

us discuss the immigration policy and not the tariff and other matters outside, because, if we do, each side making assertions and the other rebutting them, we may discuss the subject for six weeks and get no nearer to a conclusion.

Mr. LAURIER. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that he is willing to receive any good suggestion as to the best immigration policy to be pursued.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but we cannot get any.

Mr. LAURIER. The best immigration policy this side of the House can suggest is a revision of the tariff policy of the Government. You have before you the fact that the present policy, instead of carrying out the promise which was made, and keeping the people here, is sending our own population to the other side by hundreds of thousands. Now, notwithstanding that, you are asking this House to vote nearly \$200,000 to bring immigrants to this country, who, if the present course continues, will simply land at Quebec and pass on to the other side of the line. My hon. friend is showing that the whole system is vicious and rotten; that it is useless to spend this money as long as the present condition of affairs exists. Is that not fair? What better proof can you bring to show that the immigration policy of the Government is unsound than to quote the results of that policy during the last ten years? We are willing to bring immigrants from Europe to this country, and for that purpose you propose to expend \$200,000 next year. Now, I maintain that if you expend that amount of money in the way you propose, it will be simply thrown into the sea, you will derive no benefit from it. If you wish to make the expenditure of this money fruitful in good results, you must reverse the conditions now existing. How is this to be done unless the results of your past policy are shown to the country? I would not discuss annexation upon this question, I would not discuss imperial federation, nor any other of the subjects the hon. gentleman has mentioned, because they have a very remote bearing upon the question. But I do say that the tariff policy of the Government has an intimate connection with their immigration policy, and that it is the reason why we desire to discuss it at this time. If the present Chairman had been in the Chair before six o'clock, when this subject was opened, I think he would have perceived that it was the whole subject of immigration that was under discussion, and not this particular item at Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend take the position that this vote of \$197,000 ought not to be voted until there is a change in the policy of the country?

Mr. LAURIER. I take the position that it is a fair question to discuss as long as the present tariff policy is persisted in.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend think that if he raises a large question of policy like that so long as the present tariff is maintained, it is useless to expend this \$197,000?

Mr. LAURIER. I say this is a question upon which we require more information, and therefore it is fair to debate it at this moment.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not my hon. friend think that the better way would be to introduce a resolution on the subject?

Mr. LAURIER. It may be proper to introduce a resolution at the proper time. But the hon. gentleman knows that, according to parliamentary practice, the resolution is introduced on the motion to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. M'LOCK. The House is asked to vote a large sum of money for the purpose of promoting immigration: it is acknowledged that we are in need of population. Now, what is the cause of that need? What has become of the population that has already come in? Surely there can be no more direct connection with a proposal to bring in population than the condition which has caused a loss of population. Now suppose that in the course of this discussion my hon. friend should succeed in convincing the Administration that a change of tariff would materially affect the whole question, what would the Government do? The Minister of Finance says: Invite suggestions. Why, if he invited suggestions and gave them due weight, he might discover reasons to convince him that by changing the tariff policy we might save to the country the expenditure of this money altogether. Surely the commercial policy is intimately intertwined with the immigration policy. The chairman and all the members of the House admit that the whole immigration policy is now before the committee. If that is the case we cannot separate it from one of the causes that makes it necessary to bring this vote before the House. If it is admitted, as we contend, that the necessity of bringing this vote before the House is caused by a bad fiscal policy, surely this is the time to point out the cause of the evil and to seek a remedy for it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not see any reason for changing the ruling I gave. The hon. gentleman might, with equal propriety, discuss the financial policy, the commercial policy, or the railway policy of the Government, and wander over a great many subjects irrelevant to immigration. I think it would expedite business and would be in the interest of the House, if the hon. gentleman would confine himself a little more closely to the question.

Mr. CHARLTON. I shall endeavour to comply with your request and to keep a little closer to the question in your estimation, although, in my own estimation, I was confining myself to the question before. Now, I was attempting to demonstrate the fact that the fiscal policy of this Government is in some respects pertinent to this discussion, as it is calculated to discourage immigration to this country and to promote emigration from it. Now, one particular point with regard to the fiscal policy of the Government that I was about to allude to, was this: There has been on the part of this Government, and on the part of the American Government as well, apparently, a settled determination to discourage, and as far as possible to destroy, trade between the Dominion of Canada and the United States. The manifestation of that purpose, so far as our own Government is concerned, has a direct bearing upon the question under discussion: it has a most potential influence upon the destinies and upon the prosperity of this country, and in that respect, and to the extent that it has a bearing upon the prosperity of the country, it is pertinent to the discussion, t