcomers will be as safe and sound with regard to British connection and Canadian citizenship as you say they will? Are you quite sure that mingled with those foreign elements, neither British nor American, but who will always have a natural attraction for the larger and wealthier country to the south, a country independent by itself—which has always a greater prestige in the eyes of foreigners than a colony—are you quite sure that these foreign elements will be attached to British connections in such a way that if it comes to a choice between their British connection, between their connection with the rest of Canada, between the unity of confederation, and their economic interest, that they will not ten times rather break the British connection, ten times rather break the Canadian confederation, than endanger or damage their economic or their business prospects? It may be that my view is wrong, it may be that I am a pessimist in this; but I claim that this is a point of view which cannot be dismissed by a simple laugh at Little Canadianism. After all, I

do not suppose that even as big Canadians as the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) can afford to ignore history, can afford to ignore human nature, can afford to ignore the laws that have directed all nations in the past, whether in ancient or modern history; and if history repeats itself in respect to Canada, it may be that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior cannot stop it all by himself. I think that the laws of nations, the laws of history and the laws of nature will be stronger than even my friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver).

I need not say much more on this subject; I simply claim that this is a subject which imposes itself on the attention of the people of Canada, and that before changing the basis of the policy as defined last year, before going back to the system which my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) himself had denounced with the greatest vehemence while a member of this House, I claim that the least that the parliament and the people of Canada could have expected would have been to be informed of what the minister contemplated, and that we should have been consulted before such a step was taken. There is, therefore, no hesitation in my mind in deciding that the motion of my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) is a timely one and that it should be adopted by this House.