

every reason to believe he was dealing with an alien in violation of the Alien Labour Act, and the man said that it was not proven that he knew it, and these words are added, —‘or having reasonable ground for believing that he was then an alien or foreigner.’

Hon. Sir GEORGE DRUMMOND—I think the change would make it a little more stringent in a prosecution at law.

Hon. Mr. KERR (Toronto)—No; less stringent.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—It is difficult to prove that the person actually knew, and in all cases of that kind it is open to the prosecution to prove, that the party against whom the complaint has been made had reasonable grounds for knowing.

Hon. Sir GEORGE DRUMMOND—And should have known.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—Is implied to have known, and the object of the clause is to substitute for the word knowingly, ‘knowing or having reasonable grounds for believing that he was then a foreigner.’

Hon. Sir GEORGE DRUMMOND—It seems to me the word knowingly in the original Act of 1897 is quite tight enough, and I should not like to be a party to any measure which would make it stronger. I therefore oppose this clause in the modified Bill, because I think it is quite enough to enact that if he does it knowingly he is liable.

Hon. Mr. DeBOUCHERVILLE—I move that the word ‘foreigner’ be struck out.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—I move that the word ‘alien’ be struck out and the word ‘foreigner’ left in.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The word ‘alien’ and the word ‘foreigner’ mean exactly the same thing.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Then why repeat the word?

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—I do not think they would mean exactly the same according to the way English people understand it.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Is there a difference between the two?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No; I think not.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Then the motion will carry?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Yes.

Hon. Mr. KERR (Toronto).

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Which will the hon. gentleman strike out?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The words ‘or foreigner.’

Hon. Sir GEORGE DRUMMOND—I move that the whole clause be struck out.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Section 3 of the Act of 1897—

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—That has been amended by chapter 13 of the Act of 1901. That is the controlling Act now. We are amending that Act by striking out the word ‘knowingly.’ A person may assist without knowing that he is assisting. He may not be guilty of the fault you are imputing to him if you strike out the word ‘knowingly.’ You replace that expression in the 8th line by the words ‘knowing or having reasonable grounds for believing.’ I do not find that this amendment will read properly. It means nothing at all the way it is stated.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Then it is harmless.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—If the amendment is carried it will read thus:

For every violation of any of the provisions of section 1 of this section, the person, partnership, company or corporation violating it by knowingly assisting in encouraging or soliciting immigration or importation of any alien or foreigner into Canada to perform service of any kind under contract or agreement expressed or implied, parole or special with such alien or foreigner previous to his becoming a resident or a citizen of Canada, &c.’

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—But what does ‘knowing’ apply to? Not to the guilty party, and I think the hon. minister wants to reach the guilty party. It does not apply at all.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I have no objection to allow that word to remain in, if that is going to carry the clause.

Hon. Mr. POWER—There is not much use in discussing the measure if there is no fixed policy.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The object is to get through with the Bill. If the hon. gentleman has any objection to striking out the word, I have no objection to allow it to remain in.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The question has not yet been put on the amendment which was