

eign country and settle in the Northwest, than it is for a Canadian born—in the province of Quebec at least—to go and settle in that country. Not being favoured, so far as settling in the Northwest is concerned, the Canadian is led to emigrate to the United States or elsewhere to fill up the factories and workshops of other countries. Is there any good reason, on grounds of common sense, for the immigration policy that is now carried on by the government? I have heard no such reason given. But I have seen the reason given many times in the press that its object is simply to promote the interest of speculators. It is stated that there are certain friends of the government—some newspapers go so far as to say certain officials of the government—who own land in the Northwest and who are promoting their own interests regardless of the future of Canada and the carrying out of our national ideas. They want to sell their land, and, to that end, they promote the bringing in of this mongrel population, a population that comes in by flocks. Conceivably, this might have been upheld by the former Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). But, knowing the present minister and his immigration policy, it seems to me that speculation should not appeal to him as a reason for paying a bonus to booking agents to bring to Canada the scum of continental Europe. If this goes on, in twenty years, there will be no such thing as the Canadian ideal.

Canada will be still a great country, but filled up with a foreign population and with a population of the character that is creating such alarm to-day in the United States. The best proof of what I say is the fact that for the first time last year we had in Montreal, under the present policy of the government, a socialist parade with the red flag of anarchy at its head, and possibly this year, if the police do not interfere, we shall have a repetition of that procession. In a few years the Jewish population of Montreal has increased from 8,000 to 40,000. It seems to me therefore that if the twentieth century is to be, in the words of the right hon. the First Minister, Canada's century, we must first establish a sound and solid Canadian basis. Otherwise we shall see in the Northwest, with its strong influx of population from the United States, a repetition of the story of Texas. When the state of Texas belonged to Mexico, there was a strong American population going into that country, and the result was that not long afterwards Texas declared itself in favour of annexation to the United States. In our case of course it may be that the Americans will be better satisfied with the laws and institutions of this country than those of their own, but they are coming in so thick and the foreign population is coming in so fast, that it is physically impossible for us to assimilate them, and we will be taking only a wise and prudent course if we take some steps to pre-

Mr. A. LAVERGNE.

vent a repetition in our Northwest of the story of Texas. It will be only by establishing a solid national Canadian basis that the twentieth century will be ours. Otherwise we shall be strangers in our own country and the foreigners will be the masters. Therefore I beg to move the following motion :

That the payment of bonuses on immigration has a tendency to bring in a less rather than a more desirable class of people, that it is a most unwise policy and expenditure and therefore should not be continued.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I am sure the House has heard with relief the motion just made by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) because I think every one will agree that he has been successful in crowding into an hour and a half a more liberal proportion of mis-statements with regard to important public questions than it has ever been our misfortune to listen to. Having condescended however to close his remarks by moving a motion, it is possible for us to consider and discuss it. I may say, however, that it does not seem to have a great deal to do with the greater part of the hon. gentleman's speech. If I could gather anything from his remarks, it was that he was opposed to immigration. He was afraid that Canada would cease to be Canadian if immigration continued and therefore it was not sound Canadian policy to encourage immigration. That is the point that I singled out from the very large number of contradictory positions taken by my hon. friend.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Does my hon. friend say that I am opposed to immigration ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is what I understood.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Not at all. What I am opposed to is this system of bonusing, which has the effect of bringing into this country an undesirable class of foreign population.

Mr. OLIVER. I am glad to be corrected, but it does not appear to me to make any material difference in the result, whether that result be brought about by the payment of bonuses or any other means. If there be any danger of such an influx of people within the next few years as will swamp the Canadians of to-day, that is a condition which the hon. gentleman devoutly desires to prevent. The question of bonuses therefore is merely a side issue and the question of securing immigration is the real issue, if issue there be. In any discussion of this nature, I think it only needs to be stated that Canada has an area equal to that of continental Europe, that it has at present a population not quite equal to that of Belgium, that under such conditions there must be necessity for a reasonable and rapid increase of population if we who are alive to-day, wish to see