

from a minister of the Crown that the matter would be further prosecuted, but so far as my information goes not a thing has been done from that day to this.

Now comes the case of the photo-engravers. The Government since the beginning of the strike in February has been aware of all the facts. Mr. Nunn on the 12th of February communicated the facts to the immigration branch of the Department of the Interior. The department seems to have taken no action at all except to send a telegram to the port of entry notifying their agents that a strike was in progress and to pay particular attention to immigrants who might be photo-engravers. That, as a preliminary step, was perhaps proper enough but the matter should not have rested there. What the minister should have done was to take action under section 38 of the Immigration Act. The labour unions complain that notwithstanding the minister had all the facts before him in detail, he took no action, confining himself merely to what investigation which might be held by officers at the various ports through questioning the immigrants. In section 38, there is a specific power granted to the minister if he sees fit to exercise it, to exclude men of any particular class or occupation, and the object of that is to prevent men coming into Canada during the time of strikes or lockouts, so as to protect our own workmen. All the Minister of Labour would be required to do; all that the acting Minister of Interior would have had to do—and they were one and the same person at that time—was merely to pass an Order in Council under section 38 to prohibit immigration into Canada of photo-engravers during the continuance of that strike as the union labour men desire in order to protect themselves. What did the minister do? He seems to have done nothing; he does not seem to be aware of the situation at all; he left it entirely to his officials. The Minister of Labour has been so much taken up with emergencies and dreadnoughts and closures that he has had little time to attend to labour difficulties.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) is misrepresenting me; I hope not intentionally. It is not five minutes since I stated to this House that I kept in close touch with the superintendent of immigration in this city in every step that was taken.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If the Minister of Labour kept in touch with the superintendent of immigration that is all he seems to have done, because he certainly authorized no action which gave these labour men the reasonable justice they demanded. They desired to have photo-engravers excluded, and photo-engravers were admitted to the

country and the minister seems to have done nothing except in the case of the three men at Halifax. The men who went to Toronto have not been prosecuted in any way yet. Three men were detained in Halifax. They seem to have had the required amount of money in one form or other, but that money was supplied to them by employers in Canada who desired to bring them into the country to compete with Canadian labour and to break the strike then pending in Toronto. It is true that the matter was brought before Mr. Justice Graham and he, on grounds that appeared to be highly technical—he states in his judgment they are very technical—held that the immigration officer at that point had not the required jurisdiction to make the original investigation, and there being no board of inquiry, the proceedings were irregular and the further detention of the men would be illegal. Mr. Justice Graham has made a few observations with regard to the money in possession of these men, but he did not decide the case upon that point at all—

Mr. MCKENZIE: My hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) is now dealing with a nice point of law. Mr. Justice Graham did not decide that the officer had no jurisdiction; he simply decided that the fact of his jurisdiction did not appear on the face of the order.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That makes the point more technical still. But at all events the question as to the possession of the money was not the basis of the judgment. Leaving out entirely the consideration of the Halifax case, let us take the Toronto case. The men were in Toronto; it was established beyond peradventure that the money they had was supplied them by their employers expressly for the purpose of evading the sections of the Immigration Act, and the other sections framed thereunder, which say that these men should have a certain sum of money which should be their own money. The money was supplied, as I say, by the employers in breach of that Act. These facts have been brought to the attention of the Minister of Labour and the acting Minister of the Interior in the shape of declarations and correspondence. I have a copy of a letter written by Mr. O'Donoghue, who acts as solicitor for the various labour organizations in Toronto, dated March 19, setting out specifically the cases of four men: Russell, West, Collis and Gunther; stating that he had gone to the city clerk of Toronto under section 42 of the Act, and the city clerk had informed him he did not think he had any right to inquire into the matter. But, under that same clause the minister might, upon receiving a report from any of his officers, as defined