

ing to work, and to take what they have to pay their honest debts, and enable themselves and their families to live, to my mind, they will constitute a great accession to this country. I do not agree with my hon. friend that a man who raises wheat should be despised. I say that the man who raises, on a given acre, more wheat than his neighbour, although his neighbour may be a gentleman of royal birth and with all the wealth in the country, is a good man and a good citizen of Canada. Whether it be wheat he raises, or oats, or pease, or currants, or anything else, if he does better than his neighbour, that man is a more useful citizen. If he makes two blades of grass grow where one grew before, he adds to the richness of earth's products, and, therefore, becomes a good citizen. I am in favour, as I said, of doing all we can to get into this country citizens who are honest, industrious, who will pay their debts. I am sorry they cannot speak the English language. Let us go to work and try as soon as possible to teach them my language. They will thereby not only increase their ability to trade with their neighbours, but will become better citizens in the all-prevailing force of our British supremacy; they will join in the regular cavalcade that must make Canada, as it must make the nations of the world, forget the Slav, forget the Celt, forget the Scotch, forget the French, forget the everybody, in the overmastering onward march of that British supremacy that takes all nations under the sway of its mighty power, and will not be retarded by anything except those crimes that hinder the advancement of humanity.

Mr. ARTHUR W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). The forcible argument of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who has just taken his seat, would probably have had more strength if he had adapted it to the circumstances that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) outlined. His argument was based solely on the supposition that 17,000 or 18,000 foreigners, Galicians or Doukhobors, did not make much difference in a population of five or six millions, that it was comparatively easy for this country to assimilate that number of strangers. But, the point of argument of the member for Alberta, who comes from the district where these people are settled, is that that district is a sparsely-settled district, and that it already contains thousands of those foreigners, that the proportion is not one in a hundred, it is a large percentage, and that therefore, their influence, whether for good or ill, is a large influence, and is bound to be a great influence in the future social status of the North-west Territories.

Now, this immigration question has had a rather peculiar force in this country for the last few years. I notice that the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson), who introduced

this subject this afternoon, was not at all at home with the subject, and did not feel that he had much free room. And I will tell you the reason why. I remember well, in fact my first recollection of the immigration policy, was the promise that we used to hear time and again previous to 1896, that we would be treated by the then Conservative government with a vigorous immigration policy. They promised the North-west that they were hatching a vigorous immigration policy. Previous to the general elections of 1896, the two parties who were appealing for power in this country were both promising the North-west a vigorous immigration policy. Certainly it is not a party question, and as the member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) stated this afternoon, neither in this country nor in the United States is it a party question, except as one party is in power and the other is not. In the United States the Democratic party is opposed to immigration, and is willing to pass all kinds of restrictive laws when they are in opposition, and the Republican party the same. It has probably been the same in Canada. Both parties have promised immigration, and I submit in all fairness that we have to acknowledge that the immigration policy of the last few years has been vigorous, and has been successful, in so far as it has induced immigrants to come into this country. As to the effect, as to the character of that immigration, there is a difference of opinion. But, we have had better value for the money, so far as the quantity is concerned, beyond doubt.

Now, as regards the Doukhobors, I think the hon. member for Lennox proved to our satisfaction to-day a remark that was once made by a celebrated American, that you cannot draw up an indictment against a whole people, and the hon. member for Lennox failed most miserably in his attempt, by charging that those Doukhobors were people of a low grade, of bad morals, or were likely to be hurtful to this country. Nobody who had seen the Doukhobors when they first arrived would be unfavourably impressed by them. Certainly, they do not speak our language or wear our dress, but that is not a crime. Though they may differ from us in those respects, they may be just as good men, and make just as good citizens as we do. But the Doukhobors, when they arrived in the North-west, were a people that any country could be proud of. They were people of superior physique, and although we could not understand their language, their every appearance told us that they were an intelligent people. I do not think that we have much to fear from the Doukhobors, if the Doukhobor can only be persuaded that he is in a good country. That, so far, has been the trouble, he does not think so. We have heard much of a protest that has been lodged by the Doukhobor people against the laws of this country. That protest virtually amounts to a charge that