

*Chinese Immigration*

entering under the provisions of this act, but I thought some hardship might be imposed upon individuals who had been in Canada for, say, ten years.

Mr. STEVENS: It will not apply, for this reason: you are not going to register these people under the calling upon which they enter the country. I wish it were so, but it is not. They will simply be registered as students. So the fact that they have changed their calling will not penalize them in any sense under this clause. My hon. friend need not lose a particle of sleep over any Chinese that are in the country.

Mr. NEILL: In line 6, page 12, I think the word "the" before "controller" should be changed to "a," or else there is likely to be confusion. I would also point out that the word "officer" occurs there, and if the minister changes the previous section and makes it read "peace officer" the same amendment ought to be made in this section.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that line 6 page 12, section 27, be amended by striking out "the" before controller and substituting "a"?

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend (Mr. Neill) suggests "peace officer." I think that ought to be included.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will look into the amendment suggested by my hon. friend to section 26 as well as to this section. It is usually well to exercise a little care. I have no objection to this standing for the purpose if need be.

Mr. STEVENS: The point may already be covered if the Immigration Act provides for "officer" including peace officer.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is where it should go.

Mr. STEVENS: There is no objection to its being carried with that understanding.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 27 stands.

On section 30—Liability of transportation companies:

Mr. STEVENS: This is the same as in the old act, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 31—Liability of railway companies:

Mr. STEVENS: Is this the same as in the old act too?

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think the increased penalty is the only change.

Section agreed to.

On section 32—Chinese landing in violation of act, etc.:

Mr. STEVENS: I would suggest that we might strengthen the latter part of subclause (b) "and shall also be liable to deportation when so ordered by the controller," and make it obligatory that the party so offending should be deported. Anyone who deliberately violates the provisions of this act ought to be deported without any consideration.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We might strike out the words, "when so ordered by the controller."

Mr. STEVENS: I have more objection to the qualifying words, "shall be liable." Why not make it read, "and shall be deported." Make it a positive statement—obligatory. If not my hon. friend will find himself deluged with all manner of appeals for clemency. There is no minimum either; it is a fine not exceeding \$1,000. The fine might be only \$1.

The wording of the clause is to 10 p.m. lean towards clemency. What we want in these penalties is something drastic and definite, because that is the only way in which we are going to get effective restriction under this act. We invite the odium of the criticism referred to by the Prime Minister, and yet we do not obtain the full effects that we are seeking.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It does not matter who the national is, if he wilfully misrepresents—

Mr. STEVENS: No. This section begins, "Every person of Chinese origin or descent who—"

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, but I am making reference to the fact that any national who obtains entry under a fraudulent certificate or who wilfully misrepresents himself should be punished. I have no particular desire to shield such an offender.

Mr. STEVENS: I would point out to the minister that the two clauses of this section are inconsistent one with the other on the basis of his own suggestion. For instance, the first clause refers to every person of Chinese origin, and that includes liability to deportation. The second clause refers to persons who aid and abet, having in mind, no doubt, persons who are not of Chinese origin, and there is no question of deportation there. That shows a distinction between the two. Of course, that person might be a citizen of