

a burning question. I think it shows very bad form for a minister, especially a French Canadian minister, to bring up in this House a question which, last year, when only the name of a bishop was mentioned on this side of the House, drew forth expressions about popery and sectarianism which ought never to be brought into this House. Another statement has been made by the hon. Postmaster General in which he had to retreat. He was asked if he would state under his responsibility of a minister that 'La Vérité' was the organ of the clergy, and he had to give in and say that it was generally known as the organ of the clergy. It might be a Catholic organ, but it is not the organ of the clergy, and the proof is that not long ago the editor was censured because he had made certain uncomplimentary remarks about a bishop who is now dead. Also a polemic originated in that newspaper which was somewhat ridiculed by private members of the clergy on account of its too candid belief in the doctrines of Leo Taxil. So you see, Mr. Speaker, that the statement of the Postmaster General is not one which can be relied upon. I challenge him to say the contrary, because I belong to Quebec, and he never knew what Quebec was before he landed there with the Liberal forces. I know for a fact that the Quebec politicians asked who opened the window to let that float in? Now another statement was made by the same gentleman, as well as by the member for Strathcona (Mr. W. McIntyre). He asked, Why should not the immigration funds be paid to railways to help them move people from the east to the west? I wonder if the minister is aware that no immigration money is given to the railroads to diminish rates from one point to another. If the railroads do get a subsidy from the government, let it be used for the purpose of transporting people who live in Canada, and with indiscriminate rates. Why should the minister object that rates from Labelle to Brandon should be less than those that are being paid to move immigrants from Halifax to the Northwest? He has spoken of the liberty of races which is guaranteed by the constitution. Well, if he is in favour of the equality of races, if the province of Quebec pays 30 per cent of the immigration fund to bring in foreigners, why should not Quebec have the right to say how that money should be spent? Now if bonuses are to be paid, or ought to be paid, a point on which I take issue with the government, why should a minister put that question in a false light before the country and say that we are working to prevent immigration? I would ask him according to the sound principle of logic if it is a prevention of immigration simply to criticise a policy that induces immigration not only from Great Britain, not only from continental Europe, but from every country except France and Belgium?

197

It seems to me that such an argument is too much opposed to British fair-play even for a French Canadian minister who wants to pour taffy down the English people's backs. I have heard of many a man, who by using too much soft soap, had slid down the lather. Another point that was made this afternoon was that there was a French law against immigration to Canada. That law still exists, it was passed shortly after 1763 when France ceded Canada to England. It was only right that a nation like France, who sent immigrants into all her colonies, found that it was not to her advantage to develop a country which was no longer hers. That law has not been forgotten by the minister, and I would ask him if that law has been revoked or if it is still in existence. At all events, I think it is but right to call this fact to the House to show the light in which this question should be treated. Another point which has been mentioned this afternoon is that the French do not emigrate. Now, Sir, the same thing could have been said about the English in 1899, a period not far back, for we find that British immigration in that year was only 10,660. If it is a fact that this policy of bonusing immigration has given some results by reason of the advertisement of Canada in Great Britain, why should not the same means have been used in France? If France had the same opportunity that England has had of having a magnificent office on the Strand, of having a permanent exhibition of Canadian agricultural products, she would have made a better showing in sending immigrants to Canada. Some one has told us that two of our immigration agents in France have to walk on crutches; perhaps the term was a little too strong, but no one can deny that one of them is infirm and cannot be as active as a man who has full use of his limbs, and it must be admitted that legs help a lot for immigration purposes. If the same operation had been carried on in France as in Great Britain we might perhaps have had better results. As to the question of the French people not emigrating, history teaches us, Mr. Speaker, that France was one of the pioneer countries who sent her navigators not only to India, not only to Africa, but whose adventurous son, Jacques Cartier, was one of the first to plant his foot on Canadian soil. If France did not approve of a policy of emigration why should she be so urgent in sending out vessels and trying to establish colonies in the new world? When the Declaration of Independence was made in the United States there was a vast colony representing French interests in Louisiana, and if France was not interested in her colonies why then should she have accepted the invitation of a Franklin to send a Lafayette with arms and moneys to fight for the American cause? It is useless for me to proceed