

Mr. CARVELL: The member for Halifax and myself do not often disagree, but I do think that the provision made by the Secretary of State meets all objections. I cannot conceive of the Secretary of State—I care not whether he is Grit or Tory—sanctioning a prosecution against a company for failure to carry out certain requirements of the law unless there was a real failure; unless some person was substantially injured by the company's neglect.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 17—Further application of this Act:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move that at the commencement of this section, the following words be added: The sections added or substituted in the principal Act by”.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Should there not be a provision that the Act shall not come into force until January 1, 1918? It is usual in company legislation to fix a future date upon which the Act shall become effective, in order that companies may be given an opportunity to understand its provisions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is necessary that the incorporating sections of the Act be available right away. The compulsory clauses of the Act do not take effect immediately in any case.

On section 92—Investigation of affairs of company:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move that in subsection 1, subclause 2, the word “company” be changed to “corporation”, and that the word “company’s” in line 37 be changed to “corporation’s”. A company which has no share capital is called a corporation.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would it not be well to have a form in the schedule to the Act for returns?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is intended to have forms to comply with section 106, but they are not to constitute an appendage to the Act.

Bill as amended reported, amendments read the first and second time and concurred in.

**FORBIDDEN CIRCULATION IN CANADA.
“THE FIDDLERS”—STATEMENT BY HON.
FRANK OLIVER—AMENDMENT
NEGATIVED.**

On the motion of Hon. J. D. Reid for Committee of Supply:

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to draw the attention of the House to a matter that I brought up some time ago, and I would like to have an opportunity of dealing with it at some little length to-night. It relates to the prohibition of the book called “The Fiddlers.” When I brought this matter to the attention of the House on a former occasion, I asked the Government to specify the portion of the book that was in contravention of the Consolidated Orders in Council regarding censorship. It was a very plain and simple question, but I have not yet received an answer to it. Instead of an answer, the House was favoured by the Prime Minister with a statement by Surgeon-General Fotheringham, who made a long report to the Prime Minister, which the Prime Minister presented to the House. The purport of the report was that this book contained reflections upon the conduct of Canadian soldiers, and, therefore, it was undesirable that it should be circulated in Canada. The fact, if it be a fact, that the book is according to the description of Surgeon-General Fotheringham, does not bring it within the censorship regulations, and, therefore, the prohibition of the circulation of the book by order of the Government or the censor is a trespass upon the rights of the people of Canada that should not be committed by its Government. It is to be supposed that, when a Government has the full power to make a law, as it has in the passing of regulations regarding censorship, having made provision for the prohibition of undesirable books or other literature, it should be willing to be bound by law that it itself has made, and that it should not undertake to exercise for the suppression of free speech or of the circulation of literature a power that it does not possess by any authority of any body, not even of itself. I might perhaps read to the House the conclusion of the report by Surgeon-General Fotheringham in regard to this book. He says:

It is submitted, please, that the above criticisms on the character of the pamphlet in question are fair and represent the general unreliability of the pamphlet as a whole. If I may be permitted to express an opinion based upon my personal knowledge of the situation among the Canadian troops in France and Britain as regards alcoholism and venereal disease it would be that the circulation of statements such as fill the pamphlet in question, among the people of Canada is most undesirable, and should be prevented by any measures open to the authorities, having regard to the interests both of the troops themselves and of the Canadian public.