

try to take from continental Europe children—yes, even infants in their mother's arms and bring them to this country and let them grow up with the country and become accustomed from infancy to our institutions. It would be a far better policy to get into this country infants than grown persons and women who would naturally find it difficult to adapt themselves to the environment of a country new to them. Therefore, so far as this change is concerned it was evidently in the interest of Canada. But there was another change: The first contract referred simply to continental Europe, the company having the whole of the continent to draw from, but in this contract the company's work was restricted to certain countries. And my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) argued that this was in the interest of the company. I have been much puzzled ever since to know how a gentleman with, apparently, such a logical and mathematical mind could possibly have arrived at such a conclusion. If his contention is sound, that it was in the interest of the company to be restricted to certain countries instead of being allowed the whole of Europe, the following argument is also true: If they were excluded from every country in Europe, except say Norway, that would be in the interest of the company. Surely, the larger the area they had in which to carry on their work, the easier it would be for them to get emigrants and the more emigrants they induced to leave their country and come to Canada the more they benefited themselves. Yet the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) made it a strong point that this change was in the interest of the company, and his supporters applauded that statement. But it is obvious that the statement is illogical and incorrect. The next part of the contract is this:

The company shall undertake a systematic and persistent propaganda in the countries named by which people in the agricultural districts shall be made aware of the advantages offered by Canada as a field for settlement, by advertisement in the papers, by pamphlets published by the company in the languages of the different countries referred to, and by personal canvas, all advertisements of the company to be approved by the representative of the department. And the company agree that a sum of not less than £3,000 be annually expended by them in carrying on this work.

The supporters of the amendment say that this is another concession to the company—that the former contract was bad enough, but that this gives something more to the company and is against the interest of Canada. Now, in the first contract this is all the company were to do:

Call the attention and, in response to queries furnish reliable information regarding the climatic and other conditions and resources of Canada and generally to point to Canada as a desirable field.

And, further, under the first contract, the government were under obligation to spend £500 in printing and place the literature so printed at the disposal of the company, but in this contract the government were relieved of this obligation and the company were obliged to do their own printing and make an expenditure of at least \$15,000 a year in carrying on this work. And still these hon. gentlemen say that this change in the contract was another concession to the company.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Yes.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the government had not to pay £750 for printing under the last contract?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I think not.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. It certainly had.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. That is an entirely new phase of the contract to me. If he is right, perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam Hughes) will show me that condition in the contract. I have never heard of it.

Mr. MONK. The government had to pay £750 a year and the company had to pay £1,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. That is another feature of the contract entirely, and referred only to Norway, Sweden and Iceland. The next change in this contract was in reference to the money standard. Under the first contract all families entering the country from continental Europe were obliged to be the possessors of a certain amount of money. That restriction was removed to some extent and only applied to Galicia, Roumania, Servia and Russia. Supporters of the amendment say that it was in the interest of the company and against the interest of Canada to remove that money standard. I admit that it was, to some degree, favourable to the company, but I do not admit that it was against the interest of Canada. The government in dealing with the company, found that many immigrants landing at Montreal or Halifax would represent themselves as possessing the minimum of money necessary to qualify, and sometimes they would not even admit having any. Of course, it was very difficult for the North Atlantic Trading Company to show to the government that all families entering Canada as a result of their propaganda possessed the necessary money. They called the attention of the government to the matter and offered to prove their case. They even invited a representative of the government to go to Hamburg, and, in the office of one of the steamship companies, to prove that one of the emigrants on leaving Hamburg changed money equivalent to \$9,000 of Canadian money, and yet when the same person landed at Montreal or Halifax