

jects, who after all have the first right to these rich conditions—if he would so expend one-hundredth part of that money he would reach better results, far more durable results, which would leave no fear for the future. Because there is no question that the danger indicated yesterday by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is a real and grave danger. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Roche) may have seen these immigrants as they passed through that port, with beautifying glasses. I have seen them also, some of them have passed through Montreal, and some have remained there, and they are not as good as our own Canadians, very far from it. I desire therefore to call the minister's attention to this point. It may be that the same remark can be applied to the other provinces; but speaking particularly of the conditions in the province of Quebec, you could recruit, at very little expense, in the New England States, a splendid agricultural class which you could settle in the North-west. Very likely if you brought these special advantages before those of our compatriots who have gone to the States, you would obtain the same results. I hope the hon. gentleman will accede to that proposition.

I only wish to emphasize one more point. We spent last year, according to the Auditor General's Report, what I call a fabulous sum in advertising. I question whether there is much wisdom in such an extraordinary expenditure. I think we have carried that altogether too far. We must make our country known in some dignified way. I can understand that we should make it known in Great Britain where we have authorized agents, and in France where we have authorized agents, and my hon. friend mentioned an agent that we have in Belgium. We should place every information possible, if you will, at the disposal of intending emigrants. But if you look at these figures in the Auditor General's Report, it would seem as if this country was a perfect circus from the way it has been advertised. We have been paying thousands and thousands of dollars to be spent in Chicago in making maps to be circulated. I think that thing is carried too far. My hon. friend ought also to control the statements made by Mr. Preston. Mr. Preston is the agent-general, having jurisdiction over all these numerous and expensive agencies that we have in Europe. He gets \$3,000 a year, and all his expenses paid. With that remuneration, if he is a competent man, he ought to avoid falling into the errors which were pointed out yesterday, and of which I have heard a great deal myself.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). With regard to one point which has been spoken of, that is the curative treatment of trachoma, I wish to say that when the patients were examined for that disease by the doctors and were pronounced to be affected by it, they were

Mr. MONK.

afterwards examined by specialists, who reported that the disease was curable. They were subjected to the treatment of specialists for three weeks, and at the end of that time the specialists pronounced them cured. They were brought before the inspecting physician and before the American inspectors. The disease had disappeared, and they all pronounced them cured. That is sufficient for me. I know doctors differ. I know one will pronounce you to be affected by scarlet fever or small-pox, and another will say you have not got it. But when the same people pronounce a patient diseased and after treatment pronounce him cured, we accept that. My hon. friend's doctrine on political economy is about as valuable as his opinion on the subject of surgery or medicine. Whether it is an advisable proposition that the money of the country should be expended in transporting citizens from one portion of the country to another, has not yet, I think, been pronounced upon by political economists in the same line as the opinion of the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I think it is not proper to expend government money in transporting the inhabitants of one portion of the country where it is desirable they should remain, to another in order that they may obtain an easier living. It may be of advantage to the individuals, but it is of no profit to the state.

Mr. MONK. I wish to say that I did not pretend that trachoma was incurable. What I said was that I had information, and I believed very reliable information, to show that it was absolutely incurable, and that once a patient is afflicted with it he goes on gradually and becomes a burden upon the community. Personally I do not know anything about it. I did not pretend, either, that we should transport Canadians from one part of the country to another. But if the hon. gentleman will come down to the province of Quebec and see farmers who have eight, nine or ten sons, with a farm of perhaps one hundred or one hundred and twenty acres, he will agree with me that when these sons grow up and pay taxes to this government, some facilities should be afforded them to reach the plains of the North-west instead of trying to get people from the eastern part of Europe.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am bound to take exception entirely to the view advanced by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that it is the duty of the government of Canada to hold out inducements to draw away the population of the eastern provinces and take them out to the North-west. We are all interested in the great North-west, and our desire is that the increased population we get for that country shall come from foreign countries, those countries of course from which we are most likely to obtain desirable immigrants. But certainly at a time when the eastern provinces are not increasing as much