

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

SPEECH

OF

MR. HENRI BOURASSA, M.P.

ON

IMMIGRATION

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 1907.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has grown eloquent to a degree seldom known in this House. It is one of the first times that I have noticed that hon. gentleman abandoning the stern path of logic to adopt the high-toned and not well defined way of grandiloquence in order to avoid a straight issue. I was surprised, more especially at one of the statements of the hon. gentleman, when he said that the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne)—which to him seemed to have lasted an hour and a half, whilst in fact it was only three-quarters of an hour—was full of inaccuracies, and that in his hour and a quarter speech he has not found it proper to dispel any of these so-called inaccuracies. Before reviewing the speech of the hon. gentleman, I will remind the House of some of the facts stated by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) which the minister has not deigned to refute.

The hon. member stated that the North Atlantic Trading Company's contract had been made by the government as a change from the policy of paying bonuses to booking agents, and that, according to the declaration made last year by the minister himself, this has been stated by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne), and not refuted or denied by the minister.

The hon. member for Montmagny stated that the policy of paying bonuses had proved, under the operation of the North

Atlantic Trading Company, to be a failure. This has not only not been denied, but it has been admitted and ratified by the minister.

The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) stated that the policy of paying bonuses to immigrants had a tendency to bring a bad instead of a good class of immigrants. This has not been denied, but reiterated as a reason for the cancelling of the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company.

The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) stated that the system was a bad one. The minister has not denied the fact; he has simply tried to evade the issue by saying that this system was no longer in existence under the present order in council. The minister has tried to quibble with words by stating that there was no contract; but when a question was put to him by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) he was obliged to admit that, under this order in council, he would enter into a tacit contract with booking agents. Instead of making the case better, it simply makes it worse; because the people of Canada are sick of tacit contracts, secret contracts; what they want is a fixed, determined and public policy in immigration as well as in anything else.

The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) stated that the result of such a policy was to bring a large number of people into this country whom we could not assimilate. The minister has not

refuted that argument, and it would have been very difficult for him to do so, because in a moment I shall read his own words, which were stronger than my hon. friend's, a far stronger condemnation of the policy which he is himself trying to enact and impose on the people of Canada to-day.

The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) has stated that, with regard to immigration, it was no more a question of bringing all sorts of people, but a question of bringing the best class of people. The minister has not denied the fact, he has simply tried to prove that under the present order in council he is doing that. This was one of the few points in the speech of the hon. member for Montmagny which the minister tried to discuss, and I will prove that the minister is entirely wrong in regard to it.

The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) stated that after the government had denounced the North Atlantic Trading Company's contract, they had failed to announce their future policy, and had adopted this order in council whilst parliament was in session, and did not even consult the representatives of the people here assembled to give instructions to the government. The minister has not denied the fact, and the fact remains; and here is a radical change in our policy, the enactment of a principle contrary to the very policy of the government, as announced and propounded last session; and that change has been made in this session when parliament was sitting, when it would have been the easiest thing possible for the minister to consult the representatives of the people. I wish one of the colleagues of the minister were here, I wish the Minister of Marine and Fisheries were here, so that he could repeat those words of denunciation which he thundered so eloquently against the Conservative government because, forsooth, they had dared to purchase one million of dollars' worth of arms in Great Britain while parliament was in session. Is this another one of those principles for which the Liberal party attacked the Conservative government, but which they now advocate?—with this difference, that in the case to which I refer it was simply a question of the expenditure of money, whilst in this matter it is a question of a change of policy, a change of attitude on the part of the government, contrary to the attitude which they took last year; and without consulting parliament, whilst the representatives of the nation are assembled here, they meet in a closed chamber and frame a policy which they announce to the country, and say that we must support it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Do we understand that the hon. gentleman goes back on his record concerning payment for arms in 1895?

