

omics, nothing in common with us in national sentiment—to men who come here, not with our inherited pride in our own land, but with the purpose only of making money. It was no part of the idea of the fathers of confederation that these people should be gathered from the ends of the earth and helped to come to this country, given such inducements as to bring them here in such number that before twenty years are over at the present rate of movement, they will be masters of the country and the two races that have formed the Canadian people will be swamped by these 'intruders.'

The example of the United States has been quoted to us to show that there is no great danger to the native population in bringing all sorts of people from abroad into our country. I regret that my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) has not gone a little deeper into that subject. I fear he was too anxious not to weary the House by giving figures. But it seems to me that these figures are most instructive. Generally speaking they show that at no period in American history was there ever such a large incursion into the United States of the foreign-born element in proportion to native population as has been brought into Canada under the so-called broad and patriotic policy of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). When I speak of foreign-born population, I leave aside the figures relating to those that come to Canada from the British islands, though perhaps I should be able to show that a large proportion of these are foreigners. But even assuming that all those who ship from Great Britain are British, and leaving aside all those from France and Belgium, and you find that you are bringing in a larger proportion of foreign-born and foreign-educated immigrants into Canada in proportion to the population of Canada than ever were brought into the United States in proportion to the population of that country. Nor is that all. There is still another grave reason to condemn this policy of bringing in these foreigners. In the United States the great bulk of the foreign element leave ship at the eastern ports, settle in the eastern part of the country and mix with the relatively dense population there, just as we find in our own case in Montreal or Toronto. But the western states of the union, whether annexed or purchased or conquered, were settled by American-born people. That is to say, the basis of the political institutions, the basis of education, of organization, of everything of a national character, was laid firm and immovable by the American-born settlers who left the eastern states, giving up their places to the foreign element and went west; so that when the foreigners moved slowly westward they found themselves upon a solid footing of true American institutions. I leave altogether aside the pro-

blem of the foreign element in the United States which is disquieting the mind of President Roosevelt and of many social observers and writers, and I take it for granted that this foreign element does not, in fact, threaten the character of the United States. But, even assuming this—which is very far from being proven—to be the case in fact, we find that the same does not apply to Canada. And why? Because in Canada under the policy followed by this and by the preceding government—though it has become much more dangerous of late, than in the past—you leave the eastern provinces in the hands of the old population, giving very little inducement to the sons of the farmers of Ontario and Quebec and the maritime provinces to go west, and you allow the railways that you have incorporated, that you have subsidized with the money of the people of Canada to give better facilities to a Doukhobor or a Galician to reach the western plains than they offer to a Canadian. We allow them to give better facilities to the Doukhobor and the Galician to reach the western plains than to a Canadian from Ontario or Quebec or the maritime provinces. I could read you a letter from the father of a large family in my own constituency who went to Edmonton last fall and who had to pay some \$100 more to get there than your imported Galicians or Doukhobors pay from Halifax to Edmonton. And yet you plume yourselves on your broad Canadianism. What do you mean by it? Do you want to prevent your own people from Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick from getting their share of the inheritance and domain which has been purchased and is being paid for by them—the purchase price of which came out of their taxation? You boast of your broad Canadianism and you allow your own railways, paid for with the money of your own people, to discriminate against Canadians in favour of foreigners, and you think you are going to get the people to endorse such a policy by sneering at little Canadians and casting slurs on the patriotism of men who have some regard for their country's future.

What is the result of your policy? The old provinces are settled and populated by the descendants of the pioneers of this country. Your immigrants, who are coming in larger numbers in proportion to the rest of the population than ever was the case in the United States, instead of stopping in some of the large cosmopolitan cities, where after all the individual loses more or less of his character, are landed at Halifax, St. John or Quebec, and immediately put on board railway trains and carried through to the west. All they have is just a glimpse of our large cities. They do not know what Quebec is or what Ontario is. You convey them to the west, you put them on the land there, and

Mr. BOURASSA.