

would be occupied by other people, either now or in the very near future, and the fact that they are occupying this land is a deterrent to other people from occupying not only that land, but the land in their neighbourhood. Let me tell this House that, when the American settler makes inquiry as to settlement in this country, the first inquiry he makes is: What is the class of people in the locality in which he desires to settle, and I can tell you that the greatest objection that can be raised is that that part of the country has the presence of the very class of people which the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) lauded so highly this afternoon.

I am not questioning the motives of any hon. member of this House. I am not questioning any motives in respect to the policy of the government at all, but I am here to state what I know for the information of the House and of the country. It is very well for us to theorize, and to say what might, could or should be, but it is desirable that we should, in discussing this and kindred questions, come down to facts, and understand whether we are doing the very best that can be done in the circumstances or not. We all want to see the western country settle up, and it is merely a question of what is the best policy to be pursued in order to settle that country up. If it can be shown that the inducement or acceptance of a certain class of immigrants is detrimental to the best interests of that country, and to the settlement of that country, then, I say, it is time to prevent, instead of encouraging, that class of settlement. I speak strongly on this point, because I find that there is a tendency on the part of people of this part of the country, not only in parliament but out of parliament, to suppose that the prosperity, welfare and progress of that country depends upon the continuation of this tide of immigration of the character of which the hon. member for Selkirk speaks. It is so far wide of the mark that I would be altogether failing in my duty as a member of this House and as a representative of that country, if I did not call attention, in the strongest language, to the facts of the case. What that country is to-day, it is because of the exertions, the sacrifices and the abilities of the men of eastern Canada, who have spread themselves over those plains and through those mountains, who are developing the industries and resources of that country, and who are building up a nation, a Canada, such as you have here, and, we hope, better than you have here. I say they cannot do that to advantage if their efforts are handicapped by the presence in thousands and tens of thousands of a class of people who, however worthy they may be, however capable they may be as agriculturists, are not and cannot be citizens of this country, as we would wish them to be citizens, to take part with us in the building up of a

civilization and a social system there which are a necessary part of success in the settlement of any country. It is not enough to produce wheat out of the ground. We do not live to produce wheat. We live to produce people, to produce a social condition, and to build up a country, and if you give us only those who can produce wheat, and who cannot take their places as citizens, you do us an injury, and you place an obstacle in the way of our progress, instead of conferring an advantage upon us.

I have heard hon. members say that these strange people, these Slavs, will assimilate with the other people. Do you know what that word 'assimilate' means? It is a nice sounding word. Do you know that it means that if you settle on a farm on the prairies amongst them or in their neighbourhood you must depend for the schooling of your children on the tax-paying willingness and power of people who neither know nor care anything about schools? Do you know that it means the intermarriage of your sons or daughters with those who are of an alien race and of alien ideas? That is assimilation, or else there is no assimilation. There is no assimilation, and there will be no assimilation for many, many years, and the whole country will suffer a drawback to that extent for a number of years.

Another idea that is conveyed is, that all foreign peoples are the same, that because the German people are foreigners, and because they are desirable settlers, therefore, the Galicians, being foreigners, and the Doukhobors being foreigners, are also desirable settlers. Do my hon. friends know that they could not insult a German, or a Scandinavian, as much in any other way as to compare him with a Doukhobor or a Galician? The pride of race is as strong in these people as it is in us, and they object, and object very strongly, to being placed in the same category as a Slavic people, a people who, less than two generations ago, were serfs of the soil, and who, unfortunately, have not had the opportunities, even if they had the capability, to rise very high above that position to-day. Make no mistake, that there is no comparison between the German who comes from Galicia and a Galician who comes from Galicia, and no man will resent such a comparison more strongly than the German himself. It is not because they both wear sheepskin that they are alike. It is not because they both come from the same country. They belong to radically different races. The foundation ideas in the minds of both people are radically different. The German of Galicia is a German such as he is everywhere. He is a man of dominant race, of untiring energy, of great foresight; he is a man of sterling honesty and reliability, whether he comes from Germany, from Galicia, or anywhere else. He is a German, and a citizen of the highest character. He is not only a producer, he is a