Mr. BOURASSA. No, I denounced it in 1895, and I denounce it to-day, whether done by a Conservative government or by a Liberal government. Now one of the arguments used by the hon. minister was this: He said, we are devoting most of our energies and spending most of our money in the British islands because we have found that it is the best field for immigration, and because the people of Great Britain, knowing that Canada is a desirable place to live in, want to come here. Sir, if the people of Great Britain want to come to Canada, what is the use of giving \$5 a head to booking agents to send them here? But let us accept the argument, let us suppose it is necessary to have agencies in Great Britain to bring over a desirable class of immigrants is that a reason for passing an order in council to induce people to come from Norway, Sweden, Holland, Denmark, Hungary, Russia, France, Belgium and Switzerland? If the argument of the minister is good, if the government have changed their policy because circumstances have changed and circumstances have changed in such a way that the people of Canada are entitled to see that their money is well employed by spending it in Great Britain, then why has the government adopted an order in council that allows them to spend money in foreign countries where it is so difficult to carry on a propaganda? Now on this question of propaganda, the hon. gentleman says that the order in council is far different from any past order, because according to the present order in council nothing will be paid to agents who work against the laws of the country in which they are operating. Either this restriction in the order in council holds good or it does not. If it holds good, then this order in council is nothing but a copy of the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company, because in that contract the government introduced the very same clause that the agents of the North Atlantic Trading Company were not going to do anything contrary to the law of the nations in which they were operating. If the North Atlantic Trading Company's contract was a bad one, because it brought those agents into conflict with the laws of the land in which they were operating, this order in council is equally bad because it is based on the same principle; it is the same policy, except that here you are dealing with individual agents instead of with a company.

Now with regard to this aspect of the question, I am open-minded, I am ready to be convinced that it is better to deal with agents than to deal with a company. But I am surprised that that argument should come from the minister, because last year when he announced to the House that the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company was to be cancelled, what did he say? He referred to some writings or some letters from Sir

Charles
have
compa
the ho
enume
ing li
divid

Now,
other
to ind
show.
years
Atlanti
dividua

To w
dividua
lantic
bookin
their p
down i
do. An
ed by p
main q
gaged I
Canada,
ter con
did who
sending
the pur
individu

Here
ister li
we had
compa
agents,
to pay
Circum
but it s
gentle
for mod
with th
other m
if the
is the
as they
the poli
instead
cunstar
to pay
would
has not
someve
he style
from M
but he
the circ
terial m
the inde
berta, I
minister
terior fr

The n
only to
circumst
years w
they hav
gument
gard to
applies
all coun

Charles Tupper, saying that it was better to have arrangements of that kind made with companies than with individual agents, and the hon. gentleman took credit for the government in the fact that they were now paying bonuses to a company and not to individual booking agents. He said:

Now, to whom did our hon. friends on the other side pay the bonuses? They paid them to individual booking agents—so their letters show. To whom did this government pay in the years preceding the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company? They paid to individual booking agents.

To whom do they pay now? Not to any individual booking agents, but to the North Atlantic Trading Company, a collective interest of booking agents. And do they get value for their payments? Judged by the standard laid down in the letter of Sir Charles Tupper, they do. And any man of common sense, not warped by political bias, will agree that that is the main question. . . . I know they are engaged in the business of booking emigrants to Canada, and I know that they work under better conditions to-day as a company, than they did when they worked as individuals, and are sending more emigrants to Canada. That was the purpose of the change from payments to individual agents to payments to this company.

Here we have, in the words of the minister himself last year, the statement that we had better adopt the policy of paying a company than of paying individual booking agents. Now the minister says it is better to pay individual agents than a company. Circumstances change, says the minister; but it seems to me that the mind of the hon. gentleman is changing quite too fast, even for modern times and modern circumstances, with the development of electricity and all other means of rapid manifestations. Now if the hon. gentleman would show us what is the difference between the circumstances as they existed last year when he preferred the policy of paying bonuses to a company instead of individual agents, and the circumstances of to-day which make it better to pay to agents instead of a company, we would not be so much mystified. But he has not deigned to inform us. He has in a somewhat satirical manner pointed out what he styles the inaccuracies of my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Arnaud Lavergne), but he does not deign to tell us what were the circumstances which allowed his ministerial mind not only to change so much from the independent mind of the member of Alberta, but to change so greatly from the ministerial mind of the Minister of the Interior from 1906 to 1907.

