

3 GEORGE V., A. 1913

Mr. Wiallard is then convinced that he has done nothing for his part, against the French regulations, that he has done all the law allowed him to do, that not only it is impossible to increase his means of action, but that, even if possible, it would not be opportune.

Without trying to see through Mr. Wiallard's secret mind, I have said and I repeat that, from the testimony of all those who have seen him at work he puts forth a great diligence in the exercise of his functions. It seems also evident that in sending every year to France, at first with the assent of our agent, and then in spite of him occasional lecturers who, by their direct appeals are violating the French law so much more easily than they knew it less, the Department of the Interior has not in a small degree, contributed to indispose the French Government. But I am no less compelled to think that the annoyances which Mr. Wiallard, and Canada with him, had to endure in France, came from the most part, from his obstinacy in dispensing with a co-operation which, without in reality lessening his personal action, would have allowed him to dissimulate it, more than that, to conform it to the French laws, and that the cause of that obstinacy lies in a false idea of the situation, in a defect of character or in self conceit out of place, whatever it may be,—and if this opinion is well founded, it follows that Mr. Wiallard should not hesitate to admit that he has erred on certain points, and to loyally try, if requested the carrying out of programme which I suggest to you.

2nd. That it (this programme) shall have been previously submitted and agreed to by all the interested parties, including the French Government. What will be the use in fact, of this change of direction if we do not at first take care to remove the visiting misapprehensions and grievances? Whatever policy we may adopt, it is important that our agents be not exposed to a periodical repression which, while terrifying them, would sometimes induce them, to still more unfortunate resolutions, and nearly always inspires them expédients incompatible with our national dignity.

And that question of the agreement to be made with the French Government of the guarantee to be asked that our action legitimate as it remains and lawful as it may become, can be continuously exercised, without having to fear anybody's arbitrariness,—that question, I say, draws me to speak of disagreements which exist between the agent of your department and the General Commissioner of Canada.

Before 1903, we had as representative in France, but one General Commissioner, Mr. Fabre, which depended on the whole cabinet. In that year—and I hold that information from Mr. Wiallard himself—Mr. Wiallard was appointed assistant Commissioner with mission to specially attend to emigration. Still later on, Mr. Poindron was appointed Commercial Agent, by the Department of Commerce, which gave us the representatives in France. Mr. Fabre died two years ago, and after a few months interim fulfilled by Mr. Wiallard, the Laurier Government appointed the Hon. Phillip Roy as commissioner, with, I believe, better defined, if not, as I also believe more extended powers. On its occasion to power, of the present Government, last fall, Mr. Poindron, was dismissed, the commercial agency mingled with the Commissariat, and the Commissioner placed under the authority of the Minister of Commerce.

We then presently have in France, as in the past a sub-commissioner general who attends to emigration only, and not to Canadian affairs at large, but it moreover happens that the general Commissioner, himself, reduced to the rank of ordinary commercial agent, is not a general Commissioner, consequently has no authority, even in theory, over the sub-commissioner. When this anomaly that, when one complains to him of the sub-commissioner's acts, the personage responsible before the French authority for all the doings of the Canadian Government in France, has, to defend himself, to allege the independence of his subordinate. It is necessary to observe that such an excuse must inevitably look like a subterfuge in the logic eye of the Frenchman, that far from improving the situation it is rather of a nature to make it worse.