

Hon. Mr. DeBOUCHERVILLE—I should like the hon. gentleman from Toronto to follow the usual course and explain why he proposed to strike out clause four and substitute his amendment. What objection has he to clause four in the Bill?

Hon. Mr. KERR (Toronto)—The object is to avoid contention. The clause as it was drawn before was objected to, and there was a difference of opinion on it in the Senate, and on that account it has been changed to the phraseology of the section put, in what was supposed to be a form that would be acceptable to all. It was thought that no one would in any way question the propriety of enacting that a man who induces a person by false representations to come to this country with the intent, when he came here, that he should defraud him should be punished by a severe fine. It was understood that that would be accepted by everybody.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—A gentleman in Kingston employs 500 or 600 men. About two years ago they struck. He sent by an agent to Germany or Scotland or some foreign country.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—Order.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—Well, say Germany. A number of men came out and went to work. The strikers got at them and induced some of them to stop work. Supposing they represented that this man's agent had made false representations to induce them to come to Canada, would the proprietor of the factory be liable to punishment for the act of his agent in a foreign country? That ought to be considered. It would be too bad to punish him for false representations made by his agent, when his intention may have been to act in good faith. The fact is it would be better to strike out the clause altogether.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—Knowing the excessive legal ability and talent of the hon. gentleman from Toronto, I am a little surprised that he should ask us to introduce in this Bill something which is already covered by the criminal law of the country. There is no need to say in this Bill that anybody who by fraudulent representation does a thing to defraud another shall be liable to

a penalty; he comes under the criminal code. He does an act which is governed by the common law of the country. I quite agree with the Minister of Labour in the provision contained in this clause, and with Sir George Drummond, that there should be an alternative—that nobody shall be allowed to induce people to come to Canada by false representations, and that nobody shall deter or discourage people from coming to Canada by false representations. You would then have a clause which would aim at the labour agitator who is working against the interests of the country, and prevent others from inducing people to come to the country under false representations.

Hon. Sir GEORGE DRUMMOND—It is impossible to conceive that we can get through with this Bill. I therefore move that the committee do now rise.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—Before that motion is put, I wish to say that I think it is a matter to be regretted, because there are some parts of the Bill that ought to be passed, and the minister in charge has stated his willingness to make such amendments to the provisions as contained in the printed Bill as would meet any reasonable objections; but it apparently is the determination of some hon. gentlemen to talk this Bill out. It has been charged that this Bill has been brought down at a late hour of the session. There is no question about that at all. The reason for that, I think, is quite apparent to most people, that this Bill is practically framed on the information received from Judge Winchester's report. The judge has been investigating the charges against the Grand Trunk Pacific of employing United States engineers, and the Bill could not be prepared until that information was received by the minister. However, it appears to be the determination to attack the Bill. I think the reasons for the delay in bringing the measure down are fair reasons, and it is a pity provisions that should be passed by the legislature should not be enacted this session. However, if the committee are determined to obstruct the Bill, there is no particular reason why we should sit here with the large gathering who have assembled to witness prorogation, as it is evident the Bill cannot be passed.