

3 GEORGE V., A. 1913

condemned by the English tribunals for want of authorization. The only difference rests in the fact that the English Government dispensed of the bond the official agents of the British Colonies.

4th. To distinguish in reading the above circulars between the authorized and the non-authorized agents.

The necessity of that distinction is evident, of course it would be ridiculous to say that, when the French Government expressly points out to its prefects, repressive action the unauthorized emigration agents, it does not concern those who have furnished the obligatory bond, and that when ordering also the repression of breaches of trust of authorized agents, it does not mean to hinder the honest, carrying on of a trade allowed by the law. Your department's agent in Paris, not having furnished a bond, is not authorized to incite people to emigrate. None of the lecturers delegated by your department to France was any more authorized to the purpose. The acts of such incitement committed by your agents or delegates, either under your instructions or otherwise, were then a violation of the French law and it is not to be wondered at if the French Government after several years of more or less gracious forbearance, has at last made them the subject of diplomatic remonstrances.

5th. To distinguish between the lawful and the unlawful acts of the authorized agents, because a steamship agent has furnished the required bond it does not follow that he is allowed to use all kinds of tricks.

6th. To distinguish, amongst the lawful acts, between the opportune and the inopportune ones. Justifiable or not, judicious or not, the circular of 1905 which has preceded and likely brought on the others, was partly resolved by the religious and political considerations which, not only our agents and delegates, but also some authorized steamship agents, used in their campaign in favour of Canada. About 1904, that is one year after the installation of our agency and in the height of the agitation caused by the law on associations, some French missionaries who had resided in Canada a few years went back to France in order to preach an emigration crusade. They naturally, in their speeches compared to what they were calling, justly or not, the tyranny of the anti-clerical Government to the religious liberty enjoyed in Canada. The Catholic press published their utterances, the anti-Catholic press denounced them, and the Government's intervention became inevitable. The Minister of the Interior had the law for him, none of our agents being authorized. Amongst the ecclesiastical or religious delegates whose propaganda would have exceeded the judicious if not the legal limits, the Paris agent mentions, for instance, the Rev. F. D. Dumond, the Abbe's Gaire and Lefloch.

The Paris agency, established in 1903 under the direct authority of your department, placed under the dependency of London in 1905 after the entry of Hon. Mr. Oliver, as Minister of the Interior, and reinstated in its primitive situation of 1908, has undergone so many different influences that it was impossible without a much more thorough investigation, to knowingly allot the responsibility of the present state of things.

Rightly does it seem, however, that the worst causes of its troubles, was precisely those changes of direction unquestionably entailing,—corresponding changes of policy. If we examine its work since the beginning we are struck with the lack of steadiness which marks it. Now, it wants lectures, now it does not want them. Sometimes newspapers advertisements are considered necessary and soon after as dangerous and so forth. Nowhere more than in France it would have been important to previously examine closely the economical and social situation of the country, its laws, the manners and liking of its inhabitants, and then to adopt a well defined line of conduct. Even taking into account the arbitrary part played by the Governments in a Caesarean Republic like France, we feel that our agent, on the contrary has been led, willing or not, now by the command of Ottawa, now by that of London, and now even by the claims of the Canadian political parties, when he was not trying to please everybody.