The minister has told us very often, not only to-day, but on previous occasions, that circumstances had changed in the last few years with regard to immigration. I admit they have, but in what way? The very argument which the minister made with regard to immigration from the British islands applies to a large extent to immigration from all countries. I think every one in this

House will admit that the main change which has occurred to warrant a modification of our immigration policy is that Canada is better known to the world to-day than she was some years ago. Canada's trade is better known, her agricultural and mining resources are better known; and therefore if that basic change of circumstances means anything with regard to our immigration policy, it means that the time has come when we should stand upon our dignity as a nation and step out before the world, instead of advertising our country through more or less questionable agencies as a patent medicine vendor advertises his nostrum and invites all sick and ailing people to come and be cured. Sir, the minister has taken pride in the fact that under this order in council he was discriminating with regard to the class of immigrants which were coming in, and he read the words which I will read again.

The immigrants for which this government offers a bounty and bonus or a prize to booking agents, are:

Farmers, farm labourers, gardeners, stablemen, carters, railway surfacemen, navvies, or miners, who have signified their intention of following farming or railway construction work in Canada, and female domestic servants.

That is a pretty broad ground. Let us come to the facts. How will this operate? You have a booking agent in London or you have ten or twenty of them. You have so many in Liverpool, in Amsterdam, in Hamburg, in Antwerp, in different parts of Europe. According to what the minister says in regard to immigration work in foreign countries, to which this order in council applies exclusively, they are not allowed to go outside of their offices to canvas immigrants. They must stay there until the immigrant comes to buy his ticket. I have very grave doubts, once this inducement is offered to a booking agent to make so much money per head of all the people he may ship to Canada, whether he will confine himself to the letter of this order in council or whether he will not put himself in the sad position, as stated by some ministerial supporters, of committing suicide or going to gaol. I have my grave doubts as to whether these booking agents, immediately you offer them this inducement, will stay in their offices. But let us suppose that they stay in their offices. Let us suppose that they conform to the letter of this order in council. What will be the result? Here is a man in Hamburg who does not know what tramp or other person will come from Prussia or Silesia to his office to get a ticket for the United States or elsewhere. The agent has only to sell him a ticket to Canada to get \$2.50 and he will say to him: Of course you are a railway worker or a navvy, here is your ticket for Canada and you will make a declaration that you are going there to work at

railway construction. The booking agent will receive his \$2.50. By what human means does the minister pretend that he will control the work of these booking agents so that after five minutes conversation they will be able to find out what occupation an immigrant may have been engaged in three hundred or four hundred miles away from his office? All nationalities and occupations will come. It may be that a large number will be sent to Canada as farmers or farm labourers or railway workers or navvies because forsooth they have passed through some of the criminal courts and they have been condemned either to go to gaol or to leave for America. There is nothing in the order in council that prevents a booking agent from making his \$2.50 out of that kind of immigrant.

In regard to female immigration, those who are familiar with the social life of London and other English cities, those who have read some of the reports of the London County Council know very well that a large female population is sent every year from continental Europe to London composed of women who have passed through criminal courts. They are sent to England and then they are taken up by the Salvation Army. Now, I have the greatest admiration for the devoted work of the Salvation Army, for everything they have endeavoured to do to raise to a higher moral and physical standard some of the lowest classes of the United Kingdom; but as a Canadian I fail to see that the population and the future of Canada should be made part of that kind of work if that kind of work means that after the Salvation Army authorities, without going beyond the varnish of civilization with respect to these people, shall ship them to Canada in order to make them civilized beings. I have the greatest objection that Canada should be made a dumping ground—even at the expense of being considered narrow by the broad minded Minister of the Interior. I have an objection to Canada becoming the ground of exile or reformation for the Salvation Army to ship to us all the worst characters from Whitechapel or any other of the worst quarters of the larger English cities. If that is what is called British immigration, if that is what is called immigration tending to give a permanent basis to British institutions in Canada, then I say to the minister that he is greatly mistaken with regard to the social conditions in that country; and it simply proves that he does not know the fundamental principles of the development of nations, and if he thinks that a nation and the best interests of the people are promoted by the degraded elements of its population, he is mistaken.

