

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I am willing that it should go out.

The amendment was agreed to, and paragraph e was stricken out.

Section 9 as amended was agreed to.

Sections 10 to 24 inclusive were agreed to.

The Bill, as amended, was reported, read the third time, and passed.

**CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL  
—SEDITION, ETC.**

**SECOND READING—CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING:**

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED moved the second reading of Bill 160, an Act to amend the Criminal Code.

He said: By the Bill now before us it is proposed to make several amendments to the Criminal Code, some of which are particularly directed against a condition which has been prevailing in Canada for some time past, of unrest and disturbance, brought about chiefly by aliens. It is in the interest of law and order that the provisions which it is proposed to add to the Code, as expressed in this Bill, should pass. I therefore move the second reading of the Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

On motion of Hon. Sir James Lougheed, the Senate went into Committee on the Bill. Hon. Mr. Girroir in the Chair.

On section 1—unlawful associations:

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: Can my honourable friend give us any further explanation about that? There has been no clause of this kind in the Code before.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: No, but within the last few months, particularly since the armistice was signed, there has come to the attention of the Government the fact that a great number of associations, particularly of aliens, have been organized throughout Canada for the purpose of carrying on a propaganda that would lead not only to lawlessness, but to the subversion of our present institutions of government. Not only have those disclosures been made in the late sympathetic strike in Winnipeg, but the Government has had unquestionable evidence that there is a widespread movement throughout the whole of Canada. It is therefore very desirable that legislation be placed on the statute book that will lead to the suppression of this kind of association.

C-58

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: Before section 1 is passed, may I, more for information rather than as any suggested change, inquire of gentlemen having legal knowledge, in which I am wholly lacking, draw attention to the words in line 10: "industrial or economic change within Canada by use of force, violence, or physical injury." I think we should be particularly careful not to have anything in this Act that would in any way infringe upon the legitimate rights of labour organizations in using economic force when efforts to adjust a dispute by arbitration and other friendly means have failed. What is the legal interpretation of the term "force" in this section? Does it mean physical force, or could it be interpreted to mean economic force?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I would say physical force, because it is followed by the words "violence or physical injury to personal property," and so on, showing the class of force that is meant.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: If the legal interpretation is physical force, I have no objection.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: In subsection 2, line 24, may I ask that after the words "Dominion Police" the following words be added: "or by the Commissioner of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police," so as to place both on the same plane.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: I have not had time to examine closely, this Bill, but I notice that by subsection 2 the property may be seized without warrant.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Yes, that is very necessary, because the property might disappear in the meantime while the warrant is being issued. It is a class of property that will not suffer through seizure.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: It is coming into Government hands by the seizure, and not into private hands, and of course the Government is responsible.

The amendment to subsection 2 was agreed to.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: I should like to ask the House to give consideration to the elimination of the words in subsection 3, "for not less than one year" in line 5 of page 2. The effect of what would be to leave it to the discretion of the court to decide what the minimum penalty would be in each case, the maximum being twenty years. In subsection 4 of this same section it will be noticed that a person who attends