

ports in Canada. I would just like to give the language used:

A bond for \$105,000 has been deposited with the department (by the British Empire Steel Corporation), this bond to cover 105 Chinese.

I want to call particular attention to this:

These Chinese are regarded as non-immigrants, and the bond deposited by the British Empire Steel Corporation will be retained until the department is satisfied that all of the Chinese covered by the same have been checked out of Canada.

Checked out of Canada; I wish to call particular attention to those words. Again, in answer to further questions by myself on the 28th of May we were informed:

It must be remembered that in none of the cases referred to were these Chinese admitted to Canada within the meaning of the Immigration Act, but were simply allowed to come into Canada temporarily.

You will note the peculiar and invidious situation. These men are not in Canada, and yet when they leave they have to be checked out, and there is a heavy bond put up to ensure their being checked out. They are in, and yet they are not in.

Scientists tell us in their lighter moments that they like to dream or think of a phase of existence which contains four dimensions, as compared with three dimensions of this present life. Some scientists think the world to which we will go after death is one of four dimensions. One can readily conceive it would need to be of different dimensions to the one in which we are functioning now to have these Chinamen or anybody else at one and the same time in Canada and yet out of it. They can hardly be in both situations at once, and yet that is precisely the condition indicated by the answers to the questions I have quoted.

The boats on which these Chinamen are employed run between five ports in Canada: Sydney, Halifax, Montreal, Louisburg and St. John. They are all Canadian ports, and the boats are continually in Canadian waters. These Chinamen are not employed for a day or two, but possibly for years. They are permanent employees on these boats, Canadian boats trading in Canadian waters, and, as I maintain, their admission into Canada was perfectly illegal. The only justification given by the department, and surely it is the laimest of justifications in this case, is the good old-fashioned one of precedent. They say—I will quote the answer to one question:

There is nothing in the Immigration Act or in the regulations in the Chinese Immigration Act which applies in a case of this kind.

And yet they were allowed in? Because it has been done before. Precedent! Now, although I am not particularly fond of pre-

cedent when it stands in the way of reform, yet there are occasions when precedent can be applicably cited—in logic, or reasoning, legal decisions, or even, perhaps, acts of legislation. In these cases it is, perhaps, applicable to quote precedent; but when it comes down to quoting precedent as a justification for an illegal action, then I think precedent falls to the ground and falls very hard. One cannot conceive that an illegal act can be justified in any way whatever by saying that it has been done before. If we are going to adhere to that principle all that criminals have got to do when they are prosecuted is to say "Yes, I robbed the bank but banks have been robbed before and therefore we have a precedent." That is an exact comparison with the condition in this case. I do not think there was ever a case where justification, on the plea of precedent, falls flatter than it does in this case.

There is another reason that makes it even worse than what it appears. It is said, and said truly no doubt, that Chinamen were admitted before under similar conditions during the war, and various cases that occurred between 1914 and 1921 are cited in which Chinamen were admitted. But there are two conditions which must be considered in that regard and which absolutely dissipate the idea that there is any force to the argument that Chinamen were brought in before. The first is this: Chinamen were allowed in during the war, and the expression "during the war" can be used to justify and explain a great many things. However, the war is not in progress now. But there is a still further reason. During the war the admission of Chinamen was legal on condition of paying a \$500 poll tax. To-day it is not legal under any circumstances whatever either with or without the payment of a poll tax. But prior to 1923 the only thing that might have happened would have been the loss by the government of \$500 per head unless a bond was given and it was provided that the employers would be responsible for this bond. If this were done one could well conceive that for that time at any rate no great harm could be done by allowing those Chinamen to come in. But that condition no longer exists. It is not legal now to bring in Chinamen by paying \$500 or any other sum, and to say that a bond was given is no justification. I do not care if I give a bond for a million dollars; it is no justification for my robbing a bank. And when it is said in this case that a bond was put up I reply that there is nothing whatever in the act which justifies the putting up of a bond.