ask the House to increase the age to 14, so that the punishment will be correspondingly severe if the offence is committed in respect of girls under that age.

The amendment was agreed to.

On clause 4,—

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Clause 4 has attracted a good deal of attention and comment, and the age does seem to me to be unreasonably great. I do not myself concur in the theory that women require this kind of protection up to the age of thirty; at the same time, I feel some hesitation in moving that it be changed, since the Government consented, I understand, in another place, to limit the age to thirty. My own impression would be that twenty-one is quite old enough, and if the suggestion were made by any hon. member I would be glad to adopt it.

HON. MR. POWER—I took the liberty of making the suggestion on the second reading of the Bill, that the change the hon. gentleman has mentioned should be made. I do not wish to do anything that might embarrass the Government in another place; still, I shall venture to move that the words twenty-one be substituted for thirty in the section.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I would suggest that if this protection were given to girls while in their teens it would be sufficient.

The amendment was agreed to.

HON. MR. POWER—There is another portion of the clause which strikes me as being rather unreasonable and unfair, and it should either not appear here or it should have a wider application than it has. The clause reads as follows:

"4 Every one who, being a guardian, seduces or has illicit connection with his ward, and every one who seduces or has illicit connection with any woman or girl of previously chaste character and under the age of thirty years who is in his employment in a factory, mill or workshop, or who, being in a common employment with him, in such factory, mill or workshop, is, in respect of her employment or work in such factory, mill or workshop, under, or in any way subject to, his control or direction, is guilty of a misdemeanor and liable to two years' imprisonment."

The alteration in the age makes this clause much less objectionable than it was, but I do not see why this special protection is thrown around factory girls and not given to other girls who are in positions where there is much more danger than in the case of factory girls. As a general thing girls employed in factories are employed in large numbers—25, 50 or 100—to go to work at the same hour and leave at the same hour, and who are under one another's eye, and it really seems to me that the facilities for leading astray girls employed in that way are much less than those which exist in the case of other classes of girls. Domestic servants, I think, are in a much more dangerous position than factory girls. My impression is that as the Bill was originally introduced into the Commons by the Government the wording of this particular clause was different from what it is now. This was the language of the Bill as introduced by the Government in the House of Commons, and I think it is better than the language of the Bill as it now stands, and I would be disposed to reinstate the previous wording instead of the wording we have now. The wording in the Bill as originally introduced is: "who has in his employment, or who being in a common employment with him in respect of her employment, or work under, or in any way subject to his control or protection." I do not see why the particular class of girls indicated by this clause should be singled out for special protection, and I think that we ought to go back to the original wording of the Bill. It has been said, I understand, as a reason for this distinction, that the trade unions ask that the law be made applicable to girls employed in factories. There is no objection to that, but no satisfactory reason is given why it should not extend to other girls who are in the employ of other persons as well as to factory girls.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I do not exactly see the propriety of the suggestion that my hon. friend has made—in the first place, for the reason that he has referred us to the Bill as it was originally introduced, and we now have the Bill in the form it is before us, after the other branch of the Legislature has passed upon it, and the suggestion that we should reintroduce the clause as it existed in the first instance looks very like an invitation to get up a difference of opinion on the point which might endanger the Bill itself. Then there is another reason: If it is made as extensive as my hon. friend suggests, there are reasons apparent on the face of it why it should not be done. If, for instance, it is applied to