

in prohibiting the immigration of labourers into British Columbia, for a certain specified time. We did that under this subsection of section 38:

The Governor in Council may, by proclamation or order, whenever he deems it necessary or expedient—

(c) prohibit for a stated period, or permanently, the landing in Canada, or the landing at any specified port of entry in Canada, of immigrants belonging to any race deemed unsuited to the climate or requirements of Canada, or of immigrants of any specified class, occupation or character.

Under that provision of the law, we passed Order 2642, prohibiting the entry into the ports of British Columbia of all labourers until the 31st of March, 1914. That has met with the approbation of the labouring people in British Columbia, and, notwithstanding that the hon. member for Edmonton thinks that was rather an unnecessary Order in Council to pass, I think it has proved its justification by the practical effect of it since then. How many have come into Canada of any of these classes during this winter? Practically none at all. We are in receipt of resolutions, passed by the labour organizations of British Columbia, asking us to renew it for another six months, on its expiration on the 31st of March.

Mr. GRAHAM: Are you going to?

Mr. ROCHE: We have got it under our very serious consideration, and before the end of March, 1914, we will have propounded our policy upon this subject. I am sure the hon. member is not so very anxious to see the Government meet the situation in a practical manner, as he is to see us put our foot in it, so that he and his friends might be able to make a little political capital out of it.

Mr. GRAHAM: If we leave you alone, you will put your foot in it anyway.

Mr. ROCHE: Well, we have not done so up to the present time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that an evidence that there is still unemployment?

Mr. ROCHE: I did not say that we were going to renew it; I said that we had it under our serious consideration. We are in hope, as the spring opens up and as the spring work opens up as well, that there will not be any labour congestion, but plenty of work for the labouring men. We have not definitely decided as to what action we shall take in regard to the matter, but at any rate this is our justification

under that section for passing that Act. It has met with the approbation of the people of British Columbia. We have received resolutions from the labouring element approving it and desiring its continuance.

I do not know that it is necessary for me to enter into any more lengthy explanation of the question, but I would simply say that the Government has no objection whatever to bringing down all the papers that have been moved for by the hon. member for Edmonton. There is a phase of this question which the hon. member for Rouville discussed when the Minister of Justice was out, upon which the Minister of Justice would like to say a few words.

Mr. LEMIEUX: After this Order in Council was passed, was there any correspondence with the Government?

Mr. ROCHE: I presume that that correspondence, if there is any and if it is not of a private nature, will be included in the motion of the hon. member for Edmonton.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend alluded to the deportation of Bhagwan Singh and the failure to deport some thirty-nine other Hindus. He might well explain to the House how Bhagwan Singh was deported, although there was a writ of habeas corpus to protect him, and why the other men were not deported.

Mr. ROCHE: The reason of that is this, Bhagwan Singh was deported prior to the judgment of Chief Justice Hunter. The others were not deported by reason of the decision of Chief Justice Hunter. The hon. member for Rouville will not take exception to that?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend read from the Act that no order of a judge had any effect upon the authority of the minister. I take it that the minister did not exercise the authority conferred upon him by the Act, in the case of the thirty-nine Hindus. I would like to know why he did not exercise that authority.

Mr. ROCHE: The hon. member scarcely puts my words correctly. I was defending the action of Mr. Malcolm Reid, our officer, in having deported, according to his instructions and under a certain section of the Act, those thirty-nine Hindus whom Chief Justice Hunter had since that time released on the ground of a defect in the Order in Council passed by the hon. gentleman himself. This defect has since been remedied and now, if a similar case arises,