The minister has stated that my hon. friend from Montmagny had given utterance to a policy that would be detrimental to the interests of Canada. Of course, that

is a broad point of view. That is a large basis for discussion. There are many ways in which a public man may view the interests of his country. It cannot be altogether dismissed by saying: 'You are a little Canadian, you have no breadth of mind and you do not understand the interests of the country.' For my part I think it is just as patriotic to say: 'Let us take a little more time to increase the population of our country, let the land speculators of the west wait a little longer to make their money; but let the basis of the future population of Canada be sound both mentally and physically.' It may be that such is the view of a Little Canadian, but I think that hon. gentlemen who go to the very basis of this patriotic policy will agree with me. It has been stated that we want to see the result of our policy. There was once a famous phrase uttered in this House: 'Cox cannot wait.' This very sentiment can be applied to many of the friends of the hon. minister who cannot wait for their paying dividends upon the lands they have secured from the government. I am afraid that the same phrase would apply that these hon. gentlemen cannot wait because they are anxious to secure their 50 per cent or 100 per cent or 200 per cent profit from the sale of land. The future of Canada, the future of British institutions, the future of the British flag—which some of their legislators have put on every school house in Manitoba—is a very small asset in the ideas and aspirations of some hon. gentlemen concerning the Northwest. I want perfect liberty to be given to every man to make as much money as he can. But I have some objection, as a Little Canadian, if the hon. gentleman wants to style it in that way, to seeing the future of my country endangered by the policy of men who simply want to reap the greatest advantage possible by speculating with the soil of Canada and not only with the soil of Canada but with the future of the Canadian people.

Now, Sir, the hon. minister has tried to make my hon. friend from Montmagny appear as very narrow minded and as being animated by racial prejudice because forsooth he stated that it was not desirable to have all sorts of people in this country but that it was a better policy to bring in people who have something in common with the various elements that have laid down the foundations of this country, who have the same blood, the same ancestry, the same national traditions and who come here to adopt our nationality and to help us in maintaining those traditions. The hon. gentleman has tried to leave the impression that my hon. friend from Montmagny objected to the importation of people from Scandinavia or other European countries because he was animated by racial prejudice. Neither has my hon. friend from Montmagny stated, nor do I state now, that the

people
many
people
and a
civiliz

I am
ple in
highest
our pro
which w
social s
ligious
herited
prove o

Possib
Englisl
himself;
Russian
man; I
much b
inasmuc
ing us t
dence ha
for ours
not a he

Sir, I
adian, I
ber of
ces hav
circums
gentlem
triotic
Canada
now he
then he

Let m
have be
so much
to stean
immigra
steamshi
gration
ence to
characte
where h
bonus.

Does
booking
compan
Minister
Hambur
patriotic
grant e
cannot
triotic a
by \$2.50
send yo
ister of
ficate of
or Live
Immigr
member
1902, w
true to
Let me
of the I
for Albe

It seen
this is a

people from Scandinavia, Russia, or Germany are not a splendid race of people, a people animated by high national traditions, and a people actuated by a deep sense of civilization.

I am not claiming that we are the best people in the world; that our civilization is the highest form of civilization; but I do claim that our present civilization suits us, and it is that which we have set ourselves to improve. Our social system, our political system, our religious system, are those which we have inherited and under which we are trying to improve ourselves.

Possibly a Chinaman is a better man than an Englishman, let the Englishman answer for that himself; a Japanese may be a better man or a Russian may be a better man than the Englishman; I say nothing about that, he may be a much better man, but he is not one of us, and inasmuch as he is not one of us he is not helping us to develop along those lines that Providence has chosen for us, or that we have chosen for ourselves. His presence is a hindrance and not a help.

Sir, this is the language of a Little Canadian, known heretofore as Mr. Oliver, member of parliament for Alberta. Circumstances have changed, but I am afraid the only circumstance that has brought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) to abandon this patriotic policy which he calls now a Little Canadian policy, is the circumstance that now he is a member of the cabinet and then he was a free member of parliament.

Let me say further that it appears to me to have been a mistake in the past to have spent so much money as we have in paying bounties to steamship companies for the conveyance of immigrants, and for this reason: we made the steamship companies, by that means, our immigration agencies, and it did not make any difference to the steamship companies what the character of the immigrant was, who he was, or where he was from, so long as they got the bonus.

Does not that argument apply to the looking agents as well as to the steamship companies? Certainly it does, unless the Minister of the Interior can prove that every Hamburg Jew he selects as an agent is so patriotic, that when an undesirable immigrant comes to his office he will say: I cannot send you to Canada; I am too patriotic a Canadian to do that; I will lose by \$2.50 commission on you, rather than send you to that country. Unless the Minister of the Interior can give such a certificate of character to every Hamburg Jew or Liverpool Jew that he appoints as an immigration agent, the remarks of the member for Alberta on the 29th of April, 1902, which I have just quoted are just as true to-day as they were five years ago. Let me quote further what the Minister of the Interior said when he was member for Alberta:

It seems to me, from my point of view, that this is a most undesirable system and a most

undesirable expenditure, and I would ask that it be not continued.

