

quarters and started on his way wherever he is going to establish himself in Canada. But if the transportation company who sold him his ticket have been negligent or careless to the degree that they have sold the ticket—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is the existing law.

Mr. ROBB: —we are placing the responsibility upon them.

Mr. BOYS: The minister has already told the committee that he had cases last year and the year before. I think he said \$2,000 odd and \$6,000 odd. In other words, where the company was negligent under the existing law, the company paid. Where the company was not negligent, that fact being established, I presume, after an inquiry, the department paid. Why did the department pay the \$2,000 odd and the \$6,000 odd which the minister referred to a moment ago? I presume it was because on inquiry it was found that the transportation company had not been guilty of negligence. If that be so, I would ask the minister on what ground he now undertakes to hold the transportation company liable if they are not guilty of any negligence, carelessness, or wrongdoing of any kind? For example, a passenger is admitted in perfectly good health. Perhaps during the voyage he develops disease. Why, under those circumstances, should the transportation company be held responsible. What has given rise to this change?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend has just touched the point. It is the diversion of steamship business that formerly would go to the port of New York where, for years, the transportation companies have been paying on this basis. Now, that they are coming to Canada, why should we put them in any better position than that in which they have been in the United States? They have been perfectly satisfied with that.

Mr. BOYS: It was considered proper before that the guiding principle should be one of negligence, and that appeals to me. If they are guilty of negligence, they ought to be responsible; but if they are not, it is hard to see how they should be held responsible, and I do not think it is a good argument to say that some other country treats them differently. The more burdens you impose upon them, the higher become the freight and passenger rates.

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. BOYS: What were the amounts that the department paid out?

Mr. ROBB: In 1922-23, the department paid \$6,795. In 1923-24, that was reduced to \$2,577, although there was more business. That shows that the transportation companies have been more careful and they will be still more careful if we put the whole responsibility upon them.

Mr. BOYS: Personally, I am with the minister in exerting every effort to make them careful. My sole point is that if they are not guilty of negligence, it is not fair to make them pay. As regards the \$6,795, no doubt in the first instance the transportation company was held to be guilty of negligence, and after an inquiry was made to find out whether it was guilty of negligence, it was found that it was not, and therefore the department paid. If so, why should this change take place? If any good reason is given for the change, I will accept it at once; but if no good reason is shown, it is unfair to any transportation company. It is simply placing upon the company a burden which it should not be asked to bear and in the end, with other burdens, it is increasing the cost of transportation, freight and passenger charges to the people of this country.

Mr. ROBB: May I repeat again that the total cost last year was less than 25 cents a head? Who has made any money in any way out of these people prior to the time when they have passed the medical examiner and entered on their way to Canada? I will answer that myself. The transportation company, as my hon. friend knows. Why then should the transportation company not be held responsible?

Mr. BOYS: In the first place, we are seeking immigration and we want the companies to assist us in getting immigration. If they in their assistance, do anything wrong, they should be held responsible; but if in co-operating with the department in securing immigrants, they do nothing wrong, on what proper basis can you hold the companies responsible? That is my point.

Mr. ROBB: We are paying a great deal of money to advertise the advantages of this country and that is of advantage to the transportation companies. Why should they not share up to this extent? Why should they put up a fight against this?

Mr. BOYS: They are doing more than paying their share. The minister's figures indicate that they paid \$60,000 where we paid \$6,000. I am not asking that they should not be called upon to pay their share so far as that