

man's name I want to mention particularly is Leslie, which I venture to say is a Scottish name. He went on the prairies with a group of harvesters and as soon as the harvest was over he made his way to Winnipeg and from Winnipeg to Toronto, and he caused more annoyance and was a more violent anarchist I suppose than we have ever had in our city. He stood up in the dock in the police court and declared himself a revolutionist who was proud to have been able to shake hands with Lenin of Russia; and he wanted the city of Toronto turned into a Moscow. He led a party down to this city this session, having walked all the way from Toronto to intimidate this government, and one thing I can commend the government for most heartily is the fact that there was no surrender to that bunch of Bolsheviks. There were not very many of them. I think it is only right that we should have a law to deport a man like that or any group of men who will create disturbance in the country. I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Millar) that the minister should have wide powers to deal with men of that type. I think I may fairly say that we have in this country among the masses of the people a larger proportion who are orderly and law-abiding than perhaps can be found in any other country in the world. I think that is largely due to the fact that our agricultural population is large. Nothing makes a man steady, sober and orderly like having some real stake in the country he lives in. In this Dominion of Canada every man can have some stake here; if he will practise thrift and make a few sacrifices in his young manhood he can have land of his own and a home of his own.

Mr. GOOD: May I ask my hon. friend whether the stability depends on the amount of stake a man has in the country? If so, would that apply in superlative degree to a millionaire?

Mr. HOCKEN: I do not quite get the drift of my hon. friend's question. I do not know that any millionaires are going around like Mr. Leslie, declaring themselves in favour of revolution. I do not think millionaires make revolutionists, although some of my hon. friends will disagree with that. I do not think a man is a revolutionist unless he has evil in his heart. I do not think any healthy man need starve in this country. Any man who is industrious and thrifty can make his way and gain a competence in Canada. But men who come here with a different idea, that of stirring up strife, ought to be deported, and the more quickly they are deported the better it is for those who

remain. There are men in this House, on every side, who began their lives with no more money than Mr. Leslie had when he came out to this country, but they did not attain a competence or a comfortable livelihood without effort. Are we who desire to work, are people who are sober, thoughtful, steady and orderly, to be subject to the agitations of men who pride themselves on their acquaintance with Trotsky and Lenin and declare for revolution in public places in this country? I think not. And as far as I at least am capable, my voice and my vote and my influence, though they may be very little, will be directed against that class of people, and I will support this or any government in taking whatever measures are necessary to get such people out of the country without delay.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am going to address myself to a very brief effort to alter the viewpoint of the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) and possibly of others who may agree with him. But before doing so I commend the government for coming so close to, indeed entirely into, our ground on this subject, as they have on many others under the enlightening influence of office. What a few years ago was considered rank and bold autocracy is now considered wise and sane administration. The deportation powers of a minister or of a government are not powers that are exercised for the purposes of punishing offences. They do not imply a crime; they do not imply an offence against the law. They are simply a power, one of many, exercisable for the purpose of selecting the immigrants who come to Canada. This is their purpose and no other. Before any citizen of our country or any alien on our shores is to be deprived of his liberty or his life he is entitled to a trial by judge or by jury. But why is this? Because his liberty and his life are his natural rights, rights that no one can deny him unless he forfeits them in whole or in part by his own misconduct, by offences against the law of the land. But to live in Canada is the natural right of nobody until his citizenship there is established. It is not the natural right even of any man from England, even of any man merely because he is a British subject. We are not prepared to admit a man simply because he can raise the British flag. His indefeasible right to live in Canada we have never admitted, and we are sorry we cannot admit it. Much less have we ever admitted that any man from anywhere else on earth has a natural right to have a habitation here.