

represented himself as having less than the amount needed to qualify him under this contract. At any rate, I submit that this money standard was not important. In fact, it strikes me as being a foolish one in every particular and one that should not have been in the contract at all. I do not regard the change as a concession to the company or an injury to Canada. In order to ascertain the amount of money possessed by the immigrants to whom the restriction applies, it was agreed that the company should establish the facts by reasonable evidence.

Now, that was a fair provision of the contract. Nothing more could have been expected from the company than that. They had to offer the government such reasonable evidence as would naturally be expected by them in establishing a money standard. It was a very difficult thing, and a very unnecessary provision in this contract, I believe. The contract goes on to state :

In order to assist and encourage the company in a special effort in Norway, Sweden and Finland during the next three years, and after that in any countries which the minister may name, the government shall make a grant to the company of £750 a year for special work in those countries on condition that the company undertakes to spend a further amount of £1,000 a year in such special work.

Now, that is a change in the contract, I admit, but I do not think it was altogether a concession to the company, I do not regard it in that light. I think it was eminently in the interests of the country, it was an endeavour to secure for Canada a class of immigrants which everybody, I know, in this House will consider desirable. To show how profitable this provision of the contract to Canada was, I will give you the immigration figures from Norway, Sweden and Finland, for the five years after this provision was made. In 1900-1, 1,255 immigrants from those countries landed in Canada. That was before that special provision was made. In 1901-2, the immigrants increased to 4,318, nearly 300 per cent. In 1902-3 the number increased to 5,950, or over 400 per cent of an increase. In 1903-4 the immigration from these countries was 4,235; in 1904-5, 4,567. Now, I submit that that extra inducement of £750 given to the company by the government proved a wise expenditure, and inasmuch as this second contract in this respect differs from the former contract, I submit it is one deserving of the commendation rather than the criticism of hon. gentlemen. The term of this contract was ten years, but it could be terminated at two years. The old contract could be terminated at three months. There is certainly a change in this respect, and possibly it may be argued that it was in the interest of the company. But I submit that any organization, or company, or syndicate undertaking to do work of this

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN.

character are surely entitled to two years notice before the government could terminate it. I say that is a fair business proposition, and any similar business carried on between any two companies in this country, or any two individuals, would be subject to a similar condition. I submit that so far as this particular provision of the contract differs from the former, it is not open to criticism. The next part of the contract deals with the terms of payment. It states : Bonuses earned under the agreement are to be paid to the company quarterly.

This does not differ from the former agreement I think. The next clause is new :

No bonus is to be paid on any immigrant not mentally and physically fit, or who is a criminal or has a criminal record, and any expenditure incurred in having such persons cared for or deported, is to be charged against the account of the company.

This section was not in the former contract, and I submit that it was not altogether in the interest of the company, it rather placed upon them a new burden. Now we come to the third contract which was concluded on the 28th of November, 1904. The first clause has been criticised by the member for North Toronto in, I think, an unfair manner. He read the first few lines of this section, which are to this effect :

The company shall and will carry on an active educative work in the agricultural districts of the following countries.

And he won the applause of his friends upon the rendition of that clause. I say he won the applause under what, possibly, might be termed false pretenses, and I think it is the duty of my hon. friend to give back to his friends that applause, and admit that he did not secure it by fair means. If a lawyer pretending to present that clause of this contract to a court had read it in the fashion he did, he would be instantly reprimanded, he would lose his standing amongst his professional friends, and possibly he might be sent to prison. Now, I would not like to see such terrible things happen to my hon. friend. I think, however, he should explain this matter to his supporters on some future occasion, and candidly tell them that he won their applause in this particular respect under false pretenses. I put no emphasis and attach no malice to the word 'false.' According to the way the hon. gentleman read the contract you could not understand what kind of work the company were expected to carry on, nobody in the world could have any idea of it. It was open to any opinion, and I suppose my hon. friend wished that everybody should attach any meaning to it they liked. Now, I wish to read this clause of the contract :