These are the words of the member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) speaking of the immigration policy of the government, and if I have any reproach to make to my good friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne), it is that he has taken the words of his motion from the very language uttered in this House by the member for Alberta. The former part of my hon. friend's motion was taken from a speech made by the member for Alberta one year later than the speech I have referred to, and the circumstances which existed then exist to-day, the only change being that the member for Alberta is now the Minister of the Interior. On the 14th of July, 1903, the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) said:

Something has been said, I understand, about the paying of bounties or commission to induce immigration. To my mind, if ever there was need for that system, that need has passed.

It was not a question with him then, as to discrimination or selection, but in his opinion the whole system was bad, and he condemned it without qualification.

The payment of bounties and commissions—

And here again, Mr. Speaker, if you do me the favour to follow the wording of the motion, you will find that my hon. friend from Montmagny has made a faithful copy of the language of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver):

The payment of bounties and commissions has a tendency to bring the less desirable rather than the more desirable class of people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is still my opinion; and at the expense of being denounced as a racial zealot, or a Little Canadian, I still hold the patriotic view which the member for Alberta held before he became Minister of the Interior.

But that is not all. A Bill was introduced providing for the better inspection of immigrants in the matter of their health, and the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) supported the Bill, but he warned the House that sanitary precautions were a small consideration compared with the great national principle at stake. He said:

From my standpoint, the diseases existing among immigrants are but a trifling consideration in comparison with the general character of the immigrant. I cannot understand the frame of mind which looks carelessly upon the introduction into the very life of our country, of a population without regard to whether such population will raise or lower the general standard of our people. It does not need any demonstration on my part, that if the increase of population which will necessarily take place in the development of these resources is of a character and constitution essentially different from our own, not only will they build up a different civilization wherever they establish themselves, but they will invariably control our civilization in this part of the country.

Now, Sir, the argument made by my hon. friend from Montmagny, is the very argument that was made by the hon. member for Alberta, when he was a member and not a minister.

It may be said that I have given these quotations simply for the pleasure of putting my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) in contradiction with himself. If he has that thought he may dispel it; because after all when there has been some good in a man it is well to remind him of it, for it may help to awaken remorse. If I have reminded the Minister of the Interior to-day of his former self, it is simply because I still hope that he will not utterly abandon his patriotic ideas, and that instead of being dragged into this policy by a government which was dragged into it by his predecessor in the department, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) will assert his own will, and although he has given way by adopting this order in council, he will hesitate in the application of it and stop before committing the errors of his predecessor.

It is said to us: You want to restrict all immigration to Canada, you do not want the population to increase and the resources of our country developed, you are taking an unpatriotic view and the people of Canada will not support you. That charge is false. The view I take is this: That in the development of a nation regard must be had for all conditions; regard must be had to the past and to the future as well as to the present, and care must be taken that the present exigencies of interested people are not to control. I am in favour of a strong and well directed and well controlled policy of immigration, and I think I could prove from the words of the Minister of the Interior in the past, that he agrees with me. I hold that the best immigration agent is an agent you have not to pay or hire to do your work; I hold that the best and the most patriotic and the most business-like immigration agent is the contented settler, who being satisfied with his lot in this country will write home to his relatives and friends to join him in this happy and fertile land. Instead of spending so much money in favour of steamship companies, and railway companies, and booking agents, and land speculators, if you took a little more care that the settler coming to Canada is properly treated from the time he lands until he reaches his future home; is not robbed on the way; is not intercepted by the land speculator; is not intercepted by the agents of the very same men who have enforced this immigration policy upon you;—you will have a much better immigration system than the system which is costing you so much at the present day.

