

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see any objection to that. It enlarges the definition of the offence, and it seems good to do so. It may enlarge it too much, but I would not support an amendment to strike out anything more than subsection 3. It seems to me that subsection 4 is pretty dangerous, but 3 is the worst.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: What about subsection 2?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Strike out the words "in adultery, or."

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all right, because it says:

—thereby endangering the morals of such child or rendering the home of such child an unfit place for such child.

The case the honourable gentleman opposite (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) brings to our attention would not come within subsection 2 if it stood alone, because no one would say that a child's morals were endangered by its living with its parents.

Subsection 3 was struck out.

On subsection 4—not a valid defence that child too young to understand:

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: That is a very extreme provision, but we can let it go, I think.

Subsection 4 was agreed to.

On subsection 5—definition of "child":

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: This is very extreme, too.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: I do not know who it is that wants these clauses. I have always felt that proposals of this kind should go before a committee so that we could hear evidence in support of them and could learn who was requesting them.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: No doubt they come from children's aid societies.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: If we were to pass all the legislation that is requested by some of these societies none of us would be out of danger.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: The Senate has been very chary about accepting amendments of this kind.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: The late Senator Ross took a very great interest in all legislation affecting the Criminal Code. I remember one occasion upon which he was instrumental in inserting a very beneficial clause in a Bill amending the Code. Some welfare

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

organization had succeeded in getting a provision inserted raising the age of consent, and imposing one of the heaviest penalties known to the law upon any man having sexual intercourse with a girl under that age, even though she were a common prostitute. All she had to do was to prove that there had been sexual intercourse between herself and the man, and he immediately became liable to this extreme penalty. Senator Ross suggested an amendment whereby the judge was enabled to instruct the jury that if they found the complainant either wholly or partially to blame they might acquit the accused. This did much to prevent successful blackmail.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: This subsection is very similar to the old subsection 3.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Subsection 5 was agreed to.

On subsection 6—at whose instance prosecution to be instituted:

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I move to strike out the words "three, four or five" in line 32 of this section—they never should have been there—and to change the word "subsections" to "subsection."

The amendments were agreed to, and subsection 6 as amended was agreed to.

Section 3, as amended, was agreed to.

Sections 4 to 18, inclusive, were agreed to.

The preamble and the title were agreed to.

The Bill was reported, as amended.

### THIRD READING

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN moved the third reading of the Bill.

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

### EXTRA-TERRITORIAL BILL

#### SECOND READING

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN moved the second reading of Bill 74, an Act respecting Extra-Territorial Operation of Acts of the Parliament of Canada.

He said: As honourable members well know, Canada's extra-territorial jurisdiction dates from the passing of the Statute of Westminster in 1931. A new statute is necessary in order that extra-territorial effect may be given to Acts of the Parliament of Canada which were passed prior to that time, and in which it was clear, either by word or by implication,