

*Immigration Act*

lighted to take part. Now when a case of the sort mentioned in the bill occurs the opposite takes place, and the party not only is not welcomed but is met at the border by an immigration officer in brass buttons and told that he cannot come into this country at all. It does seem to me that the fact that he has lived ten years in Canada ought to be sufficient proof that he is fit to be in this country, and I do suggest that some attention be given by the Immigration department to the question. We are getting no immigrants at all at the present time. I am not prepared to say whether that is a good or bad policy on the part of the government. This is not the time to discuss that question; we shall probably have an opportunity to take it up later. But, as I said before, I agree with this part of the bill: that is, to keep out the prostitutes, the pimps and the drug addicts and to allow in those people who had lived here for ten years but who went away in an honourable effort to improve their position. A distinction ought to be made, and I am sorry the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has not made that distinction. The sheep ought to be separated from the goats; I am for the sheep every time, but as for the goats I am not going to take up the cudgels on their behalf.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Immigration--

Mr. SPEAKER: In accordance with the rules of the house, if the hon. member speaks now he will close the debate.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have not spoken as yet.

Mr. RHODES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order may I point out that technically the hon. member has spoken inasmuch as he moved the second reading of the bill through the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps).

Mr. JACOBS: By the unanimous consent of the house I think we ought to hear the hon. member.

Mr. STEVENS: Nobody is objecting to hearing him.

Mr. SPEAKER: The sponsor of the bill was represented and my first impression was that he had been spoken for, but I think in view of the fact that the hon. member for North Winnipeg has been substituted as the sponsor of the bill, it would be only fair to allow the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to speak in the ordinary course and not to close the debate.

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that no one is objecting to the hon. member speaking, and it would be entirely wrong to leave an impression on the records of the house that such objection had been taken.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, may I point out that I had some cases to present to the house and have not had the opportunity as yet of presenting them. My colleague was under the impression that if he did not take up this bill it would go to the foot of the list, and he therefore took the action he did; but I have not had the opportunity of saying one word upon my bill.

Mr. RHODES: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order: I rose merely for the purpose of seeing that there was a proper observance of the rules of the house. If my hon. friend were permitted to speak at this stage it would have the effect of altering the rules and permitting an hon. member to make three speeches on the second reading of a bill; he could make the first speech by proxy, then he could speak in his regular turn, and then again in reply.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Speaker, would you please give the rule under which it is suggested that we can make speeches for each other by proxy?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Will Your Honour rule as to when a man may speak in this house by proxy?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Mr. Speaker, had the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre been in his place he would have moved the second reading of this bill; as he was not in his place, the bill should have stood, but by courtesy another hon. member was allowed to move the second reading on his behalf. We all want to hear the sponsor of this bill address the house, but we must recognize that we have rules and if they are to be broken I do not know where we will land.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Minister of Justice (Mr. Guthrie) be a little more explicit as to his idea of how the rules are being broken?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The bill would not have been read the second time in the absence of its sponsor, but by courtesy we allowed another hon. member to act for him. That member then takes the place of the mover, otherwise the bill would not have been before the house on this occasion.