

Canadian domicile to-day who will not have it to-morrow. There are in that section certain provisions which exclude classes of persons whom it might be desirable to exclude even if they had a Canadian domicile; but on the other hand, under this section, any person, who has not a Canadian domicile, is for instance excluded if he is blind. It is necessary for our protection that we should enact a law that if a man comes here and acquires a domicile and his wife unfortunately should be blind, we should shut her out for ever. Still that would be the effect of this measure.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. McKENZIE. Before six o'clock I was referring to some features of the immigration Act which I thought required an explanation. It is a well understood principle in British law that the head of the family to a very large extent regulates the rights of his children and his wife in any country. When the husband is entitled to a domicile or a settlement in this country, then I understand it follows that the wife is also entitled to a domicile, that the domicile of the father is the domicile of the children, at least until they are old enough to obtain a domicile or a settlement for themselves. That being the case, only with the greatest care and for the strongest reasons should any law be enacted in this country that would break up the family, that is that would enable the father to enter Canada and remain here, while preventing the mother and the children from following him. We can readily conceive a situation where a child might be born while the mother was in transit to this country and it would appear to me extraordinary that the mother, when arriving on our shores, would not be permitted to land with the infant, although under the existing regulations such a situation might readily arise.

I am not familiar with the reasons why Asiatics are singled out as different from other people coming into this country. There may be good reasons for making a special law for Asiatics. All I can say is that the great majority of the Asiatics in our country are about as desirable as any other foreigners who come into the country. We find them very industrious, clean, honest people, willing to earn a livelihood and taking part in any of the occupations offering in my part of the country. Personally it seems to me an exceedingly hard law that an Asiatic, an Assyrian for instance, comes to my country, stays for perhaps three years, is a naturalized British subject, has considerable property, running into the thousands of dollars, but

Mr. DOHERTY.

when he wants to bring his wife and family here, they cannot be taken into the country, no matter how young they are unless each of them has \$200 in cash. I do not say that children should be admitted if they are unhealthy or if there is anything the matter with them that should prevent them coming in, simply because the father is in this country, but when the father is a British subject and has ample property in Canada, it is a hardship that should not exist. If a man is to live in this country, if we give him the privilege of voting, and other rights of citizenship, I do not think we should prevent his wife and family from coming to live with him. Under our general naturalization Act it is stated that the domicile of the husband is the domicile of the wife and that the domicile of the father is the domicile of the children, at least until they are 21 years of age, and that if they have no father the domicile of the mother is that of the children. I have met several cases of this kind in my own county and I am not in a position to explain to these Assyrians and Asiatics why this hard rule is made against them as distinguished from other foreigners coming into this country. I would like to have some satisfactory explanation of this regulation from the minister, and if it be at all possible, I would like to see some amendment or some regulation by which the cases of which I speak could be taken away from the general rule so that a man who is given the privileges of British citizenship in Canada, should be allowed to bring his wife and family to live with him, if they are competent to enter Canada without violating any regulation except the requirement of \$200 in cash. I think the enforcement of that law in the case of children who could not possibly earn it, is a hardship, that it should be applied only to those capable of earning it and who, if they were industrious, should have it.

Mr. OLIVER. It would seem from the remarks of the gentlemen who have spoken that there is a misapprehension as to the purpose of this law. This law is for the purpose of excluding certain classes of people for certain reasons and the desire is that this intent shall be carried out. If it is not the desire of the Committee that people should be excluded, the law could easily be amended, but as the case stands at present, we have a law which was passed last year, following up another law passed three years before, and we now propose to make certain minor amendments in detail in order to carry out more completely the intent of the law that was passed last session, and hon. members forthwith complain about the fundamental principle of the existing law. That is not the question