

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not. I know the ostensible purpose is to exclude these people, but if they get past the gates they can still be dealt with under this clause as immigrants. These are the prohibited classes:

Those who disbelieve in or are opposed to organized government.

That phrase is too broad because, in practice, it may very easily be interpreted to mean those who are opposed to some particular organized government. We have heard all sorts of governments proposed. We even advocate in this House certain changes of government. If a man is an alien and advocates some government that is not familiar in this country, he may come under this section. The same is true of the other phrase:

Those who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property.

No one would reprobate more than I would the unlawful destruction of property or any destruction of property, but this phrase may be and has been very broadly interpreted. If during an industrial dispute a striker might advocate the leaving of the pumps and the safety of mines be threatened, he might be said to be teaching the unlawful destruction of property, because his action might result in certain losses to property. That is the line of interpretation which was actually taken in one case in Canada. That is the danger in this legislation as has been pointed out by the Trades and Labour Council of Canada and their legal adviser. I would suggest that if we are to have sections of this character in the act, they ought to be more definitely phrased. This section, so loosely drawn, lends itself to broad interpretations under which almost anyone might be convicted. Paragraph (o) reads:

Persons who are members of or affiliated with any organization entertaining or teaching disbelief in or opposition to organized government. . . .

And so on. That is the same style of phrase, and it may very easily be interpreted as meaning those who are dissatisfied with the particular kind of government which prevails at the present time. The viciousness of the legislation in my judgment, lies in the fact that anyone who is suspected of doing this kind of thing, if he is an immigrant—and I may say with regard to paragraph (n) or (o), whether he is an alien immigrant or a British-born immigrant, because there is no limitation—is declared to belong to the prohibited classes. Although he may have gotten past the immigration gates, he still belongs to those prohibited classes. We are told in the introductory paragraph that anybody who be-

longs to those prohibited classes is not allowed to establish domicile in Canada. This means that any of those people who are suspected of acting or thinking along these lines may be deprived of the right to trial by jury.

I agree with the objects aimed at in this legislation, that we ought to keep out of this country undesirables. But I believe, when a man comes into this country, when he lives for a time here, when he commits or is suspected of committing a crime against the country, his trial ought to be, not a mere departmental inquiry, but a trial before a judge and jury. We owe him that. Our general conviction is that every man in this country ought to have a fair trial, and I would urge that the minister consider the advisability of so redrafting this legislation as to ensure to every man in Canada a fair trial and not merely a departmental inquiry.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not think there is anybody in this House who is not desirous that people of undesirable character should be kept out; but I would urge upon the minister that it is un-British, un-Canadian and unfair to turn a man out of this country because he may have a common repute of being undesirable. It would be so easy for some unpopular person among a certain class to be condemned because people who do not like him said that he came under one of those undesirable classes. That a man should be liable to deportation, whether he is an alien or a British subject just because he is suspected of entertaining certain undesirable beliefs, surely is very far from the ideals of justice and fair play. I feel that if we pass any law which does not measure up to the ideals of fairness and justice which we all should hold, we only lower the law, and the appreciation of the law, in the minds of the people. I believe that the legislation should be modified along these lines. I do not condone these offences nor do I desire the people entertaining these views to have asylum in our country; but they should not be kept out, nor should they be turned out if they do get in, simply because by common repute they hold certain views and because they may be suspected by some one or other of harbouring undesirable doctrines.

Mr. ROBB: The laws of this country are enacted for the protection of the Canadian people, and there is no hardship in any respect in this legislation nor has any hardship been caused hitherto to the people of the classes referred to. Let me read the law to hon. gentlemen who I am sure will agree that no hardship is imposed upon any of the people