

comes to Canada, the North Atlantic Trading Company is entitled to the bonus if Jones is an agriculturist. Are you going to pass an Act of parliament, giving the Interior Department authority to pay the North Atlantic Trading Company this bonus? Such a principle has never been followed in the history of this country. The next ground for cancellation that is alleged is :

That the engagements thus undertaken cover a possible period of nearly thirteen years and involve the payment by the country of about one million dollars without any reasonable compensating advantages.

In stating this, the hon. gentleman is simply an alarmist. This is not a contract for thirteen years, it is a four year contract, with the option of extension, if the government so desire. And again :

That the contracts were made under a pledge not to disclose the personnel or agents of the alleged company who are either unknown to the government, or if known to the government have not been disclosed to parliament notwithstanding various attempts to secure the information.

It is difficult to say whether that is true or not. There is no evidence so far as I know, that the contract was given upon the understanding that the names of the members were never to be disclosed. All that we know is that Lord Strathcona instructed the Minister of the Interior that the contract was not to be made public. Another reason alleged in favour of cancelling this contract is :

That it does not appear that the alleged Trading Company has any corporate existence, any recognized headquarters, any known directors or officers, that it has any vessels afloat, or possesses any trading or operating facilities of any kind or any agents or agencies effective or otherwise.

I submit that it makes no difference whether the company have a corporate existence or not. To say that they have no recognized headquarters is not true. Their headquarters are in Amsterdam and their office is there. As to the company having no known directors or officers, we know the name of the manager, and we know the name of the secretary. As to their having no vessels afloat, they may have a great many, or they may have none ; but whether they have any or not, I do not think that my hon. friends would lie awake nights worrying about that. This amendment proceeds :

That no evidence has been given to parliament of the plans and methods of operation, or that it has been primarily instrumental in sending one single immigrant to Canada and all efforts so far made to discover its workings have proved unsuccessful.

Now, I submit that all the figures prove the success of the propaganda of the company, prove the wisdom of the contract. And even if you produce this poor Mr.

Ennis, who has been trotted out by the hon. member for East Hastings, you only succeed in proving, by that much evidence at least, the actual methods of the company's work. Further it is said :

That the conditions of the contracts are injurious, improvident and absurd.

I say that is simply a misuse of words ; it is an arrogant postulation of the fact under controversy, and does not prove anything one way or the other. I submit that nothing has occurred, no reason has been given by the mover of this amendment, or by any hon. member supporting it, no evidence has been given either here or in any parliamentary committee, nor is there anything on the records to justify any hon. gentleman in voting for the rescinding of the contract under the terms of this amendment and for the reasons therein given.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand). Before any other hon. gentleman addresses the House, perhaps I may be allowed to ask the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) a question. I have listened for several hours to the hon. member for Lunenburg defending the North Atlantic Trading Company's contract, and now I would like to ask him the names of the gentlemen forming that company ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I thought no hon. gentleman in this House would be so foolish as to ask such questions at this time. For a small consideration I could obtain children to ask any number of just such questions. I do not see any relevancy in it.

Mr. GEORGE W. FOWLER (King's and Albert). Mr. Speaker, before taking up the question of this contract, I wish to refer to a matter somewhat personal to myself. The hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. D. Ross), with somewhat questionable taste, has introduced into this discussion, a matter in which I am intimately concerned, a case of litigation now before the courts of the province of Ontario, to which certain members on this side of the House are parties. This case is now sub-judice, and it would strike me that the matter should not have been allowed by the Speaker who was in the Chair, to be referred to, for that reason. However, the hon. gentleman (Mr. D. Ross) was permitted, in my absence, to make certain statements and to read certain garbled extracts from the papers in the case referred to. I fail to understand what public interest there can be in a lawsuit about a private matter between parties, even though those parties may be members of the House. Surely, there are sufficient points in connection with the subject under discussion to engross the attention of hon. gentlemen who wish to take part in the discussion without dragging in matters that are entirely irrelevant. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. D. Ross) had an object in view. He wished to follow out the policy that has