

good graces of his party. As a matter of fact, a few days before I left Vancouver, in the month of January, Mr. Baer went to a solicitor and asked that a writ for his salary be issued against the Liberal organization committee of Vancouver.

An hon. MEMBER: They must be hard up.

Mr. STEVENS: The party funds are in bad shape. I am not here to cast any reflection upon Mr. Baer, but I want to tell the hon. member for Rouville that when he quotes Mr. W. W. Baer as an authority, he is quoting a gentleman who has been discarded by his own party, and one who, among those who know his record, has very little influence in the affairs of British Columbia. Mr. Baer is a man of considerable intelligence, but he entirely lacks balance; I will not say anything more at present with regard to him personally.

The hon. member for Rouville stated that Bhagwan Singh was deported in defiance of a writ of habeas corpus. No such thing occurred. Bhagwan Singh was deported quite properly. The writ of habeas corpus was never served, and, as a matter of fact, the writ was secured in Vancouver under, what I may term, misrepresentation—I shall read the judgment in a moment, which sets forth that fact—or, at least, through concealment of certain facts. The judge simply said to the registrar: 'You may advise whoever is concerned, by telegraph, that a writ has been issued.' A wireless was sent to Mr. Malcolm Reid, the immigration agent, stating that a writ had been issued. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you: Would you accept the service of a serious writ, which would interfere with the discharge of your duties, and which was conveyed to you in a wireless message? Any one might forge a name on a telegram; any irresponsible person might file a telegram stating that a certain writ had been issued, but that is not service of a writ. The writ was never served upon Mr. Malcolm Reid. I will read the last judgment rendered in this case. Hon. gentlemen opposite have read certain judgments that have been handed down, and my hon. friend from Rouville quoted a judgment given in the province of Quebec, which had nothing to do with the case at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I quoted it in reference to the question of habeas corpus.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend quoted a judgment in reference to the Thaw case in the province of Quebec, but that had

[Mr. Stevens.]

nothing whatever to do with the British Columbia case. The hon. member for Edmonton, on the other hand, quoted the Thaw case as an illustration of what the Government might have done in the Bhagwan Singh case, so there is a great difference of opinion between these two hon. gentlemen.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What I stated was, that I would like to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice were he in the House.

Mr. STEVENS: The judgment of the Chief Justice of Quebec had no bearing on the Bhagwan Singh case whatever.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I beg your pardon.

Mr. STEVENS: I have here the decision of Mr. Justice Morrison and I shall read portions of it. The learned judge says:

The incident referred to in the material filed, that I was interrupted in my sittings at the Vancouver Criminal Assize by a solicitor on the applicants' behalf for the purpose of instructing the registrar to forward a message to Mr. Reid that the writ had been issued, cannot I submit in any way be taken as a confirmation of my previous order. I merely told the registrar that if a writ had in fact been issued I saw no reason why he should not state that fact in a telegram to whomsoever might be interested in that occurrence. Considerable stress was laid in the affidavits filed on behalf of Bhagwan Singh upon the alleged contumely displayed by Mr. Reid when told of the proceedings leading to the issue of the writ and which allegations are derived by him. As to that phase of this matter all I have to say is that Mr. Reid is a responsible officer of a great department of Government and doubtless the minister in charge of that department will take proper cognizance of this incident if founded on facts. Under all circumstances I do not think I am called upon to display any undue sensitiveness concerning it. The dignity of the court in such cases usually takes care of itself. The order of the 7th October, 1913, upon which is based the writ of the 19th November, 1913, is therefore set aside.

My hon. friend from Rouville condemned Mr. Malcolm Reid in most unmeasured terms for his action in this case, but I can tell the hon. member that in my estimation, and in the estimation of every man who has given this matter any thought and who knows the facts, Mr. Malcolm Reid acted as it was his duty to act; he did not take a single step without having good reason for his action. The difficulty is that the Hindus have got into the habit of going to our courts whenever any little minor dispute arises.

Let me remind hon. gentlemen opposite that last year upwards of 4,000 people were deported from Canada to the British Isles, and of that number I do not think one single case was appealed to the courts. On the other hand, on the Pacific