

examination when the child was taken off the ship could detect that the child was subject to epileptic fits. As a matter of fact when the examination was made it may have been asleep. The child was said to be only eleven months old, as was borne out by its general appearance, and gained entry into the country under false pretences. After the child had been allowed in the discovery was made that it was subject to epileptic fits which as time went on became of a more serious character. Some years later the child was deported. In such a case is there any reason why this country should be saddled with the maintenance for life of such an individual who deliberately broke into this country or got in by fraudulent representations made on its behalf?

Then there are cases where a man does not accidentally come under the provisions of deportation, but deliberately, fraudulently and with full knowledge of the law lies himself into the country. I have nothing to say against the second clause of the bill, which provides that no immigrant with a previous residence here of ten years shall be refused reentry into Canada by reason of his absence from the country. There are a large number of criminals in Europe, sometimes conditions get too hot for them; they have to come over here and they secure entry by false pretences. Although they may have broken the law they may manage to keep clear of it for a period of ten years, and if they escape that long we cannot do anything with them. Obviously we do not want to encourage that class of people to come to Canada.

The first section of the bill applies not to aliens only, but to "an immigrant." If such immigrant becomes naturalized he cannot be deported. Therefore it should apply only to aliens, although the wording is "immigrant" and that might be held to apply to someone other than an alien. As an illustration I would point out the practice of the insurance companies. An insurance company insures a man's life for a long period of years. On the application for insurance the insured makes certain statements. The policy does not state that if he is not caught making a false statement in one, two, five or ten years he will be cleared of responsibility. The man dies when he is ninety years old and if it is found that he made a deliberate, material and wilful misstatement in his application his insurance policy is liable to become void. If insurance companies are as particular as that we might do well to follow a similar practice in relation to immigrants.

Then there is the question of orientals coming into Canada. Some years ago we passed an act prohibiting the immigration of Chinese labourers. A registration system was put in force whereby within a certain time every Chinaman in the country had to be registered. It was discovered that many of them had come in illegally. When an attempt was made to check up and to register their names, where they had come from and on what boat they had come to Canada, it was discovered that a number had come in illegally by faking passports and by other false means. The ages appearing on some of the passports were obviously incorrect. While the situation was remedied at the time in regard to Chinese, it was not improved regarding Japanese. When Japanese go back to their own country on a visit they have to obtain a passport or certificate from this country before leaving. When they apply for a certificate their record of entry is investigated, the time they came and how they came, and if it is found they obtained entrance illegally, even although they are British subjects, they can go away if they like but cannot return. Surely that is a desirable arrangement, because undoubtedly there has been a good deal of abuse of what was known as the gentleman's agreement in connection with Japanese.

To my mind the general spirit of the proposed bill sponsored by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is one with which all members must be in sympathy, but before the bill is passed in its entirety it ought to be sent to a committee for further investigation.

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Immigration): This bill constitutes a very radical departure from the immigration laws which have been on the statute books of this country for a great many years. As the language indicates, the bill contemplates that mere residence in Canada renders the person incapable of deportation. I have sympathy with the views expressed by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) in the matter. I sympathize with those who happen to be in trouble or suffering affliction, and it is unfortunate that under the provisions of our law we find it necessary on occasions to cause the deportation of offenders to their countries of origin. I have a great deal more sympathy however for those who were born in Canada or came here legally and have a legal right to remain, and it is for their protection that the law stands in its present form. It may be said that at times the administration of the act is unduly harsh. From time to time cases have been discussed in the