

cide whether the conduct of the government in making that contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company was proper or not. It has appeared clearly in evidence that this company was first organized in 1899 and was reconstructed in 1902, but it had no corporate existence until June of last year. That has been established beyond all controversy. It was with this company that the government made this contract. We find it stated by one of the witnesses, I think Mr. Smart, that this company was incorporated with a capital of \$200,000 and that that amount did not even represent the financial strength of the men who were behind it. Now, Sir, I say if that be true—and that statement was made—it did not redound to the credit of the government of this country. It was stated by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross) that it was the intention of the government more than a month ago, and was whispered, and known by many in this House to cancel this contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company. Now, Sir, what are the facts? In reply to a question by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) said that it was not decided to cancel that contract until the 14th day of April. It must be quite evident that there is a discrepancy somewhere.

I would like for a moment to refer to the organization or incorporation of this company. It was incorporated in one of the Channel Islands. It seems to me that is a condition of things that cannot be justified by this government. I know that the government will not be endorsed in conduct of this kind by the people of the country. It was incorporated there, according to the information we obtained from Lord Strathcona, and I believe I will be sustained in saying that a cablegram was not sent to Lord Strathcona until pressure was brought to bear by the committee. From Lord Strathcona's reply we find there are several gentlemen, I believe living in London, England, a hotel keeper, a law clerk, a grocery clerk and four others who constituted or are named as incorporators of that company. What we are anxious to find out is who own the other 2,993 shares in this North Atlantic Trading Company, and I make bold to say that before the investigation is concluded there will be information before this House that will help us to know and realize who the real members of this company are, who hold the other 2,993 shares of stock in the North Atlantic Trading Company which are not accounted for. We may have suspicions, and we have suspicions, and I ask any member of this House how can we help entertaining suspicions when we find that men of this kind, men who are certainly engaged in honest occupations, are the incorporators of this company, but it seems to me that that information was just as surprising to the followers of the

government as to the members of His Majesty's loyal opposition. I shall now in a few words—and I will be brief—I do not intend to take up two hours like the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Crawford), I am going to be very brief.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. That is right.

Mr. GUNN. I would like to refer to some things that have been said by hon. gentlemen opposite. There seems to be an organized attempt on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to criticise and to try to show that the hon. gentleman who had the honour of submitting this amendment to the House is not worthy of the position he occupies in this House. I say there are no men in this country who know better than the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches that the hon. member who introduced this amendment (Mr. Foster) stands to-day as one of the first public men in Canada. He, Sir, is a gentleman about whom I have read since I was a boy—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GUNN. I would like to say that I am not nearly as old as my hair would indicate—although I never had the pleasure of meeting him until I had the honour of being elected a member of this House and coming here a year ago last January. I say to you, and I say it candidly and from the bottom of my heart, that if there was one public man whom I admired in the great Dominion of Canada more than another, it was the hon. gentleman who submitted this amendment last Friday night (Mr. Foster). Why, Sir, is there an organized attempt by hon. gentlemen who sit on the government side of the House to endeavour to instill into the minds of the people of this country the idea that this hon. gentleman is not sincere? I said a few minutes ago that I challenged one hon. gentleman opposite to produce one tittle of evidence that the hon. gentleman who sits in the front row on this side (Mr. Foster) has ever done one thing in the public life of Canada that would degrade him in the eyes of the people of this country. More than that, I would like to say that I am exceedingly sorry that he is present; I would very much rather have said these things in his absence, but I would like to say and I am bound to say, and I am placing myself in the judgment of every hon. member who is listening to my voice, that he would grace any deliberative or legislative assembly in this world—and there are no hon. gentlemen who realize that better than the hon. gentlemen opposite. Why is it that they made such a deliberate, such an organized attempt to keep that hon. gentleman out of the House? Does any hon. gentleman who is interested in the welfare of the public affairs of Canada mean to tell me that he is not a valuable man in this House? Why