

ness, by which men are held up to the tune of \$100 or \$150 to secure permits. This is a public scandal; it existed before the minister came into office, however, and I do not want him to think I am blaming him for this practice. It should stop, however, and if the minister coming into the department fresh, with the power he has with the men of his group, will merely say that this thing will stop, he will be doing a public service and will prevent this country from becoming a by-word in foreign countries whose nationals are compelled to pay this sum for a permit to enter the country. The regulations should be clear and impartial; they should be applied to one as to another; there should be no favouritism shown Jones which may not be shown Brown and everyone knows that is exactly opposite the present practice. Let him stop that practice and he will have done a great service in maintaining the reputation of Canada abroad and at home. If he will do that, and will deal with this other matter by giving instructions that men should not be so harassed, after having been Canadian citizens for eighteen years, because they want to bring some relative into the country, he will be doing another great service. I do not want to take up too much time of the House but I was under obligation to a great many people to take up this question, and I have done my duty as well and as briefly as I could.

Mr. CAHAN: Mr. Chairman, there is no department of government with the administration of which I am in less agreement than with that of the Department of Immigration. I had intended during this session to move that a committee of the House consider the whole matter of immigration, from the passing of the orders in council governing immigration, down to the administration of that department, but inasmuch as the session is short, and also since we have a new minister, after consulting with a number of members of the House it was agreed that it would be well to allow the new minister to have at least one year in which to investigate his department and to bring down a satisfactory explanation of the future policy of that department. I believe that next session a considerable number of members of this House will expect such a statement from the Minister of Immigration.

Mr. NEILL: I rise to endorse to a large extent the request of the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner), only I wish to define certain things which I would like the minister to emphasize. Together with the hon. member for Acadia I would like a de-

finite statement placed on Hansard for the information of the country; I have tried to get it privately, but have not succeeded. I would like to know what are the various assisted policies of the Department of Immigration. I am not concerned with those schemes which require or desire that immigrants should come here at their own charges. I am primarily concerned with the different schemes by which the public money is expended in helping people to come to this country, and I think it would be perfectly proper that this vote should not pass until a definite statement has been placed before the committee so that we may know what the policy of the department is. Beginning with the scheme for bringing out boys, we are entitled to know what is paid in connection with the scheme, who has the handling of these boys, and so on. A long statement is not needed, but only a brief summary of the cost and method in each case.

Then we come to coöperative societies like the Salvation Army. Next we have the scheme by which farm labourers are assisted to come out, and they are helped in some way that is somewhat shadowy. I find now that there is a subsidiary scheme, so to speak, by which the farm labourers are divided into two classes—the experienced farm labourer and the inexperienced farm labourer. I should like to get particularly what constitutes an “inexperienced farm labourer”, because if he is not just simply a common, ordinary labourer, I do not know what he is. If he has not had any experience of working on a farm, how can he be classified in connection with farm work? That is some sort of subterfuge adopted in order to bring practically unskilled labour into this country. Then there is the statement by which apparently the government lends itself—and yet we are told that it incurs no responsibility—to the scheme by which the railway companies advertise that they will bring out men and guarantee them employment in this country. Yet when an advertisement of that character is produced in this House and the matter is put up to the department, the department denies all responsibility. Now I want to know, and I think the House wants to know, what the scheme is in connection with railway companies, what their obligations are, and whether the department or this government does not at the same time incur some direct or indirect responsibility.

Then we have the scheme alluded to a few minutes ago, the empire settlement scheme,