

the country, and who conform to the conditions imposed by our immigration laws, we should, at the same time, put an end to a system which has been productive of bad results and, to my mind, threatens a very grave danger in the future, whatever may be the country in which that system is allowed to prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I am not prone to calling the attention of the House too often to the example of the United States, but there is one fact that we must not lose sight of and that is that in that great country they have never put in force the system of bonusing immigrants. For a long time they gave no particular attention to immigration, but the moment there began to flow into the United States that stream which has continued to flow and increase in spite of all the preventive measures and all the restrictions that have been adopted by the Americans, they put into practice a system of inspection, of selection, and even of taxation to which I venture to say, without being a prophet, we will be obliged to have recourse before many years have elapsed. We must not lose sight either, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this matter of the very large expense to which this system puts us. When I came into this House in 1896 our expenditure under the head of immigration reached some \$200,000. Immigration at that time was, comparatively speaking, insignificant. We have to-day reached a very large figure indeed. I venture to say that a careful examination of our accounts would reveal the fact that we are expending in connection with immigration, not only on bonuses, but for every other detail connected with the system a million dollars a year, and we do not derive, to my mind, anything like the benefit which we ought to derive from such an expenditure. In the United States there is a head tax. Not only have they put in force the most stringent laws in order to ensure a most perfect system of inspection and such selection as is possible in view of the immense stream of immigration which comes to their shores, but they have placed a tax upon immigrants which enables them to carry out their system of inspection and selection without the expenditure of a single dollar from the national treasury and they have at the end of each year a large surplus which is the product of the immigration tax which enables them to improve every year with the increasing wants of the country the precautions they take against an undue inflow into the country of undesirable people.

Mr. Speaker, the members of this House who take some interest in this subject should really read the proceedings of the Congress of Social Science which has lately been held in the city of New York and which brought together the most eminent authorities in the United States upon all

subjects connected with social economics and other social questions agitating the Americans at the present time. So important was that meeting that the government of this country sent down Dr. Bryce, our medical inspector under the system of immigration, to attend the sittings of the branch of that congress which particularly had under consideration the immigration question. Not only do we find from the deliberations of these men, all of whom are men of great experience, that they do not intend in any sense to relax the stringency of the laws existing in the United States at the present time upon that subject, but their argument appears to be that in view of the immense population of the American Republic—over 80,000,000—it is necessary to adopt a system of dispersing these immigrants all over that great nation for the purpose of avoiding the bad results of immigration even carefully watched from the merger which immediately takes place of these foreigners in the great American republic on account of the immense population. Those conditions do not exist over here, and one of the inconveniences, one of the dangers pointed out by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, when he was plain Frank Oliver, member for Alberta, was that in view of our small population these immigrants are grouped in the Northwest, and this grouping of them far removed from the rest of the population constitutes, to use the very language of the hon. gentleman, a very grave danger for the future of this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) took very severely to task the mover and seconder of this motion, because they pointed out, I think, in guarded and discreet language, the strange absence of effort made by this government to secure desirable immigrants from France. My hon. friend the Postmaster General repudiated absolutely any such intention, and he took occasion to preach a doctrine of tolerance and the cessation of any appeal to race and religious prejudices. I was very happy to hear my hon. friend, because he has not always carried that doctrine into practice. I have noticed with very great pleasure that my hon. friend has become converted to this view, very much like the conversion of the Minister of the Interior, since he has attained to the high position which he so worthily fills. But these were not always my hon. friend's ideas, and in regard to roaming about the province of Quebec and making strong appeals to race and religion in his younger days and before he had found the road to Damascus, he excelled to a certain extent. I do not wish to refer particularly to this subject, but it is no exaggeration to say here that my hon. friend and his friends on more than one occasion infringed that rule in the province of Quebec. I remember