

portion of foreign born in the jails of the province of Ontario is 38 per cent. It is pointed out that the yearly cost of each inmate of the asylum to the province of Ontario is \$200, so that each commitment of an alien to an asylum means a future cost to the province of \$6,000, and so the 364 sent to the asylum last year means an ultimate cost of over \$2,000,000 to the province. It therefore seems to me that it would be wise administration on the part of the government to revise their immigration policy. I quite agree with what my hon. friend from Mille Iles has said, that the first consideration should be quality instead of numbers. The European immigrants, particularly those from the slums of European cities, have added greatly to the cost of the local authorities. It is, therefore, in the best interest of Canada, even on financial grounds, entirely apart from moral and national grounds, that there should be careful discrimination exercised as to the character of immigrants being allowed to land on our shores. I should like to make a few observations with reference to the incursion of the government into the treaty-making field. I notice that the address makes allusion to certain treaties that are being negotiated, but omits entirely any reference to treaties of a more interesting character. The government congratulated itself some years ago on having struck out on an independent path so far as the treaty making power is concerned, and I observe of late that a kind of diplomatic corps is being cultivated by the government within its cabinet circle, and certain hon. gentlemen seem to be clothed with ambassadorial powers to attend foreign courts occasionally with a view to negotiating treaties; but I can scarcely congratulate the government on what these hon. gentlemen have accomplished. We recall the mission of the present Minister of Agriculture to Japan a couple of years ago in connection with the question of immigration. That gentleman appears to have been diplomatically chloroformed on that occasion. He was told to return to Canada and the relations between Japan and this country would continue to be harmonious, and the imperial court would see that not too many Japanese would come out.

That mission apparently failed in its results. A couple of years ago the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Finance went to France, apparently to negotiate a treaty, and a very great eulogy was paid to those hon. gentlemen upon their apparent success. They had thrown off the incubus, so to speak, of the British representative upon that mission, and had practically, of their own motion, and upon their own responsibility, successfully negotiated this treaty. But we were surprised to learn a short time ago that, notwithstanding the ratification of the treaty by this parliament, the treaty had yet to be ratified by France.

I notice the right hon. Prime Minister, in the House of Commons last night, stated that a supplementary treaty had been entered into. I should like to learn from my right hon. friend why the treaty was not ratified by the French government. The press report rather indicated that the Canadian ministers failed to represent to the government of France that, under the favoured nation clause, Switzerland would come within the rights of the treaty. Parliament has not received any information on the subject. I should like to know from my right hon. friend if he has any information on that subject? What will be the provisions of the supplementary treaty? Is it proposed to negotiate a new treaty, and to alter the terms of the old treaty, or what is the intention of the government on that point? This is a matter involving public interest, and I scarcely understand why allusion is not made to it in the speech from the Throne. I very much doubt if this treaty had been negotiated by British diplomats that it would have been left in the incomplete shape in which it was left by the representatives of Canada in dealing direct with the French government.

There is another subject which should be of some interest to the trade of Canada, and that is the extent to which this government may have gone in their correspondence with the German government relative to the removal of the tariff reprisals which obtain against both countries. The policy of the government has been to open up; or it is represented that the policy of the government has been to open up, new markets; it seems to me to be a senseless