

chase in future years—all secured to this country by the expenditure of \$1,000,000. Therefore I think that we cannot for one moment consider a proposition to drop a vigorous immigration policy. I do not intend to detain this House much longer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CRAWFORD. You have got pretty nearly enough, have you?

An hon. MEMBER. You have not begun yet.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have enough thunder here for two or three hours more. I think that I have at least proved that the contract has not cost any more than it should. We get good value for our money. We get what we pay for, nothing more and nothing less. Nothing else can be made out of the contract. We pay so much per head for immigrants. We have the opportunity of saying whether they are fit subjects for this country or not, and we do not pay for a single immigrant who comes into this country unless he is first accepted. The North Atlantic Trading Company have no pull with this government. They cannot dictate to us as to what class of people we are going to take. It is a square business deal and a deal of that kind must be continued if this country is going to be prosperous and become the great nation we expect it to be in the future. The principle enunciated in this resolution, I am satisfied, will not meet with the approval of the people of the country. That being the case as far as I am concerned I will at least recommend that this resolution be voted down.

Mr. B. B. GUNN (South Huron). Mr. Speaker, I have not heard all that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) has said, but I have no doubt in the world that the speech he has just delivered is one that will go down to history as an exceedingly long one indeed. I observe by the clock that he has spoken for nearly two hours and for not more than two minutes has he made reference to the subject under discussion. I wish, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, to refer to one or two of the things which I did hear the hon. gentleman make allusion to. He was interrupted two or three times and he replied to questions submitted by hon. gentlemen on this side one by the hon. member sitting behind me here. He was bold and honest enough to acknowledge that he knew nothing about the subject he was discussing. I avail myself of the privilege of asking the hon. gentleman another question. He was alluding to the colonization companies of the Northwest and I asked him if he referred to the colonization company of which the late member for Lambton, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, was a very conspicuous member and he said he would deal with that later on. I listened very attentively

Mr. CRAWFORD.

for that reply but I did not hear him make any reference at all to the matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I might just say that is reserved for another occasion.

Mr. GUNN. At the outset I would like to say that I have listened very attentively to this discussion during its progress since the amendment was moved by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) last Friday night, and the speeches that I have heard from the other side of the House—and I believe that I have heard every one of them so far on this question—have not touched upon the question at issue at all. I believe that every hon. member will agree with the statement that we are not attacking at the present time the immigration policy of the government. All we say is that the government entered into a contract with a company known as the North Atlantic Trading Company, first in 1899 and afterwards in 1902, and we believe that it is a contract which should be probed to the bottom and that every hon. member, whether he sits on your right or your left, Mr. Speaker, should help the opposition, if there is anything wrong in this contract, to ferret it out, and to place the responsibility where it properly belongs. I listened very attentively indeed to the remarks made by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) last Friday night and I expected that he would make some reply to the arguments advanced by my hon. friend from North Toronto. But, Sir, what did we find? We found that hon. gentleman discussing for more than an hour and a half the immigration policy of the government. What did he say? He went on to discuss the area of the three North Western provinces. I do not think that that was a proper treatment of the question. He went on to tell us what land was worth in 1896. He said that the number of acres he mentioned were worth, in 1896, \$400,000,000 and that to-day they are worth \$1,200,000,000. The speech of the hon. gentleman was devoted to that subject and it was only during the last three or four or five minutes that the hon. gentleman who holds the exalted position of a minister of the Crown referred to the subject under discussion. It seems to me that the government have made up their minds that the hon. gentlemen who represent constituencies in the great western country are to make reply and to advance reasons why this contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company should or should not be cancelled. I listened with a great deal of respect to the delivery of the speech made by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross) the day before yesterday. He is another hon. gentleman who did not touch the question at all. But, he did discuss a subject that he should not have discussed in this honourable House, namely, a suit which is pending in the courts between some hon. members.