

And so on. The opening words of the former section were:

Every person who by word or act in Canada seeks to overthrow by force or violence.

And so on. The proposed amendment would accord in measure with the former section if the words were left out which the minister says are to be stricken out, namely:

Provided that this section shall not apply to any person who is a British subject either by reason of birth in Canada or by reason of naturalization in Canada.

The proposed amendment goes very much further, and would apply to a resident of Great Britain.

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. BOYS: Perhaps I am wrong.

Mr. ROBB: If he was a resident of Great Britain and not a British subject.

Mr. BOYS: The former section applies to a British subject.

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: Who was not by reason of birth in Canada or naturalization in Canada, and so on. The present act applies only to aliens. That is really the change.

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: It would seem to me that if there was one person who should be deported above all others, it would be a British subject who was coming to Canada for the purposes mentioned in the act. I do not know why that change should be made. I personally would be more inclined to forgive an alien for an offence of that kind than a person from the British Isles.

Mr. BELAND: The hon. member thinks the new clause is not strict enough?

Mr. BOYS: I do not see any reason for the change. Surely a resident of the British Isles coming here and advocating such a proposition as is referred to in this section should be treated as severely as an alien. Why is it necessary to make that change?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): He was disqualified under the act of last year.

Mr. BOYS: Pardon me, the language of the previous act was "every person." That would apply to everybody, no matter where he came from. The exception is found in the last two or three words, as follows:

Provided that this section shall not apply to any person who is a British subject either by reason of birth in Canada or by reason of naturalization in Canada.

These are the only two exceptions. Surely it cannot be argued that that would apply to a resident of the British Isles? It certainly would not. Why is it necessary to exclude him? I would forgive an alien much quicker than I would a British subject for an offence of this kind. What prompted the minister to make this change?

Mr. ROBB: I am bound to say that, now my attention has been directed to it, I share very largely the views of my hon. friend.

Mr. BOYS: I am glad I am right for once.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister will now come to the conclusion that when the late government passed legislation it was not very far out.

Mr. BOYS: I agree with that.

Mr. GRAHAM: It took the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Boys) to show it.

Mr. McMASTER: Would there not be a way to meet the desires of the leader of the opposition, the member for Brome and the member for South Simcoe all at the same time? Make this law apply to British subjects as well as to aliens.

Mr. BOYS: It applies to them now.

Mr. McMASTER: Or strike out the provision in reference to suspicion, and do not have British subjects or aliens deported on mere suspicion. Make the one law apply to everybody, and have it a law which meets our idea of justice.

Mr. HOEY: Give them a trial by jury.

Mr. BOYS: I must admit I share the views of the member for Brome in regard to finding any one guilty on suspicion. Personally I think this law is a move in the right direction, and I would be willing to take a chance on it; so that if the minister can accede to the request I would have no objection. I read the act more or less hurriedly, but it seems to me the words are exactly the same. The former section read:

Or who, by common repute belongs to or is suspected of belonging to any secret society or organization.

And so on. I think the words are identical in the proposed amendment, and for my part I do not seek to make any change, although I appreciate the argument that nobody should be found guilty of an offence