

views on the part of hon. gentlemen, but I wish to see the work of the session gone on with.

The CHAIRMAN: Rule 13, section 5, says:

Speeches in committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

The general principle of the bill may not be debated upon a section. In my opinion the point of order raised by the hon. member (Mr. Neill) is well taken.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Under what circumstances would the transportation company be compelled to return members of a family?

Mr. ROBB: Where one member of a family is suffering deportation it might work a hardship to send that one member of the family back without the others—a younger child, for instance. It may be extremely desirable that that person be deported—it may be a case of tuberculosis, trachoma or something against which we wish to protect our people. We are going to ask the transportation companies to see to it before these people embark for Canada that they are a fairly healthy family, and if they are not the company is to take all the family back.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Permit to enter Canada or to remain therein.

Mr. NEILL: I have two or three small amendments to submit to this section. I suggest to the minister that the word "legally" be inserted after the words "or having" in the fourth line on page 2. That is to ensure that the man will have landed legally in the first place.

Mr. ROBB: I would point out that the definition of "landed," as set out in clause 2 of the act, is as follows:

"Land," "landed" or "landing," as applied to passengers or immigrants, means their lawful admission into Canada by an officer under this act, otherwise than for inspection or treatment or other temporary purpose provided for by this act.

So my hon. friend's amendment is quite unnecessary.

Mr. NEILL: If that is the interpretation of the word "landed" I will omit that amendment. I suggest also two other amendments: First, that after the word "only" in line 8 the words "not exceeding six months" be inserted, so that it will read:

Such permit shall be in the form A of the schedule to this act, and shall be expressed to be in force for a specified period only, not exceeding six months.

That is to put some reasonable limit to the operation of these permits, which are of a very loose character in any case. The third amendment I suggest is that section 3 be amended by adding at the end thereof the following words:

A return of all such permits, with particulars and reasons therefor, issued during the year shall be made by the minister to parliament within ten days of its meeting.

That is simply to follow the example that we have in a great many other acts, where exemptions applied in the discretion of the minister shall be given the necessary publicity by their reference to parliament at the next ensuing session. I presume that these amendments will have to be put singly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: With regard to my hon. friend's amendment limiting the period of the permit to six months, I would point out that the six months' period, according to the section, may at any time be extended by the minister in writing. In order to attain the object my hon. friend has in mind he will have to put the words "not exceeding six months" after the word "writing."

Mr. NEILL: I will ask that that change be made.

Mr. ROBB: The commissioner points out that when you give a man a permit you lift him out of the immigrant class, so that the period whereby he may acquire domicile does not count while the permit is in force. That is the reason for the permit.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What does the minister say about the six months?

Mr. ROBB: I do not see why we should be limited to that. I think we can trust the government of the day to administer it fairly. I would rather my hon. friend would not press the amendment.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My experience has been that the permit system is rather a good one. In the cases in which permits have been granted in the county in which I reside they have been granted, I think, for a year. I know one or two cases where, after a year, an inspector of the department has come to the city of Guelph, made full inquiries, found the probationer has done well, and has allowed him to remain. I think the minister should be given discretion to grant a permit for as long as he desires. It only applies to doubtful cases, and if a man has made good, and the permit is only for a year, as they are now being granted, I see no reason why the immigrant should not be permitted to remain.