

Grant (Sir James), Tyrwhitt,  
Grieve, Weldon, and  
Guay, Yeo.—47.  
Haslam,

**NAYS :**

**Messieurs**

Adams,	Laurier,
Allan,	Lavergne,
Amyot,	Legris,
Bain (Soulanges),	Lippé,
Bain (Wentworth),	Lowell,
Beausoleil,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Béchar, d,	Macleon (York),
Belley,	McCarthy,
Bennett,	McDonald (Assinibola),
Bernier,	McDougald (Pictou),
Blanchard,	McGreevy,
Bourassa,	McInerney,
Bowman,	McIsaac,
Boyd,	McKay,
Brown,	McLennan,
Bruneau,	McMillan,
Cameron,	Marshall,
Campbell,	Masson,
Cargill,	Mignault,
Carling (Sir John),	Miller,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Mills (Bothwell),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Moncrieff,
Casey,	Montague,
Chesley,	O'Brien,
Choquette,	Quimet,
Coatsworth,	Paterson (Brant),
Craig,	Patterson (Colchester),
Curran,	Perry,
Daly,	Pridham,
Davies (P.E.I.),	Proulx,
Davis (Alberta),	Putnam,
Denison,	Rider,
Devlin,	Rinfret,
Dupont,	Robillard,
Edgar,	Roome,
Fairbairn,	Rosamond,
Forbes,	Ross (Dundas),
Fraser,	Ryckman,
Fréchette,	Scriver,
Gibson,	Smith (Ontario),
Gillies,	Somerville,
Girouard (Two Moun- tains),	Stairs,
Godbout,	Sutherland,
Grandbois,	Taylor,
Guillet,	Tisdale,
Haggart,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Hodgins,	Vaillancourt,
Ingram,	Wallace,
Innes,	Welsh,
Joncas,	White (Shelburne),
Lachapelle,	Wilmot, and
Langelier,	Wood (Brockville).—105.
Langevin (Sir Hector),	

Motion negatived.

**SEDUCTION AND ABDUCTION.**

Mr. CHARLTON moved that Bill (No. 3) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, for the purpose of making more effectual provision for the punishment of seduction and abduction, be read the second time. He said: In presenting this Bill to the House, I desire to make a very few remarks to set forth the reasons why I deem that the Criminal Code,

in this respect, should be amended slightly in some of its provisions. The measure for making seduction, under certain circumstances, a criminal offence, was first introduced into this House, I think, fifteen years ago. That Bill, in the various stages of its progress through the House, received the efficient aid of my hon. friend who now leads the House, and from whom I solicit a kindly consideration of the amendments that are proposed to be made to that Act. The Bill was at first received with great manifestations of disfavour. Very few members saw fit to support the principle of the Bill, but it gradually won its way, after discussion from year to year, and through the gradual creation of a public sentiment in the country in favour of the measure. The pressure of public sentiment in the country led to the adoption of the measure by the House. The Bill, after its passage by the House, was reaffirmed by the action of the House, I think, in three successive sessions before it secured the assent of the Senate, and it received in that body some modifications which somewhat impaired the efficiency of the Bill. At last it became the law of the land, and that law has been upon the statute-books for several years. Many prognostications were made with regard to the operation of the law. Those who were opposed to it apprehended very grave difficulties arising from the facilities it would afford for blackmail, and apprehended that it would prove to be a law not in the interests of the country. These fears, I am happy to say, have all proved to be groundless. The law has given satisfaction, has proved to be a law which has been received with favour by the country, and has grown in favour as it has continued upon the statute-book, and as its operations have developed the influence that it is calculated to exert. The results, I affirm, are in the highest degree satisfactory; and I may point with great gratification to the fact that the record of illegitimacy for the province of Ontario is lower than that of any other country in the world, so far as I know. It is lower than the record of the state of Massachusetts, it is lower than the record of the British Empire, or of any of the European countries that I am aware of. It amounts to only a fraction over 12 in the 1,000; and I attribute this favourable condition of public morals, to some extent, at least, to the operation of this law. Now, Sir, I do not need to descant upon the character of the old law or its provisions, for these are all familiar to the members of the House. The old law fixed the age of consent at sixteen years. Seduction between the ages of fourteen and sixteen was a criminal offence. Seduction below fourteen was punished with still greater severity, and between the ages of fourteen and sixteen seduction was a penal offence. I propose, in this measure, to ask the House to increase the age of consent from sixteen to eighteen years. This is practically the law