

must register them. The registration requirement applies to pistols and revolvers.

Section 3 was agreed to.

On section 4—having pistol or revolver while committing offence:

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: This section makes it an offence to have a pistol or revolver on the person while committing any criminal offence, and renders the offender liable to additional punishment.

Section 4 was agreed to.

On section 5—soldiers, sailors and others added to those who may carry weapons:

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: This is an addition:

It is not an offence for any soldier, public officer, peace officer, sailor or volunteer in His Majesty's service, or constable or other policeman, to carry loaded pistols or other usual arms or offensive weapons in the discharge of his duty.

I presume the amendment is made to remove any doubt.

Section 5 was agreed to.

On section 6—"brother" and "sister":

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: This section refers to social crimes and defines brother and sister to include half-brother and half-sister.

Section 6 was agreed to.

On section 7—lottery sale void:

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: This section provides that the winner of a lottery loses his winnings to the Crown, instead of to the informant—to whom he never lost them.

Section 7 was agreed to.

On section 8—driving car equipped with smoke screen:

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The following is added as subsection 5 to section 285 of the Code:

Every person who owns, drives or is in charge of a motor car, automobile, boat or other vehicle of transport equipped with an apparatus for making a smoke screen, shall be guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars and costs, and not less than fifty dollars and costs, or to imprisonment for any term not exceeding twelve months and not less than one month, or to both fine and imprisonment.

Apparently men are using smoke screen apparatus for the purpose of hiding their licence number and their own identity.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: It does not cover politicians?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: No. If it did, I should like to have the subsection made retroactive.

Section 8 was agreed to.

On section 9—previous illicit connection with accused:

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The meaning of this amendment shines out clearly from the reading of it:

Proof that a girl has on previous occasions had illicit connection with the accused shall not be deemed to be evidence that she was not of previously chaste character.

Hon. Mr. PARENT: This is an extraordinary amendment. Beyond doubt, if a girl has had illicit connection before, she is no longer of chaste character.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: With the same party.

Hon. Mr. PARENT: I should like honourable gentlemen to declare their views on this amendment.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Each member will have to speak for himself.

Hon. Mr. PARENT: I do not think this amendment should pass. We should not declare that a girl is chaste when she is no longer so. It is contrary to both law and morality.

Hon. Mr. COTE: I think there is more merit to the amendment than the honourable gentleman states. Previous relation with the accused is part of the same offence. He should not be acquitted on the plea that he has committed the same offence before with the same person. The two offences really constitute one crime.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The indictment has to certify when the offence was committed. The indictment says John Jones on such a date seduced such and such a girl of previously chaste character. Had the authorities known of the first offence the accused would have been charged with it. John Jones replies that a year and a half before he had illicit connection, and he gets off.

Hon. Mr. PARENT: It comes down to a question of fact. The woman in question has or has not done this or that, and it is a question of fact whether she is of previously chaste character. If in fact she is not of previously chaste character, why declare her to be so?