

here for ten years, cannot be deported to their country of origin. I do trust, and I feel, that this house will deal with all matters of immigration from a dispassionate, non-political standpoint; for I am afraid that probably in the past—and I am not charging any one political party or any one government—I am afraid that in the past there has been a tendency at times to forget the supreme importance of seeing that the population of this country is kept clean. That is the business of government. I may be charged with being too harsh in the enforcement of the law, but if we divest ourselves of the right to deport those who introduce themselves into Canada against our immigration law, then we have taken a step which, I am sure, we shall deeply regret.

Now, the first paragraph of the proposed amendment provides that immigrants who have completed ten years continuous residence in Canada shall not thereafter be liable to deportation. If this becomes law it would be impossible to deport the most undesirable aliens who succeeded in entering Canada illegally, provided they did not come under the notice of this department until after ten years continuous residence. For instance, a criminal who entered illegally and after five years residence was convicted of a serious crime involving a sentence of over five years, could not be deported if the proposed amendment becomes law, because part of his residence in Canada would be spent in a penitentiary. It may be that the sponsor of the bill did not foresee what might follow the adoption of this subsection, but it is obvious that that would be its effect. Under the act as it now stands such a person cannot acquire domicile irrespective of the period of residence in Canada, and therefore would be subject to deportation.

I believe that a further effect of this proposed amendment would be that aliens convicted of infractions of the Narcotic Drug Act could not be deported. Anyone who has had experience in dealing with cases under that act know very well with what facility addicts can hide their real condition, and they will succeed in doing so for years until the drug has made such inroads on them mentally and physically that their failing becomes apparent. From that angle again I submit that this bill should not pass in its present form, or in any other form which would take away from those charged with the administration of the law the right to deport people of that character. A large number of people who have been resident in Canada over ten years are deported from time to time to their country of origin by

reason of their contravention of the provisions of the Narcotic Drug Act. The adoption of this bill would divest us of the right to take such action. In a word, the proposed amendment wipes out one of the most important protective features of the act. Any addict who procured entry into Canada, and remained here for the time contemplated by the bill, could continue here and we would have no recourse.

I do not want to labour this point just now, I hope to take it up later in the session, but it is important that we should retain this right of deportation. No one likes the work of deporting people because they are mentally defective or for some other reason less than I do. It is not a pleasant task, as I am sure those who have preceded me in the administration of this department will readily admit.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Hear, hear.

Mr. GORDON: My hon. friend says, "hear, hear"; at least I can expect a good deal of sympathy from him. When we in this parliament exercise the right, which is vested in us under the British North America Act, of encouraging new people to come to Canada, we undertake a considerable responsibility. Let me make myself abundantly clear; we have attracted to this country splendid people of all races, people who will be an honour to Canada, and who to-day are an honour to this country. At the same time, however, I am afraid we have within our boundaries many people who, under a system of careful selection and a proper immigration policy, never would have been permitted to enter Canada.

When migrants become mental cases in Canada, who has to take care of them? The federal government does not take care of them; their care falls upon the municipalities and the provinces. The provinces have expended millions upon millions of dollars for the care of these people. The province of Ontario, with which I am most familiar, has invested some \$38,000,000 of capital and expenditure in institutions to take care of the sick and afflicted. A great burden is cast upon the people of that province by reason of the mental cases that have been induced to come to Canada by the federal government. Therefore I say when we come to consider an amendment which will have the effect of divesting us of our right to return to the country of origin those prohibited cases who come to Canada, we must consider adopting a course that may easily result in casting a further burden upon the provinces and muni-