

and in the British Isles is not known in the United States.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) will allow me: Have the bonuses paid on immigrants from the United States been changed recently? It used to be \$3 for an adult male, \$2 for an adult female, and \$1 for a child.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think there has been any change. What I am saying is that the condition surrounding the payment of bonuses in Europe and those in the United States are altogether different. In regard to the complaint made by my hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) that we were not giving enough attention to immigration from certain countries in Europe, I can only say that it has been a necessity of intelligent immigration effort that work should be pushed most where the best results can be achieved. A few years ago, owing to the favourable attention of the British public had been attracted to Canada by a long course of immigration effort it was practically impossible to get any considerable number of people from the British Isles. At that time we had to look to central or northern Europe for our immigrants, and the efforts of the department, at that time, were turned in that direction. After a time persistency of advertising in Britain, improved conditions in Canada making the country more adapted to settlement by British immigrants, together with changes in Great Britain, attracted the favourable attention of the British public; and to-day we find public opinion in Great Britain very favourable to immigration to Canada. Under these circumstances, it seemed reasonable that the money employed by the people for immigration should be used where it could produce the best results. A few years ago these results could be best achieved by effort directed to the over-crowded countries of central Europe. To-day, undoubtedly, the best results are to be achieved by directing our efforts to the British Isles. We have there a vast population, a prolific population, a population already assimilated and one fully imbued with the idea that Canada is the country for colonization. It seems to me only reasonable, therefore, when we are taking the money of the Canadian taxpayer to secure immigration, that we should spend it where it will produce the best results. We are not pushing our efforts in continental Europe, as we are pushing them to-day in Great Britain, for the reason that none of the countries of continental Europe offer the same inducements to immigration effort. Not only are the laws restrictive but in many of the most desirable countries the conditions are not favourable. Take, for instance, the case of France to which my hon. friend has alluded. No one will say that France is not at the head of civilization, that the

Mr. OLIVER.

French people are not desirable in every way, that France is not an agricultural country. In fact France is one of the greatest agricultural countries in the world, but it is carrying a stupendous burden of militarism. It has an empire which ranks only next to Great Britain. It has burdens on its population to-day which make it absolutely unreasonable to expect that flood of immigration from France to Canada that we would expect from Great Britain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would think that those conditions, if they do prevail, would rather induce immigration from France.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not going to quarrel with my hon. friend's opinion. I am only stating the facts; and in consequence of these facts and conditions, the sentiment of the governments in all those European countries which are in that condition, is absolutely opposed to emigration, and particularly emigration to Canada. Therefore in carrying on an immigration propaganda in these countries, we are doing that in the face of public opinion and contrary to the good will of the government.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. When the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company was being discussed, one of the reasons given why France was not included in that contract was that in France there was no restriction on emigration. My hon. friend gave that reason in answer to the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) and so did the right hon. the First Minister.

Mr. OLIVER. If the First Minister and I so stated, we were both at fault. What I have said is that the condition of public opinion which these European countries, by reason of the military burdens they carry and the colonial responsibilities they have assumed, and in the case of Germany by reason of her trade relations—by reason of all these circumstances the governments of these countries are not favourable to emigration to Canada. Therefore a dollar spent in Great Britain to-day will produce more and better results than a dollar spent in Germany or France. That, I think, is sufficient reason for the greater energy now being shown towards inducing British immigration. I have no desire to draw any comparisons, but I think that in this part of the British domain it is only fair and reasonable that, other things being equal, we should look to the British immigrants as being the most desirable, and when we can secure them we are doing our duty to our country.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. That argument would be very good if the government had not spent more money in continental Europe than Great Britain.