

in the Immigration Act, have taken action. He need not wait for the reeve or clerk of the municipality to send him a complaint. The complaint was before him, full particulars were before him, and he has calmly sat with that knowledge before him since the 19th of March last and has done nothing. And that is what the men complain of. Now, they ask for investigation into the case of these four men in Toronto, they ask for the deportation of these four men, if the affidavits read are true, it is beyond question that these men have been brought to Canada in violation of the Immigration Act; and unless some prosecution follows and these men are deported, it is just a case on all-fours with the Murray case. I do not believe the Government will permit prosecution of these employers who have been guilty of breaking the immigration law. Certainly, they stopped prosecution in the Murray case, and they have encouraged this kind of thing in the case of the photo-engravers whose case is under consideration. The charge is not against the officers of the department—mark that. I want the minister to understand that the charge is one of laxity on the part of the Minister of Labour—that is what these men complain of. I know the minister is a very busy man, I know that it is very difficult to manage two important departments such as he has charge of at the present time, if he has not proper assistance, let him get proper assistance; but let me impress upon him that so long as he is Minister of Labour his first duty and paramount is to look after the interests of labour. The hon. gentleman was in Guelph last September, addressing the labour congress, hearing all the resolutions which these labour representatives had to propose, hearing their speeches, consulting with them and knowing the requests they had to make; but up to the present moment, he has not moved a hand to comply with any of those requests, so far as I am aware. And let me tell the hon. gentleman, and tell him plainly, that there is a good deal of talk in connection with that matter; it is said that the only definite action he has taken was when in Montreal he stated that he had not much use for labour unions—a statement which he afterwards denied in this House. But he can easily see the importance of the matter under discussion, I do not care what may be the cause of a strike; granted there is difficulty between a union and an employer and a strike follows, what protection has the union if the employers are permitted to break the very clauses of the immigration laws which were put in for the protection of labour unions and to bring people in from other countries, men who take the places of Canadian union men out on strike? In such a case the protection of the

Mr. GUTHRIE.

men is gone. If we do not support the provisions of our immigration laws in regard to labour to the very letter, you might as well wipe them from the statute-book. The Toronto union in this case request that an investigation be held at once in regard to the men now resident in Toronto who they allege, have been brought into Canada in breach of the Immigration Act. If it be found that a breach of the law has taken place, a prosecution should follow in order that the Murray case may not be repeated. It may be that later on in the session, the Murray case will be brought up too. And, further than that, the men illegally or improperly in the city of Toronto working as photo-engravers should not be there, but should be deported. I hope that after this discussion the minister will see his way to taking immediate action in this matter.

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE (Maison-neuve, Montreal): I have listened to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) who has said something with regard to assisted immigration. If I understand the immigration law, surely, when an immigrant is handed money before coming into the country in order that he may have an amount to qualify him for entry under terms of that law, that is assisted immigration. And surely if assisted immigration is not permitted in this country, this should not be permitted. This is not the first time that such immigration has been brought in. For the benefit of the Minister of Labour, I may tell him that in 1910, about twelve or fifteen bricklayers were imported into Montreal under similar circumstances to those which have been described here to-day. But these men were held at Quebec and two of them were deported because they had not the necessary \$25 in their pockets. Of course, there was a strike at that time. I am not speaking so much of the misrepresentation as of the injury that is done to Canadian workmen by these immigrants being handed money to come into Canada at a time when a strike is on. The members of the Manufacturers' Association are great friends of the Minister of Labour and they will always see to it that men are brought at the time of a strike and also that those men have the necessary amount of money to fulfill the requirements of the law. After what has been brought before the Minister of Labour and the Government, the coming in of immigrants under these circumstances should be prevented and those who are in Toronto in violation of the immigration laws should be deported.

Motion (Mr. Carroll) for adjournment of the House, negatived.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.