

Scotia and New Brunswick from getting their share of the inheritance and domain which has been purchased and is being paid for by them—the purchase price of which came out of their taxation? You boast of your broad Canadianism and you allow your own railways, paid for with the money of your own people, to discriminate against Canadians in favour of foreigners, and you think you are going to get the people to endorse such a policy by sneering at little Canadians and casting slurs on the patriotism of men who have some regard for their country's future.

What is the result of your policy? The old provinces are settled and populated by the descendants of the pioneers of this country. Your immigrants, who are coming in larger numbers in proportion to the rest of the population than ever was the case in the United States, instead of stopping in some of the large cosmopolitan cities, where after all the individual loses more or less of his character, are landed at Halifax, St. John or Quebec, and immediately put on board railway trains and carried through to the west. All they have is just a glimpse of our large cities. They do not know what Quebec is or what Ontario is. You convey them to the west, you put them on the land there, and within ten years you make them the complete masters of that land. They have not even a moment's contact with the rest of the people of Canada: they have no intercourse with those people with whom they are called on to live and carry on the business of the country. There is more than that. Providence, in its wisdom, had divided the continent upon certain geographical lines while the policy of men has parted it contrary—everybody will admit—to the laws of nature. You have two immense stretches of territory, each with different climates and resources and economical interests. They are divided by a barrier of water and barren land which, if ever peopled, will be so thinly populated that for all time to come you will always have a natural barrier between eastern and western Canada, such as never existed in the United States. And you will have in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba and that stretch of northern country whose capabilities we are only beginning to perceive, a population foreign born, foreign educated, knowing nothing of our country, having nothing in common with us, developing trade and farming industry and economical needs entirely different, if not entirely opposed to ours. What will be the result? Within thirty years you may look not only to the probability but to the certainty that this House will be controlled by members elected in those constituencies west of Lake Superior. You will have our Canadian parliament controlled by a majority, of whom certainly the four-fifths

if not the whole will be foreign—neither English nor French nor British nor Little Canadians nor broad imperialists, but simply foreigners who came to this country to make money, who will try to control this parliament so as to make money; who will subordinate everything to that object, and who will be quite content to see British institutions disappear from our midst in spite of all the British flags with which you are decorating the schools of Manitoba. When this parliament will fall under the control of those foreign elements—and that may happen in the lifetime of the present Donkhobors and Galicians, before the first Canadian born generation of those immigrants will be taking part in our public life—are you going to tell me that it is not a wise, not a sound and patriotic and British policy to pause at least a moment and look into the possibilities of such a future?

Having said so much on Canadian immigration, leaving aside all questions of French or English or Scotch or Irish, I will not be more afraid to state my views in this House with regard to French immigration than I was in the city of Toronto. My views are these. Because the fathers of confederation decided, and decided wisely, that this should be a dual country—French in its origin, British by assimilation, taking from both races and both civilizations its best moral, social and political characteristics—I claim that the equilibrium between the two should be maintained and that it is in the interests of all British citizens in Canada that a French speaking population should be developed. My hon. friend has referred to the influx of Americans into Canada. I hear it often said by men, who at other times will try to stigmatize us as disloyal, as racial or religious zealots, that it does not matter from what country settlers may come, that all the Americans who want to come here are welcome. To a certain extent I agree with them. Let all good, moral, intelligent people come to this country. That we must seek a large influx of American population may be from a purely monetary point of view, sound policy; but if there be any sincerity in the so-called loyalty of those who argue this way, you cannot say it is in accord with your sense of British citizenship that you should open this country wide to the influx of American population, capital and ideas. It is all very well to say that the Americans who go west are satisfied with the laws of Canada. They do not come here to study law but to make money, and because they find the conditions at present in Canada better for making money than in the United States. But when they have grown two or three generations, when they have reached a higher stage of civilization, and when they will form the majority of the people of this country, are you quite sure they will be so much attack-

ed to
and th
Britis
where
you s
the fa
mariti
west,
and so
and C
will ?
with t
nor A
natura
wealth
depend
greater
than a
foreign
connec
tion, b
of Can
ation,
they v
British
the Ca
or dan
prospe
wrong,
this ; b
view w
laugh :