

visions of this section the person, partnership, company or corporation guilty thereof shall be liable to the same penalties as are provided in respect of a violation of any of the provisions of section 1 of said Act of 1897 as amended, which penalties shall be recoverable in the same manner as are the penalties mentioned in the said section 1 as amended.

The change promised by the hon. Secretary of State is only on the question of the minister being replaced by the Governor in Council.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—There are some other minor changes.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—That is the only change the hon. gentleman referred to.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—The House is free to move other amendments.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Yes; and the minister is free to change his views as he pleases.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—With the consent of the House.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I suppose so, but he probably got that consent beforehand.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—Did the hon. gentleman give his consent?

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—No; before giving my consent I want to know what the amendments will be, and how the Bill will come out of committee. When it is reported from committee it will be time enough to say whether we shall approve or disapprove of the changes to be made in committee. I shall be free to take my position then. There are others who may have taken their position before. They have assembled in committee, and helped to bring the government out of the bad position in which they find themselves.

Hon. Mr. BAKER—All before three o'clock to-day?

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I do not know. I suppose we are at liberty to discuss all those amendments. What I want to find out is this: the hon. Secretary of State mentioned only one change in that clause—

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I did not want to detain the House; that is the reason.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Now we are told there are other changes.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Yes; and in other clauses.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—In fact, it is a new Bill.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I suppose the preamble will remain as it is, but even the title may be changed yet. It is a radical change in the Bill we are now asked to adopt, and the motion made by my hon. friend cannot touch that principle before we go into committee. His motion is directed against the principle of the Bill as presented to the House. If his motion is lost, then, when we go into committee, we may make what alterations we like, and at the third reading, if the Bill as reported from the committee, does not meet the wishes and views of the hon. gentleman, he can move the six months' hoist.

Hon. Mr. KERR (Toronto)—Hon. gentlemen will see that there are provisions in this Bill which are not controversial, provisions for the protection of the country, which it is important should be passed, and passed without delay. Take clause 7 and the following clauses. The law has been found to be defective, and not to give sufficient power to the government to protect the country from the introduction of the class of persons mentioned there. For the protection of the country, clauses 7, 8 and 9 are immediately pressing and urgent. Therefore, it will be seen there are provisions in the Bill which ought to be dealt with. As to the other provisions of the Bill, which are controversial, it is intended to suggest something which may be acceptable. If it is acceptable, well and good; if it is not, the House is open to express its opinion about the matter. Under the circumstances, I think we would be doing our duty by passing into committee and learning what the position of the Bill will be.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—This applies essentially to immigration. I want to know are not some of these matters provided for in the Immigration Act?

Hon. Mr. KERR (Toronto)—They are not.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—Are they entirely new?

Hon. Mr. KERR (Toronto)—They are practically all new.

Hon. Mr. DeBOUCHERVILLE—We must not forget that the hon. senator who pro-