If you look to the settler, from the time of his arrival until he settles on his holding; if you make him satisfied with his life in Canada; if he finds that Canada is

a land of law and justice, a land which looks after the farmer and the settler, which prevents the speculator and the railway company from crushing him, he will be far more satisfied than if you paid \$2.50 to a Hamburg Jew to ship him to Canada—and let God take care of him when he gets here. If you would take the large sum of money you are now spending in Europe in paying these booking agents or their steamship companies, or these secret organizations like the North Atlantic Trading Company, and devote it to the development of the transportation facilities of Canada, so that the settler would find the best and cheapest means of sending out his farm produce, that he might not be at the mercy of the elevator company or the railway company which you incorporate and which you protect, and if you would also cheapen communication so that the settler could get his manufactured goods at a better price than he gets them to-day, then that settler would write home, he would tell his friends and relatives in the British Islands, in France, in Belgium or in Germany—that Canada is a land where railway corporations and land speculators do not control the government and the law, that Canada is a country where trade flourishes and a man can buy and sell without paying tribute to monopolies of any kind—and that contented settler, writing with enthusiasm to his friends of his new home, would be a far more effective immigration agent than any of your Hamburg Jews or secret organizations.

Now, with regard to the question of discrimination let me at once point out that the discrimination urged by my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) was not as between English and French immigrants, as the Minister of the Interior, in an effort to make a cheap point, would have had the House believe. The hon. minister tried to put in the mouth of my hon. friend words which he never uttered; he tried to impute to him sentiments which are foreign to him. The hon. minister tried—as many like him have tried for ten years past, on my own account—to make it appear that my hon. friend from Montmagny was seeking to raise racial distinctions as between the English-speaking and French-speaking population in this country. The accusation is no more true in this case than it ever was before. What my hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) asked the Minister of the Interior to do was to formulate and carry out a policy based upon the very nature of the Canadian people, a policy that would encourage English and French immigrants as against those from other countries. Is this again 'Little Canadian'? Is this 'mere sentiment'? I say, Sir—quoting from the words of the Minister of the Interior—we must take facts as they are; we must accept history as it is. This

country
French a
the foud
agreed t
nation,
of the
was in
eration,
so-called
that in o
to make
partly F
of all na
tered the
whether
British o
worthy o
teach br
patriotis
ers of th
rent of
should g
and the l
ained in
should gi
to people
us—noth
nothing i
ing in co
omics, n
al senti
with our
It was n
of confe
he gather
helped to
Induceme
number 1
at the pr
be master
that have
be swam

The ex
been quo
great da
bringing
our coun
from Mo
has not
lect. I
weary th
It seems
Instructiv
that at n
there eve
United S
in proport
brought
broad and
the Mini
When I s
leave asid
come to
though pe
that a lar

country was settled and founded by the French and conquered by the English. After the feuds of many years these races have agreed together to found a vast Canadian nation. But, Sir, it never was in the minds of the founders of this nation, it never was in the minds of the fathers of confederation, the men whose names these present so-called Liberals are so fond of invoking, that in order to be broad—or even in order to make land speculators rich—we ought to change a providential condition of our partly French and partly English country to make it a land of refuge for the scum of all nations. That idea, I say, never entered the mind of any patriotic Canadian, whether Conservative or Liberal, whether British or of French descent. It is an idea worthy of those 'big' men who now try to teach breadth of mind and loftiness of patriotism to others. The idea of the founders of this nation was that the double current of our national and mental activity should go on, that the British civilization and the French civilization should be maintained in this country, and not that we should give the better half of our continent to people who have nothing in common with us—nothing in common with us in history, nothing in common with us in blood, nothing in common with us in education or economics, 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 foreign-

ers. 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 problem 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 Gallician to reach the western plains than they offer to a Canadian. We allow them to give better facilities to the Doukhobor and the Gallician 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 Gallicians 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 within ten years you make them the complete masters of that land. They have not even a moment's contact with the rest of the people of Canada: they have no intercourse with those people with whom they are called on to live and carry on the business of the country. There is more than that. Providence, in its wisdom, had divided the continent upon certain geographical lines while the policy of men has parted it contrary—everybody will admit—to the laws of nature. You have two immense stretches of territory, each with different climates and resources and economical interests. They are divided by a barrier of water and barren land which, if ever peopled, will be so thinly populated that for all time to come you will always have a natural barrier between eastern and western Canada, such as never existed in the United States. And you will have in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba and that stretch of northern country whose capabilities we are only beginning to perceive, a population foreign born, foreign educated, knowing nothing of our country, having nothing in common with us, developing trade and farming industry and economical needs entirely different, if not entirely opposed to ours. What will be the result? Within thirty years you may look not only to the probability but to the certainty that this House will be controlled by members elected in those constituencies west of Lake Superior. You will have our Canadian parliament controlled by a majority, of whom certainly the four-fifths

