

the proceeds of prostitution, and so forth. We want to keep this country clean. If there is anything of that kind going on, we have, I suppose, to maintain laws for the purpose of seeing that it shall be restricted to our own naturalised or native-born Canadians. We should not in this respect have free trade with the rest of the world.

There are, however, a number of cases in which, in my opinion, the Immigration department should not enforce such harsh rules as they are doing at the present time. I have customs cases in mind. For instance, a man will be arrested for having contravened the Customs Act; he is sent to gaol and immediately upon his release he is ordered deported. Well, under our system of civilization as at present constituted, we do not look upon customs offenders as criminals of the most hardened type. Nelson's rule applies to-day as well as at the time of the battle of Trafalgar: "England expects every man to do the duty". And when you get people who are not accustomed to our laws, people who are not brought up to them in the way we have been, a little lapse from "duty" sometimes ought to be overlooked by the department in its Christian charity. I have in mind a case of that kind where a man, after serving a short time in prison, was released. In fact, he was considered to be an offender in whose favour there was something to be said, and he was released before the time fixed by the court. Upon his release he was forthwith sent back to Czechoslovakia or Austria, the country of his birth. I do not think that man did any worse than many Canadian citizens have done. I do not say we ought to indulge in the habit of "doing" the customs, but there are numbers of people, respectable members of society, who do; and yet they are not looked upon as criminals.

With regard to insane cases, I am against any law which would permit our already overcrowded asylums to receive more people. We have a sufficient number of insane, of imbeciles and idiots and others of that kind in this country for the necessities of our population, and if we have not, we can grow them here. But to hold out the hand of fellowship to an insane person is going a little too far, and I am strongly against letting down the bars in cases of that sort. I know that in many cases insane people have been permitted to come here—cases in which it would be a great hardship to deport them afterwards, the entire family may be already resident in this country when one of them develops insanity. It would be a very harsh thing to deport that person, probably a child of tender years, ne-

cessitating the return of the mother with it. It would break up the family. In cases of that kind where representations are made to the department and a bond is given that the person concerned will not become a public charge and that the cost of maintenance of that insane person will be met by the family, they are allowed to place the patient in an asylum and nothing more is heard of the matter. In that connection I may say that the Jewish Immigration Aid Society, the Federation of Jewish Charities of Montreal, Toronto and other cities, invariably, when cases of that kind occur, give the necessary bond to the department, and when that is done the department is prepared to see that the family shall not be broken up in the way I have indicated. I know of dozens of cases of that kind, and I can proudly say on behalf of my people that there is not a single case in the whole dominion which we have brought to the attention of the department where they did not concur in our request and allow the party to remain in Canada on our giving the necessary bond. Where the family could not provide the bond, the charitable societies I have mentioned have seen that it was done. So that we have no complaint against the department on that score; we have always received fair treatment from them. In many cases however they have not permitted persons whom I have considered proper immigrants to come into the country, because they did not wish to overload the quota with our people.

I should like to see some relief granted to those persons mentioned in paragraph 2 of the amendment. It does seem to me that the mere fact that a person who has lived in Canada ten years, goes to some other country and finds it not what its press agent said it was, should not prevent his coming back to Canada. In the first place that person has had the experience of ten years in this country, associating with the salt of the earth such as we are. That ought to be counted unto him for righteousness. He has been here ten years, knows something of the country, and has gone farther and fared worse. He would make the best sort of citizen and I think he should be allowed to come back. Yet the very fact that he has gone away, that he has committed the unpardonable sin of leaving Canada to see whether he could better his position elsewhere, puts him in the class that precludes his coming back. We have spent tens of thousands of dollars for the repatriating of large numbers of people resident in the New England states. Those people have come back and all kinds of celebrations have taken place to welcome the return of the prodigal; everyone was de-