

This exists with us as a grievance, not only with reference to labour generally, but also in connection with the railway employees, as referred to by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. MacLaren). Our Canadians are sent back from Buffalo unless they move their families over and become citizens. They cannot go over there and work and still live in Canada, while men come over every day from Buffalo to get work that should be given to the Canadian people. Surely, if the law is worth putting on the Statute-book, it is worth carrying out. Take a little village like Fort Erie, where I do not believe they have a single lawyer—somebody should be there to look after the matter and see that the law is enforced. I have never asked the Minister of Justice to take action in this regard, because I never felt that there was any need of it—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCLEARY. I never felt there was any need of it, so far as I was concerned. I fully expected that the law would be enforced just as other laws are enforced by officials appointed for that purpose. It should not be incumbent upon the representatives of the people to see to the enforcement of such a law as this, it should be enforced in its entirety without the need of action on our part. I trust that the discussion brought on by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) will be productive of good, and that the Government will see that it is their duty to carry out the law properly and effectively.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the representative of the Attorney General, whom I am pleased to see in his place, to inform the House how many prosecutions have taken place under the Act that was placed on the Statute-book last year. It is well known we have read it in the papers, that Canadians have been daily deported from the United States, though it may not take place where the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan) resides. Even Canadian nurses in the hospitals over in the United States, during the past year, have been deported from that country. We know also that many cases have happened in Canada where Americans were brought in to take the place of Canadians, concerning which complaints have been long and loud in the press, but no heed has been taken to them, so far as I know, by the Attorney General, or any other person for him. For some years I have had something to do with drawing the attention of the House and country to this matter, and two sessions ago I received a promise that at the ensuing session I would have an opportunity of introducing a Bill, and that such Bill would be passed word for word like the American Bill. We all know that when the session was called together, another Bill was put in ahead of mine on the Order paper; it was read and referred to a sub-committee of

the House, which was controlled by the Government having a majority on that committee. They reported the Bill to the House, a Bill that I did not agree to, because I said then, as I say now, that it was practically unworkable. It was not what the Prime Minister promised this country, a copy of the American Bill. I have introduced this year, and I hope to reach it next Monday night, a copy of the American Bill, word for word, containing some eighteen clauses, a duplicate of all the American laws. The first Bill that was introduced was the American law then, which has, however, been amended by two or three Bills since. These amendments I have consolidated in the Bill which is now on the Order Paper. I have here a copy of the American Acts, which was sent to the manager of the Canada Carriage Company, at Brockville, who wrote to the Treasury Department at Washington to know whether, if they established a factory on the American side of the river and employed American labour to run it there, it would be lawful for them to send their superintendent over the river from Brockville one day in the week, or occasionally, to superintend the work there. This is the reply they received from the Treasury Department at Washington :

I am in receipt of your communication of the 23rd instant, addressed to the Honourable the Secretary of the Treasury, in which you state your firm is considering the matter of establishing a branch in Morristown, a small place directly opposite Brockville, in the United States, and requesting to be advised whether it would be in violation of our laws for the department to accord you the privilege of sending at certain times your superintendent and foreman, and occasionally some skilled workmen across the river daily to perform service in this country.

In reply, I call your attention to the Acts approved February 26, 1885, February 23, 1887, and March 3, 1891, inclosed herewith, from which it appears that this department cannot grant the privilege desired, and that the action as contemplated by you, if carried out, would be in violation of the law.

They inclosed copy of the Act of February 26th, 1885. The Act on the Statute-book in Canada is simply a copy of that Act, but it was amended so as to make it unworkable except by the action of the Attorney General. Then the Americans amended their Act in 1887, and again in 1891. The Act now on the Canadian statutes does not include the amendment of 1887, nor the amendments of 1891, copies of which I hold in my hand. Upon reading them it will be seen that a Canadian cannot possibly go over there to work, as the letter from the department says it would be a violation of the law; but there is nothing in the Canadian law to prevent an American from coming over here to work. The hon. member for Essex says that they do come, because they have reciprocity up there where he lives. Last year the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries took a very active part when the Bill was before the Committee, having it