

Mr. WATTERS.—It is to protect her when she lands at the wharf, from the most subtle work of the white slaver. That should be taken up under the control of the Government. The recommendation further says:—

‘That suitable homes or hostels should be provided in all principal cities to receive such immigrants under the charge of a matron and doctor, and that provision and supervision of employment should be made by Government authorities.

‘Your Committee has further discussed the question of child immigration, and has evidence submitted to it by Mrs. Henderson of Montreal.’

Mr. ROBERTSON.—She is the lady who told about some hundred girls starving in Montreal and refused to give their names.

Mr. WATTERS.—She may have had good reason for that. The recommendation continues:—

‘The Committee is of the opinion that owing to the increasing frequency of industrial accidents, an ever increasing number of orphaned children are thrown upon the world and that as the children’s aid societies and similar agencies in the Dominion already have on their hands large numbers of such children, for whom no adequate provision is made, that the executive Committee should be instructed to oppose the immigration to this country of unprotected and orphan children of tender years.’

There is one other matter we have here in concrete form. Perhaps you will remember that in a dispute between the photo engravers in the City of Toronto and their employers the companies imported photo engravers from England. Some of them escaped the immigration officers at Halifax, others were deported. Habaes Corpus proceedings were instituted in the case of two or three immigrants and they were allowed to go to Toronto, based on the Judgment of Mr. Justice Graham. The memorandum of the case furnished to me reads as follows:—

IMMIGRATION ACT.

RE WALSH, COLLIER AND FILSELL. (GRAHAM, J.)

Memorandum.

The order for rejection of those immigrants gave as a cause “lack of funds.”

The fact of their having the requisite amount of money was not disputed.

The contention of the ‘officer in charge’ was that the money in the possession of each immigrant was not ‘absolutely’ the immigrant’s. They were under contract to work for a Toronto company. It appeared that the employer had supplied each with this sum of \$25.

The question was for what purpose it was supplied?

From declarations in the hands of the Government it appeared that the money was advanced by the employer simply to enable the immigrants to pass the immigration officer. The drafts, in other cases, had been taken from the immigrants by the employer after they had served the purpose of securing admission to Canada.

The learned judge was good enough to volunteer an explanation that there was apparently no evidence to justify it. According to him the money was supplied by the employer ‘no doubt as an advance or loan to be paid out of their wages when they reached Toronto. It is not to be returned to the employer, but worked out.’

Where was the evidence of that? If that had been the case, no doubt the employer would have made it so clear as to leave no room for doubt. He did not do so, but the