

and placed upon the table. And what reason do they give for not disclosing the names? They say: The names must be kept secret or otherwise these men would be prosecuted. What would they be prosecuted for—prosecuted for carrying on a propaganda in these particular countries which are covered by this contract? That surely cannot be the case for section 11 of the contract says:

It is further agreed that the company shall not in carrying out their contract with the government, act in contravention of the laws of any of the countries in which it is operating.

If these gentlemen who are carrying on this propaganda were doing nothing in contravention of the laws of the countries in which they are operating, why this need for secrecy about their names. Can it be possible that the government of Canada has stooped so low as to make a contract which contains a lie upon its very face? They refuse to disclose the names because if the names were disclosed these people would get into trouble in the nations in which they are operating, but the contract contains a clause which expressly provides that this company shall do nothing in contravention of the laws of any country in which they are operating. I say, Sir, that there is some other reason why these names are not disclosed. Mr. Smart the Canadian manager of this company knows these people and he could tell their names to the committee of the House, but the majority of that committee controlled by the Prime Minister and the government refused to make Mr. Smart give that information.

It is an improvident contract. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) said the company 'was easy'. Talk about easy things; if there ever was any thing easy in this world it was the government that made such a contract. It is no wonder that Mr. Smart seeing what an easy thing he had was willing to get out of the office of deputy minister with a salary of \$5,000 a year and take his chances with the North Atlantic Trading Company,—with, we don't know what salary, but with what we are sure will be a pretty nice pocketful of perquisites and pickings. An improvident contract; it mattered not by what agency a certain class of immigrants were procured in the countries named, the North Atlantic Trading Company got \$5 for each of them out of the pockets of the Canadian people. They may not have brought one solitary individual, (I don't say they did not) but I say it is possible under the contract that they may not have contributed to the bringing out of one solitary individual of all these immigrants, and yet they would get \$5 a head for them. Under the 1st contract they were to spend \$15,000 a year; no audit of their accounts, no evidence that a dollar was spent, their only office they could

get at a cheap rent because there was little wear and tear on it for there was only one man there once a month.

Mr. BENNETT. To get the government cheque.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, that was to get the cheque and there would not be much wear and tear about that. Never was there a more improvident contract made. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) drew the attention of my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) to the fact that the government of Canada contributed £750 a year to this company, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean), amidst the laughter of his friends which he won by false pretenses answered. That does not apply. Let us see whether it applies or not. The contract says:

In order to assist and encourage the company in a special effort in Norway and Sweden and Finland during the next two years, and after that in any countries which the department may name—

It was not to be confined for two years, but it was to run right along through the whole contract, and it was not to be confined necessarily to the countries, but after the first two years it could be extended to any countries which the government might name.

The department may make a grant to the company of £750 for special work on the condition that the company will supplement this amount by an actual—

An actual grant: oh, no.

—by an actual expenditure of £1,000.

What is the fair interpretation of that language in the contract. I will guarantee the interpretation the North Atlantic Trading Company put upon the contract is, that all they will have to expend will be £250 added to the £750 granted by the government. That is a fair construction to put upon the contract and, knowing this North Atlantic Trading Company as well as I do, having a strong suspicion of the identity of the gentlemen composing it, I am satisfied that is the construction they put upon the contract, and if they do pay a dollar, which is doubtful, it would not be more than the £250 they were entitled to under this contract.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. That is the reason they could not pay Innes' salary.

Mr. FOWLER. Exactly. My hon. friend speaks of another section under this which he says imposes a very onerous condition on these gentlemen, that is that each family should have \$100. An onerous condition, he says; we do not want the money. My hon. friend apparently is in favour of pauper immigration to this country. I think that is a very proper condition, the only fault I would find with it is that the