

Hon. Mr. KERR—I think no person will object to that. In other words a person cannot induce any alien to come in order to rob him.

Hon. Sir GEORGE DRUMMOND—I think the clause was intended to mean a great deal more than that. Not only should it deal with the case of a man who, by false representations, induces another man to come with intention to defraud, but it should deal with people who, by false representations, induce people to come to Canada or prevent people from coming to Canada, and that is my view of the situation. I would move some amendment to that, adopting the hon. gentleman's amendment as a substantial improvement. I would add 'to deter or to discourage immigration into Canada of any person by false representation.'

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—That is right.

Hon. Mr. KERR (Toronto)—The two propositions are separate ones. I suggest that my amendment be introduced, and when that is done we will deal with the one proposed by the hon. gentleman from Kennebec.

Hon. Sir GEORGE DRUMMOND—I should like to ask whether the qualification 'with intent to defraud' would not impose great practical legal difficulties in the way of conviction? I suppose it would, but it is most proper.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—I am not quite satisfied with the limited extent of this clause. In order to reach the party who makes the false representation, it must be established, and I agree with the hon. gentleman from Montreal, who made that same remark, that it was with intent to defraud that party, because it seems to me the false representation should be sufficient. If you induce a party, by making false representations, to come into Canada, you may qualify the false representations if you want to, but besides the false representations, the meaning of which we could settle, if you add, 'with intent to defraud the party,' it seems to me we are undertaking a very large contract. It is ugly enough and injurious enough to induce that party into Canada on false representations. You might imagine a case where the agent in Italy, or on the continent, might make the false repre-

sentations, and not be within this country or within the reach of the law at all.

Hon. Mr. DeBOUCHÉVILLE—I do not believe the hon. gentleman from Toronto is serious in this amendment. What is there in this which the hon. gentleman wants to strike out which will not be approved by everybody? What objection can there be to this clause? Is it not perfectly right? Why does the hon. gentleman strike it out? If it is done in Canada it will be punishable, but if it is done outside of Canada the party cannot be punished by our law. We have had such cases. I think it was said some time ago that this clause was to meet the case of the Italians in Montreal. It is not only the Italians; the papers have published other such instances very often. I could not cite cases now in which the employees of the government were accused of having made these false representations in England. You are striking the whole of this out, and providing that if, in Canada, such a thing is done, the party will be guilty. I think we should leave the clause as it is. I should like anybody to show me what harm there is in this clause as it is passed by the House of Commons. Those hon. gentlemen who have read the records will find that this question was thoroughly discussed in the House, and we had plenty of opportunity to see both sides of it.

Hon. Mr. THIBAUDEAU, from the committee, reported that they had made some progress with the Bill, and asked leave to sit again.

The Senate adjourned until three p.m.

Second Sitting.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Routine proceedings.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES BILL.

FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

A message was received from the House of Commons with Bill (No. 171) An Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

The Bill was read the first time.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Hon. gentlemen will probably have been aware of the subsidies proposed to be granted to a number of Rail-