

I think, whether the Government have been misled or not, that they have passed a good many mistaken measures, and if we repeal this section it is doubtful whether one would be allowed to point that out.

The section continues:

(b) to point out errors or defects in the government or constitution of the United Kingdom, or any part of it, or of Canada or of any province thereof, or in either House of Parliament of the United Kingdom or of Canada, or in any legislature, or in the administration of justice, or to excite His Majesty's subjects to attempt to procure by lawful means the alteration of any matter in the State.

These are all very desirable things. I do not think we should undertake to remove the protection which the law now gives to people who are honestly trying to improve conditions. You will find that in England they are proposing to make very serious changes, and amongst other things it seems not unlikely that they will introduce the federal system or proportional representation; and the idea of removing the protection which the law now gives, and exposing men, for honestly and loyally trying to reform things, to the danger of being dealt with under the earlier clauses of the Bill, is, I think, highly objectionable, and I for one could not vote for the fourth clause of the Bill. The final part of the section as it stands now is:

to point out in order to their removal matters which are producing or have a tendency to produce feelings of hatred and ill-will between different classes of His Majesty's subjects.

I think that our undertaking to strike out this clause is simply undertaking to Prussianize the Canadian system. I think it is highly objectionable.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I challenge my honourable friend or any one else to mention any case in which any citizen of Canada has ever suffered by reason of entertaining such views as those he has referred to. All they have to do is to say, "our intention is good." The whole curse of our law up to the present time has been the latitude allowed to disloyal and seditious individuals; and this is the first time in the history of an overseas Dominion that there has been established a Russian form of revolutionary government in one of our principal cities.

Hon. Mr. POWER: Section 133 would not protect a revolutionary.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: Honourable gentlemen must not think that we on this side of the House have any sympathy with

Hon. Mr. POWER.

what has been going on in certain cities, but we should be careful that we are not going too far. There is always the danger that we may not see how far a clause goes or what the effect of it may be.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: That is the common law to-day. That right obtained long before section 133 was inserted in the Code, and the repeal of that section does not take away the rights and liberties which every one has under Magna Charta.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: No, but the remarks of my honourable friend might lead other people to think that the gentleman who raised this question was in favour of this Russian propaganda, which, of course, no one here can be.

Hon. Mr. POWER: I ask for a division.

Section 4 was agreed to on division: yeas, 16; nays, 3.

On section 5—penalty for speaking seditious words, etc.:

Hon. Mr. POWER: I suppose the honourable gentleman intends to make the same amendment in this section that has been made in other places by striking out the words, "not less than one year and."

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Yes.

Section 5, so amended, was agreed to.

Sections 6, 7 and 8 were agreed to.

On section 9—penalty for theft of motor cars:

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: The same objectionable words appear in this section. I think the words "not less than one year and" should come out.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Yes.

Section 9 so amended was agreed to.

Sections 10 to 13, both inclusive, were agreed to.

On section 14—prisoner must re-elect, forty days before jury trials commence:

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: I should like to know the effect of that section; I have forgotten the provisions of the old section.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: This clause was requested by the Premier of Quebec to overcome the difficulty experienced of accused persons first of all electing to be tried by jury, and then, on the eve of the trial, after the expense of summoning a jury had been incurred, electing to be tried summarily, the whole proceeding being for the purpose of occasioning delay or