

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Are those discriminations made by Order in Council or by departmental instructions?—A. That is as to the dropping of certain countries?

Q. Yes?—A. Not by Order in Council; no.

Q. Would you please give us copies of the instructions in that respect?—A. Yes, I would be glad to. It was with the Canadian interests, the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway, that we worked out the proposition termed the non-preferred countries, not including Italy. Italy is not in the railway agreement. We are co-operating with the railways for the securing of emigrants for farm placement here, the undertaking of the railways being to recruit the suitable type, and place them at agricultural work in Canada.

Q. Would you please give us copies of the agreements which you have with the railways?—A. Yes, I would be glad to. I presume that the agreement for this year is quite sufficient?

Q. I suppose it is the same as last year?—A. No, it is not.

Q. Perhaps we might have both?—A. Yes. (*See Productions at page 732 post.*) This year's agreement with the railways is different in this respect, that the previous agreement allowed the railways to function for government in-as-far as type was concerned. The emigrants were recruited by them and not by any booking agent or anything of that kind. They, the Railways, appointed a man with Canadian experience responsible to the president of his railway for this particular work. So they were the Railway selection officers, and having selected a type they gave him a certificate which up to this year was a warrant without question that this man was of the physical type with the natural farming ability and experience to do farming in this country. This year that does not exist. He is recruited as yet by the railway representative in a particular country and brought forward and checked by our officer this year as to his suitability for that particular work here. That is the difference between last year's agreement and that of this year.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: One of the members of the committee mentioned medical examiners and asked if they were included in that organization. I do not know whether that comes in appropriately or not. I think you had better explain your organization with regard to medical inspection.

The WITNESS: I am afraid I have come entirely unprepared from the point of view of expounding in detail. I did not know what was required of me to-day, and I am afraid I have only covered the matter in a very very general way. If I may, I would suggest an open meeting; questions asked will bring you more details, after I have covered all this information, and perhaps give me some angles to start out on.

Mr. CAHAN: You are doing well.

The WITNESS: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: The railways are still bound to select the same type. Our officer looks them over.

The WITNESS: I thought, perhaps, I would leave that until we give them copies. That is what I had in the back of my mind when I was covering that. I have just gone over our organization as it exists as far as its far-flung points are concerned.

Mr. GERVAIS: Has the department an organization in the United States?

The WITNESS: Yes, I covered that in the earlier part of my talk. We have seventeen different agencies in the United States. This year more particularly; in fact, entirely as far as the medical examination is concerned, it all came about on account of the Empire Settlement assisted passage. We used over there the roster doctors, and the department of Health sent over two doctors to check the work of the roster doctors—in their medical examinations.