

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman asked me, as I was unable to explain the Bill at the second reading, to give an explanation of it now, as we hope it will pass, and therefore I am not reading the Bill as originally printed, but as I hope it will be amended in committee. The very sweeping clause in the Bill as it is now, will be reduced to making provision for such a case as occurred recently in Montreal, where an Italian had induced a large number of his countrymen to come to Canada on the assurance that he would get them employment on payment of a fee. It is only cases of that kind that will come under clause 4. The Bill in its original phraseology and spirit had a great many objectionable clauses in it and those have all been removed.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Is that the only clause to be amended?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The most important change in clause 5, is that instead of the minister being clothed with authority to do certain things, it is reserved for the Governor in Council. It is thought it would be safer.

Mr. BAKER—The explanation by the hon. Secretary of State, it appears to me, makes the Bill more odious and objectionable than it was in its original form, for we find it is aimed at a special case. Is the parliament of Canada legislating for a special case?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No, I only mentioned that as an illustration.

Hon. Mr. BAKER—The principle of the Bill is so vicious, the construction of it is so bungling, and the affect of it may be so disastrous, that I move that the House do not now resolve itself into a Committee on the Whole on the Bill, but that it go into Committee of the Whole this day six months.

Hon. Mr. YOUNG—Would it not be better to await the result of the committee's work and, on the third reading, the hon. gentleman will have the same opportunity that offers now to move his amendment?

Hon. Mr. BAKER—The objection to that is that the Bill has been introduced in the very dying hours of the Senate. Why should the Senate be called upon at such a time to consider a Bill of such importance,

and far-reaching effect? It is perfectly monstrous that any government should delay legislation of this kind to the last moment of the session. It is an open secret that the government is at sixes and sevens on this very Bill, and the spectacle is not one to be contemplated with satisfaction by any man whether he is on the right or left of the Speaker. There is no right or left, it is true, in the Senate, but the Bill is so objectionable that even on the ground of the lateness of its introduction it ought not to be entertained in the Senate.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—I admit this is most important legislation which has come late in the session in both Houses, but the reason given by the hon. gentleman to reject the Bill in toto, is not absolutely satisfactory to my mind. He takes clause 4, as proposed to be amended by the Secretary of State, and says that his objection is to the fact that it covers a special case. If he will read the amendment to clause 4, he will find it is not made to cover a special case. It has sprung from facts in a special case in Montreal, but it is general in its application, and absolutely innocuous as to its effect. It will be an offence for any one to attract aliens to this country in order to defraud them. It is so absolutely mild and insignificant, that if the hon. gentleman had said he opposed the Bill because this clause is meaningless I could understand his argument. For my part, it does not go far enough, but I would be satisfied if the other clauses are not harder to tackle than this one, to pass the Bill this session, and see how far we can amend it in following sessions. But there is a clause of far more importance than that—clause 5. I do not know that the hon. Secretary of State has given full explanations of the amendments which he intends to move. We may strike considerable difficulty owing to the importance of clause 5, the newness of the legislation and the considerable amendments which are being suggested by certain members of this body and which will be submitted in committee. I agree with the hon. gentleman from Killarney (Hon. Mr. Young) that we could, as we have nothing else before us, and are waiting for the Supply Bill, do our best to see how far we can legislate towards bringing out of this committee a satisfactory Bill on certain of its