

the city of Toronto, but it was not sufficient to satisfy him that it was his duty to make complaint to the Department of the Interior in order to have these men deported. I submit that the Department of Immigration has done everything reasonable in this case to carry out the wishes of the gentlemen who complained and to carry out those wishes in accordance with the law. It may be that the immigration agent at Halifax did not strictly and technically carry out the provisions of the Act. That is a matter for which, I suppose, the head of the department is theoretically responsible, but in reality not responsible. The attention of the officers will be called to the remarks made by the judge, and they will be required to see to it that in future no such mistake is made, if there was a mistake in this case. There are two points that hon. gentlemen will consider in the judgment of Mr. Justice Graham. One is that this money belonged to the men. They were simply given it to enable them to pass the immigration officers, the amount to be worked out at some future time. In other words, they were loaned this money for the purpose of enabling them to pass the immigration officers and it was not a case in which they could be deported. That is a very important decision if it is held to be good law. It may be necessary to amend the statute, because I think it is not desired by this House that the law should be as the judge seems to think it is.

Then there is the other question of jurisdiction. I submit that everything within reasonable limits has been done by the Immigration Department to carry out the provisions of this Act, which was passed by our hon. friends opposite and administered by officers appointed by them, notably the superintendent of immigration and the immigration officer at Halifax. I am not finding fault with these men at all. Whatever may be said of the action of the officer at Halifax, I am perfectly satisfied that the superintendent of immigration, because I have had personal contact with him in regard to this matter, did his full duty.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I do not quite agree with the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) who is now, and has been for some time, filling the position of acting Minister of the Interior, in his statement that neither of these departments is at all to blame in connection with the matter that has been brought to the attention of the House this afternoon relating to the immigration into this country of photo-engravers at a time of labour difficulties in the photo-engraving trade in the city of Toronto. I think that the Department of the Interior, through its acting minister, and the Department of Labour, have both

Mr. CROTHERS.

been very careless in the matter, to put my criticism in its mildest form. I believe I am justified in stating, Mr. Speaker, that this is another of those cases in which the rights of labour unions and organizations, when they come into conflict with the interests of manufacturers and employers, under this Administration, receive the very coldest kind of treatment and in many cases are treated with positive injustice. This case follows so closely the case, which was mentioned this afternoon, of Murray, of the Toronto Carpet Company, that one can hardly keep from adverting to the latter case. I brought it before the House myself on January 19 of last year. It was the case in which J. P. Murray—I think he is president—at all events general manager of the Toronto Carpet Company, a very large organization in Toronto, had deliberately broken the immigration laws of this country. It could not be denied. He had induced men to come from various parts of England during a strike in his own mills, had paid them money to enable them to comply with the regulations under our Immigration Act, had sent agents to Great Britain, had published advertisements and had made absolutely false representations to workmen in that country. In the month of June, 1911, two or three months before the general election, he was prosecuted. An information was laid against him by the labour people themselves in Toronto, and the matter came up for hearing before Mr. Denison, the police magistrate. There was some technical irregularity in the proceeding and the magistrate did not consider that he should deal with the case. But the labour unions were not satisfied to allow the matter to rest there as the case was so glaring. One of the declarations will be found in 'Hansard' of last year at page 1512 setting out the facts of the case. Communications were sent to the officers of the Department of the Interior, who had charge of immigration. An officer was sent to Toronto; he investigated the facts, and he instituted another prosecution, seeing that he this time proceeded under the proper section.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. member that not more than one matter can be discussed on this motion; and I would ask the hon. member to confine himself to the question before the House.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I will not deal with that matter further than to say that this case which is dealt with in the motion now before the House is practically on all-fours with the Murray case. In the Murray case the prosecution was deliberately stopped by this Government and when I called the attention of the Government to that condition of affairs I received the promise