

are actually carrying out. This is supposing that a number of boats come in and passengers are detained for a time before they are passed. The period may be half a day or more. My hon. friend will see how this will work out to the advantage of the transportation people. This is where they are detained in the immigration hall before they are passed on and examined and cleared. It suits the transportation company to get them out of the boat into the immigration hall because the boat may clear and proceed to another port. If we did not have this provision, we might hold the boat out in the stream until the passengers were cleared, so that this is not costing the transportation companies so much.

Mr. BOYS: The former section read:

The cost of his maintenance, while being detained at any immigrant station, as well as the cost of his return, shall be paid by such transportation company except as provided in section 19 of this act.

That was the old section. It is rather difficult just at a glance to appreciate the change. What is accomplished by the proposed section which repeals the former section?

Mr. ROBB: This will apply to cases where he is rejected. Section 44 reads:

Every immigrant, passenger, stowaway or other person brought to Canada by a transportation company and rejected by the board of inquiry or officer in charge, shall, if practicable, be sent back to the place whence he came, on the vessel, railway train or other vehicle by which he was brought to Canada.

When he comes in now, the liability dates from the time he arrives. Prior to this, the transportation company was not liable between the time he had arrived and the time he was rejected.

Mr. BOYS: The minister may be right. The language of the old section is:

The cost of his maintenance, while being detained at any immigrant station.

Again I ask: What does the new section provide which was not taken care of by the former section?

Mr. ROBB: It provides for the period between his arrival and his examination. The old section provided only for his expenses after rejection. This provides for his expenses prior to his rejection as well.

Mr. BOYS: I have read the minister the former section.

Mr. ROBB: If my hon. friend will read the first part of it.

Mr. BOYS: I will read the whole section:

Every immigrant, passenger, stowaway or other person brought to Canada by a transportation company and rejected by the board of inquiry or officer in charge, shall, if practicable, be sent back to the place whence he came, on the vessel, railway train or other vehicle by which he was brought to Canada. The cost of his maintenance while being detained—

Mr. ROBB: After rejection.

Mr. BOYS: What is the distinction?

Mr. ROBB: Now they will pay for him from the time he was landed to the time of rejection.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They will have to do that anyway in any case. The only distinction that I can see is that under the old act he had to be finally a rejected immigrant to come under this at all, but if he did come under it, then all the costs before rejection or after it, if there were any, must be paid. But if he never became a rejected immigrant, then under this change, the transportation companies have to pay the costs of detention during examination.

Mr. ROBB: No, they only paid after he was rejected. Prior to this they were not responsible.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the act as read by my hon. friend.

Mr. ROBB: That is the interpretation the officials have placed upon it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If they go home and look it over, they will see they are wrong. I see the difference and it is a difference right in line with the difference which the minister has enacted in the previous legislation about the sick people.

Mr. ROBB: Exactly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The difference imposes this extra obligation upon a transportation company. It says: You bring a man over. He is all right. We examine him through, for a while, to be sure that he is all right. We find that he is all right. Previously, you did not have to pay the expense during the examination; now you have to do so. In the name of common justice, why should they have to? It is penalizing the company for bringing in the right kind of people.

Mr. BOYS: Personally I appreciate very much the new method of explaining these amendments. They are most useful and without them I do not know that we could do as well as we are doing at present; we find the previous clause quoted and in some cases the amendments are outlined. That is very