

## Will Mr. Calder Explain?

By David Loughnan,  
Editor The Veteran.

A breezy discussion arose at the last meeting of the Ottawa branch of the Great War Veterans' Association as to the proper interpretation of recent amendments to the Immigration Act. These amendments, it will be remembered, were passed by the House and Senate and signed by the Governor-General in the record time of forty-five minutes—a special departure from the time honored parliamentary practice of giving "careful consideration." Unlike the innocuous Daylight Saving Bill, which was lengthily debated by over forty honorable members during an earlier session, the Immigration Act amendments were not debated at all under the skilful manipulation of Mr. Calder. Now, however, certain points have arisen which require not only explanation but comprehensive definition. This was very evident from the statements made by certain veterans the other night.

For instance, Mr. Calder might define Canadian citizenship. Under the new amendments it would appear that a British-born subject who comes to Canada, resides for ten, fifteen or twenty years, brings up a family, owns property, serves overseas with the Canadian Forces, and carries on generally as a citizen should, is, after all, only a citizen by "domicile." In other words, he cannot become a "naturalized citizen." On the other hand, a Hun can come to this country and take out naturalization papers after residential conditions have been duly complied with, and enjoy thereafter the full privileges and protection of Canadian law. If the Hun commits an offence under the new Immigration Act amendments, he is entitled to trial by jury. If the British-born Canadian commits the same offence he is liable to deportation without jury trial. Further, the new act provides for deportation of a British-born who may be only a "suspect."

It has been argued that the alien who comes to Canada and takes out naturalization papers thereby becomes a Canadian and, ipso facto, has no other country, and therefore cannot be deported. If that be so, naturalization is a greater safeguard than domicile, and the alien gets the best of the deal. Perhaps Mr. Calder can explain this special concession to the alien?

Trial by jury is a thoroughly democratic institution. British law is based on the assumption that a man is innocent until proven guilty. How then can the punishment of deportation be meted out justly without a trial? And why is the British-born Canadian singled out for such treatment? The history of the past few years abundantly proves the alien to be the conspirator against constitutional law and order. The last dozen murderers who have been hanged have practically all been aliens. The internment camps were full of aliens during the war, and the "red" propagandists who have been allowed to plan revolution since the war started are nearly all aliens. Why then should these people be given the privilege of common British justice which is denied the British-born Canadians? Will Mr. Calder explain?

No punishment can be too severe for a man who plots assassination and the overthrow of law and order. No matter where he was born the full penalty of the law should be visited upon him—but he is entitled to a fair trial by his peers. If, through the accident of birth, a man can be arrested and spirited out of the country, as a suspect, without trial of any kind, what protection is there in citizenship? Such action is Prussianism in its worst form. Russia used to practice this method with political offenders, making use of Siberia as an internment camp,—until the reaction set in and autocracy was butchered wholesale.

Since this very interesting discussion was opened up by a Canadian-born veteran there can be no harm in discussing it fully and fairly. A great many British-born Canadians—some of whom were badly disabled while fighting for Canada—would welcome a definition of their citizenship status under this new law and an explanation from Mr. Calder and the Union Government as to why trial by jury has been abrogated in certain specific cases.

It would also be interesting to know under what Order-in-council the tenth chapter of the Book of Isaiah became a "seditious libel." Will Mr. Calder explain?