

fications; reject him if he is in any way attempting illegally to enter Canada. There is no ground whatever in that message for making any charge of collusion.

Here is a letter from the superintendent of immigration, dated March 17, 1913:

I understand from Mr. Watts and two representatives of the Photo-Engraver's Union that they are to have an interview with you this afternoon at five o'clock, and in order that you may know what action has already been taken I quote herewith a letter which was to-day addressed to Mr. Nunn, secretary of the Toronto Photo-Engraver's Union:—

I am in receipt of your night lettergram of the 15th instant and have discussed with the Hon. Mr. Crothers, acting Minister of the Interior, the contents of your similar message addressed to him, and have wired the Dominion immigration agents at Halifax and at St. John the following rush message:—

Reported here that photo-engravers are entering Canada giving other than their correct occupations. Question closely all immigrants destined Montreal and Toronto and if any found to be photo-engravers reject if that action can be legally taken.

I trust that these instructions will prevent the entry of further numbers by misrepresentation, and should any cases be brought to the department's attention where the party in question secured entry through misrepresentation, an investigation will be at once commenced, and if it is found that the party gained entry through misrepresentation, deportation proceedings will be commenced.

Your obedient servant,

W. D. Scott.

Superintendent of Immigration.

As a matter of fact, several were actually deported, I think three. My hon. friend called attention to the fact that no Order in Council had been passed under section 38 of the Act. I am advised that no Order in Council has been passed under section 38 at any time. It occurs to me that it is very doubtful whether that section of the Act is applicable to a case of this kind and it is the only section under which they could be excluded. My hon. friend complained that there was no board of inquiry. Although the Immigration Act has been in force for a good many years and was administered by the hon. member from Edmonton for a number of years, I am advised by the superintendent of immigration that no board of inquiry has ever been appointed anywhere in Canada to make such investigation, but that the immigration officer has acted under section 33. The Act provides that where there is no board of inquiry, and there was none at or near Halifax, the immigration agent himself, or the officer in charge, has the same power as a board of inquiry; so that the immigration officer in this case, acting instead of a board, was simply doing what has been practised ever since the Act was passed. Mr. Barnstead, immigration officer at Halifax, who had

charge of this matter, was appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have never heard a complaint against his capacity for the office or against his integrity in filling it. This whole matter has been dealt with by the regular officers of the department, every one of whom was appointed by our hon. friends opposite and they have been instructed to strictly obey the law. Would my hon. friend suggest that these officers or any of them should be dismissed because they did not discharge their duty in this respect?

Mr. CARROLL: I made no charge against the officer. I complained that the department did not give him legal advice, so that his forms would be drawn in such a manner as to comply with the Act and could not be set aside.

Mr. CROTHERS: I know that my hon. friend did not find fault with the officer; that was not his object, it was to find fault with somebody else. He is not so particular whether the officer did his duty or not if he can only find some ground of complaint against the minister. If there was any fault it was in the officers of the department who were appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite and if they are prepared to take the position that any officer of this department has been guilty of wrong doing and desire to have him dismissed, that would be a remedy worthy of consideration.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the minister think that all officers of the immigration service should be qualified to draft warrants as they would be prepared or orders for deportation as they would be drafted by a legal gentleman? It was this lack in the forms which gave the judge jurisdiction to try the case.

Mr. CROTHERS: I thought I was safe in assuming that an officer appointed by our hon. friends opposite to such an important post as Halifax knew sufficient to enable him to discharge the duties of his office, one of these duties being to prepare papers in a case of this kind. When the habeas corpus proceedings were started he had the services of a lawyer, I understand a good lawyer in the city of Halifax, to assist him in doing the proper thing under the circumstances.

I was saying that the only correspondence we had with any employers interested in this matter was a letter written on March 18, to Grip, Limited, 48 Temperance street, Toronto, and I have been advised by some of these men that this company were acting not only for themselves but for other companies interested. The letter is as follows:

Ottawa, 18th March, 1913.

Sirs,—It has been brought to the attention of the department that, owing to a strike of