

the law has been complied with. If the men to whom my hon. friend refers have committed acts which render them liable to deportation, I have no doubt the provisions of the law will be carried out. If they have not, I do not think they have much to fear, outside of perhaps being put to some inconvenience.

Mr. BROWN: I have received a wire from Winnipeg in connection with these cases, and the statement is made that the arrests were carried out under the warrant of W. J. Egan, who, of course, is the Deputy Minister of Immigration. It may be that the procedure adopted is in harmony with the immigration law, but it certainly is not in harmony with what we understand to be the principle of British justice. There men have been arrested in Winnipeg and spirited away to Halifax; sentence has virtually been pronounced upon them in that they have been taken from their homes in Winnipeg and sent down to Halifax for deportation. Surely the minister will agree that it would be infinitely more in harmony with justice to have had these men detained in Winnipeg until an investigation could be made. They will have no opportunity of bringing witnesses to their defence in Halifax; the only evidence offered at Halifax will be that submitted by their accusers. In the very nature of things these men will not be able to secure witnesses. I am not disposed to defend those who violate the laws of our land; people who come here from Great Britain or from European countries should come prepared to obey our laws. Holmes, one of the men in question, came to Canada twenty years ago, married a Canadian girl and has a child. Surely if he has not previously come under the cognizance of the police he should be entitled to that measure of fair play which would hold him in Winnipeg instead of his being sent to Halifax to have his case reviewed there.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There may be a good deal in what my hon. friend says, but he is one of the old and experienced members of this house and I have heard no complaints against this law since it was put upon the statute book.

Mr. BROWN: It is only when abuses occur that such matters are brought to our attention.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The act gives the department the right to hold boards of inquiry where they see fit, and I gather from what the Minister of Immigration has said that this board is being held in Halifax to suit the convenience—

Mr. YOUNG: Whose convenience?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The convenience of the department, I take it, and the shipping company. This board is to hear other cases besides the one under discussion. All these matters are taken into consideration when deportation proceedings are being conducted. In the past, boards have been held at Quebec and other points in Canada. Generally speaking, I agree that it is a good thing that a man should be heard in his own province, but that is not the law at the present time in regard to immigration. The minister is only carrying out the law as it appears on the statute books.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: There is nothing in the law that tells him to take a man direct to Halifax to be tried there.

Mr. GUTHRIE: He has the discretion to fix the place.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: The minister has made the statement that the men would be given a fair trial before being deported. Does he really think that a man can get a fair trial when he has been arrested in Winnipeg and taken to Halifax away from all his friends?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am assuming that a man can get a fair trial in any part of Canada.

Mr. VENIOT: No, he can not.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If any serious reason is urged by these men to show that they cannot get their evidence, or that they have not money to obtain evidence, it is taken into account by the board. There is no railroading of cases; there will be a fair investigation and a fair finding.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Supposing a man wants to bring a witness from Winnipeg to justify his being in Canada.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does my hon. friend say that he cannot do that?

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I admit he can do it, but why should the officials of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police put the country to the expense of bringing witnesses such a distance when the trial might just as well be held where the man has resided for many years and has friends who can testify on his behalf?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It might be cheaper to gather them all in one place.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I am speaking of the witnesses necessary to give the man a fair trial. Does the minister contend that the country is to be put to the expense of bringing witnesses from Winnipeg, where the man