

difficulties apparently have occurred of this nature in the Cobalt district. I quite agree with the hon. member from Halifax, that we should not extend a principle of this kind to the whole Dominion, because of some isolated instances having arisen in the Cobalt region. Because two or three crimes occurred, by coincidence in one part of Canada, does any one think we should change the whole criminal law and act as though that class of crime had become general?

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE.—Surely the government will take into consideration the remarks of the hon. members from Halifax and Calgary. I cannot support the clause as it stands. You put the onus probandi on the man in whose possession the mineral has been found. He is guilty by having it in his possession. I have at home some mineral samples that I got 12 years ago, some of it at Sudbury and some in British Columbia. It was given to me, and I cannot tell from which place I got it. If that law is placed on the statute book, the government could send a man to my place and ask where I got this ore, and I could not prove where it came from. I could only say that I got it from friends either in Sudbury or British Columbia.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.—I have samples at home in the same way.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE.—The onus probandi should not be on the man who happens to have the mineral in his possession. I am supposed to have the complete title of movable property in my possession. It is for the party who thinks I am not legally and honestly in possession of it, to prove that I am not. As the clause stands, every one of us who happens to have some mineral, not manufactured, in his possession, is supposed to have obtained it in a dishonest way. I object most strenuously to this clause, unless we limit it to Cobalt.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.—I will suspend this clause until some explanation is offered. I have not received a proper brief about this.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED.—I venture to say there are over one hundred offices in Ottawa in which you will find many speci-

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED.

mens of mineralized rock, and it would be utterly impossible for those in whose possession it is to explain where it came from. Prima facie, all these people are guilty of theft and liable for two years' imprisonment.

Hon. Mr. POWER.—I move that the clause be struck out.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE.—The provision might be limited to mining camps and vicinity.

Hon. Mr. GIBSON.—If it is needed anywhere it is in the mining camp. I do not believe there is a member of this House who has not been presented with samples of minerals, and who could tell where he got the whole of them. I have in my mind's eye, manufacturers of jewellery, who have quartz under glass, exhibiting different samples of ores found in the Dominion. Take the case of the government of Ontario. They have a bureau of Mines, where all kinds of minerals are exhibited. Would you indict the government for having them in their possession? I think it is a most objectionable clause.

The motion was agreed to and the clause was struck out.

On clause 508-A, imposing a penalty for unlawful printing, selling or possession of plates for printing pirated copies of musical compositions.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED.—What has led to this legislation?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.—Musical compositions are constantly being imported through the post office.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.—This has come to be embodied in the Bill because some representation has been made that such a thing is constantly occurring, and authors being entitled to the protection of their rights needed this legislation.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.—If the hon. gentleman would make inquiry at the Customs Department, he would find that there are constant complaints made to that department of the smuggling of copyrighted music, and you cannot reach the offenders. All you can do is seize and confiscate the