if not the whole will be foreign—neither English nor French nor British nor Little Canadians nor broad imperialists, but simply foreigners who came to this country to make money, who will try to control this parliament so as to make money; who will subordinate everything to that object, and who will be quite content to see British institutions disappear from our midst in spite of all the British flags with which you are decorating the schools of Manitoba. When this parliament will fall under the control of those foreign elements—and that may happen in the lifetime of the present Donkhobors and Galicians, before the first Canadian born generation of those immigrants will be taking part in our public life—are you going to tell me that it is not a wise, not a sound and patriotic and British policy to pause at least a moment and look into the possibilities of such a future?

Having said so much on Canadian immigration, leaving aside all questions of French or English or Scotch or Irish, I will not be more afraid to state my views in this House with regard to French immigration than I was in the city of Toronto. My views are these. Because the fathers of confederation decided, and decided wisely, that this should be a dual country—French in its origin, British by assimilation, taking from both races and both civilizations its best moral, social and political characteristics—I claim that the equilibrium between the two should be maintained and that it is in the interests of all British citizens in Canada that a French speaking population should be developed. My hon. friend has referred to the influx of Americans into Canada. I hear it often said by men, who at other times will try to stigmatize us as disloyal, as racial or religious zealots, that it does not matter from what country settlers may come, that all the Americans who want to come here are welcome. To a certain extent I agree with them. Let all good, moral, intelligent people come to this country. That we must seek a large influx of American population may be from a purely monetary point of view, sound policy; but if there be any sincerity in the so-called loyalty of those who argue this way, you cannot say it is in accord with your sense of British citizenship that you should open this country wide to the influx of American population, capital and ideas. It is all very well to say that the Americans who go west are satisfied with the laws of Canada. They do not come here to study law but to make money, and because they find the conditions at present in Canada better for making money than in the United States. But when they have grown two or three generations, when they have reached a higher stage of civilization, and when they will form the majority of the people of this country, are you quite sure they will be so much attack-

ed to
and th
Britis
where
you s
the fa
mariti
west,
and so
and C
will?
with t
nor A
natura
wealth
depend
greater
than a
foreign
connec
tion, b
of Can
ation,
they v
British
the Ca
or dan
prospe
wrong,
this; b
view w
laugh:

ed to British institutions as you claim, and that the simple fact of having so many British flags hoisted on schools and elsewhere is going to make them British? Are you sure, when you discriminate against the farmers from Quebec, Ontario and the maritime provinces going to settle in the west, that the newcomers will be as safe and sound with regard to British connection and Canadian citizenship as you say they will? Are you quite sure that mingled with those foreign elements, neither British nor American, but who will always have a natural attraction for the larger and wealthier country to the south, a country independent by itself—which has always a greater prestige in the eyes of foreigners than a colony—are you quite sure that these foreign elements will be attached to British connections in such a way that if it comes to a choice between their British connection, between their connection with the rest of Canada, between the unity of confederation, and their economic interest, that they will not ten times rather break the British connection, ten times rather break the Canadian confederation, than endanger or damage their economic or their business prospects? It may be that my view is wrong, it may be that I am a pessimist in this; but I claim that this is a point of view which cannot be dismissed by a simple laugh at Little Canadianism. After all, I

do not suppose that even as big Canadians as the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) can afford to ignore history, can afford to ignore human nature, can afford to ignore the laws that have directed all nations in the past, whether in ancient or modern history; and if history repeats itself in respect to Canada, it may be that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior cannot stop it all by himself. I think that the laws of nations, the laws of history and the laws of nature will be stronger than even my friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver).

I need not say much more on this subject; I simply claim that this is a subject which imposes itself on the attention of the people of Canada, and that before changing the basis of the policy as defined last year, before going back to the system which my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) himself had denounced with the greatest vehemence while a member of this House, I claim that the least that the parliament and the people of Canada could have expected would have been to be informed of what the minister contemplated, and that we should have been consulted before such a step was taken. There is, therefore, no hesitation in my mind in deciding that the motion of my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) is a timely one and that it should be adopted by this House.