

so far as Mr. Preston was concerned, there was no secrecy. Surely there was no secrecy, at least not as great secrecy as they try to make out, on the part of Mr. Smart. In 1902-3, Mr. Smart in his report to the minister, which was laid on the table of this House, recites the second contract in full and yet it was stated here the other night that it was only last year, through the Auditor General's Report, that one of our friends on the opposition side of the House learned that there was such a thing as the North Atlantic Trading Company. I wish to recall the statement I made some time ago that Lord Strathcona instructed Mr. Sifton that in no case was the contract to be made public and more than that it seems for some reason to have been the practice in the past to keep such contracts secret. Sir Charles Tupper was for many years High Commissioner for Canada and he, with Mr. John Dyke, went to Holland, Germany and France in 1883, and in his report as High Commissioner to the Minister of Agriculture in that year, Sir Charles wrote as follows :

I propose in this report to give you a general appreciation of the facts in relation to continental immigration and in a confidential report the particular arrangements which I have thought it advisable to be made.

He makes a general report and then states, regarding the arrangements he made in Europe with respect to emigration to Canada, he embodied them in a confidential report. Mr. John Dyke in his report of the 31st December referred to the same visit to the continent and said :

The subject is of such importance and so intricate and delicate character owing to the objections the various governments have to emigration that I exceedingly regret that I cannot here make any more comprehensive report upon this branch of my duties.

And I could read you further extracts from reports of Sir Charles Tupper in subsequent years to the effect that he did not deem it advisable to make public the arrangements which had been made with regard to continental Europe, and what was there being done by the government towards inducing emigration to Canada.

I wish to deal very briefly with another question. It is alleged that the company has done nothing. Well, we had a very excellent proof that that they were doing something from a statement made by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup). The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) had told the House that there was no evidence that the company had ever expended a cent. But my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) took up the complaint of one Ennis who was employed by the North Atlantic Trading Company on the work in Norway, Sweden and Finland, and who complained to the First Minister that the company had

not paid him. True he was not getting very much, but still the complaint is one little bit of evidence that the company were doing something. What my hon. friend was endeavouring to show was that Ennis was only getting a small amount and that the company were getting the rest of the bonus. But there is no evidence that there were not other agents acting for the company and it must be remembered that the company were doing some work themselves. The reason Mr. Ennis was not paid was because the company could not get a settlement with the government, and consequently they could not tell what amount Mr. Ennis was entitled to. If there was any delay, it was probably chargeable as much to the department as to the company. Doubtless when the statement as to the number of immigrants upon whom the bonus was payable coming from the countries in which Mr. Ennis was working, was adjusted and settled, he would receive the amount due him. I merely refer to this matter to refute the suggestion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that there was no evidence to show that the company had done anything.

The company filed with the government statements of the amounts they paid for office rent, postage, special agents and numerous other things and their statements for 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, and 1905 were accompanied in each case by the affidavit of the officer of the company, Mr. Nathan Cohen, and the books from which Mr. Cohen made these statements were audited by an officer of the Canadian government, one Charles Albert Allan, and his affidavit to that effect accompanied each statement. In most of the years, you will find upon the file a detailed statement of every expenditure they made. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) the other night took one item, which included office rent, postage and some other things, and thought it was a very large amount, and he insinuated that this whole amount was intended to cover the rent for this very much abused office in Amsterdam. But he will find in the files a further statement of the accounts of that year, from which he will get the actual amount paid for the office rent in Amsterdam.

Mr. MONK. If the company was fulfilling all its conditions and the contract was so advantageous, why did the government cancel it ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I will come to that a little later. But before doing so let me refer briefly to the charge made that the company had not a suitable office in Amsterdam. It is urged, as an objection to this contract, that the company have not large spacious offices in Amsterdam. I submit that that is no argument. There is no reason