

former member for North Wellington here to criticise this properly. Banners for side of cars, \$16; cabs, \$56; fares, \$669.70; flags, \$10.50; laundry, \$18.02. That is his washing. Livery, \$70; loss on dining car, \$107.25. I suppose he had to have a dining car to himself and that it did not pay very well. Pullmans, \$590.05. I guess he slept in a Pullman car all the time pretty nearly. Special supper to Press Association, half price, \$150; tips, \$51.95.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is the total amount?

Mr. WILSON. The total is \$5,443.69. I believe it is the custom of the department now to insist upon immigration agents sending in a diary every day showing where they are and what work they are doing. I took the pains to copy out of a return brought down to the House a short time ago a few of these particulars. Mr. T. O. Currie, in 1898, was employed 151 days and was unemployed 162 days; or, at least, there is no report for those days. He drew his salary of \$1,200 just the same. In 1899 he was employed 156 days and unemployed, so far as the report goes, 157 days. He drew his \$1,200 just the same. In 1900 he was employed 167 days and unemployed 146 days. He drew his \$1,200 for the year just the same. Now, of course the hon. Minister of the Interior may be able to explain this. He may say that his diary did not give a detailed statement of what he was doing. If it did not, and the hon. minister has the information it is his duty to give it to the House. This is the information that I have gathered from the report brought down by the Department of the Interior. Then, there is Mr. W. H. Rogers. The House will remember and the members of the Agricultural Committee will remember that we had great difficulty with this gentleman last year. He seemed to ignore the instructions he got from the department entirely, because, on four different occasions at least when they asked him to give a daily report of what he was doing he never did it apparently. In 1898—I take it that he was only appointed in 1898—he drew \$525, and in 1899 he drew \$900. There is no account in either year as to what he did, but, in 1900 he reports as having been employed 126 days and unemployed 166 days, but he drew \$900 all the same. Here is Mr. M. V. McInnes. He is located at Detroit. He is reported in 1898 as having been employed 177 days and unemployed, or no report as to what he was doing, 136 days. He drew his \$1,500 just the same. In the next year he only lost 65 days, Sundays and all, but there was no reduction made in his salary in either of these two years. Now, there are others here that I could talk about in the same way, but I do not suppose it is necessary, because, if the hon. minister will clear up these gentlemen, it may go a good way in clearing up the whole lot.

Now, then, I shall come to the results of our immigration policy, taking Ireland first. We have Mr. C. R. Devlin and Mr. John Webster at the Dublin agency. They got \$6,689.35 in 1900, and we have the Londonderry agency, in charge of Mr. E. O. Kelley, which cost \$3,253.27, or a total of \$9,942.62. I have taken in this case the fiscal year. There were 701 immigrants in the fiscal year of 1900. Perhaps I should have taken, to make a fairer comparison, the calendar year, but, in the fiscal year 1900, as I have said, we got from Ireland 701 persons and they cost us \$14.18 per head. The Glasgow agency cost us \$5,123.73, and the Dumfries agency, \$1,872.08, or a total cost for Scotland of \$6,995.81. The number of immigrants we received was 1,411, at a cost per head of \$5. The Liverpool agency cost us \$10,730.54, the London High Commissioner's office \$2,132.72, and the Welsh agency, \$5,164.65, making a total cost for England and Wales of \$18,027.91. The number of immigrants we received from these parts of the United Kingdom was 8,814, at a cost per head of \$2.20 as against \$14.18 per head of the immigrants received from Ireland. Now, I just want to make, in conclusion, a comparison between the United States and ourselves. You will understand, Mr. Speaker, that in the United States, instead of sending parties abroad to induce people to go to that country they have a large staff to prevent undesirable immigrants landing there. In 1899 they prevented over 1,800 people from landing in their country who were considered undesirable immigrants, and they have adopted more stringent measures than those before in force because they are appointing men to come to Canada to prevent people going into the United States from Canada as immigrants. The number of immigrants that came to Canada in 1899 was 44,543, and in 1900, 44,697, an increase in 1900 over 1899 of 154 persons. That was the total increase, and had it not been for the increased immigration from the United States there would have been a very large decrease on the whole. The expenditure on immigration in 1899 was \$255,878.88, and in 1900 it was \$434,562.61, an increased expenditure in 1900 over 1899 of \$178,683.88. That is paying pretty dearly for the extra 154 people we got. We are paying over \$1,000 a head for them and the increased cost in 1900 over 1899 was nearly \$3 per head. In 1899 the cost was \$5.74 per head, and in 1900 \$9.72 per head. Now compare that with the United States. The commissioner general reports that in 1898 the number of immigrants to the United States was 229,298, and in 1899 the number was 311,715. The total expenditure by the United States on immigration in 1898 was \$275,809.32, and the total expenditure by the United States on immigration in 1899 was \$288,002.26. The cost per head of immigrants to the United States in 1898 was about \$1.20, and the cost per head of immigrants to the United States in 1899 was