

money as long as they required it; that the loan would be renewed whenever it was due, and that they could have the money for 6 per cent. as long as they wished to keep it. But now their money is gone; money in France is not so plentiful, and they want to make up their losses by charging the people higher rates. This company has been made to do more than one kind of service, and I contend that this House will do a great injury to those parties who have borrowed money for 6 per cent. if they grant this request. It will be deceiving the borrowers; nobody can deny that statement. If we keep the company limited to 6 per cent. we shall keep this \$1,250,000 in the country. Other companies will have to keep the interest where it is. I admit this is a serious question; it is a difficult thing to keep interest within bounds, but the very moment we open the door when will it be closed again? Will another company come to this country and ask charters from the Dominion Parliament and the Provincial Legislatures to enable them to loan money at 6 per cent. Never during the time we shall occupy seats in this House. Hon. members, representing rural and agricultural districts, will do a great injustice if they vote to increase the rate of interest from 6 to 8 per cent., to withdraw a million and a quarter of dollars bearing 6 per cent. to be re-loaned at 8 per cent., and their votes will come up again in judgment against them. Why? It would amount to taking the very heart's blood out of the industrious people of the country, the agricultural class. I say positively that I regret there are not more members in this House sent here to support them and advocate their interests. Some say this is a political matter. I think politics have nothing to do with it, because it is a question affecting the people in every section of the country. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier, a gentleman belonging to the French population, was one of the strongest advocates of this company, who endorsed its claims with all the eloquence in his power, pointing out what they were doing for this country and for the interests of agriculturists in offering to loan money at 6 per cent.; yet he now comes here, two years afterwards, and declares the company cannot afford to do business at 6 per cent., but must have 8 per cent., and he beseeched and threatened the House with a view to effect this change. This is a bad system to introduce, and I hope this Bill will not be given the third reading, and that the rate of interest, 6 per cent., will not be changed.

Mr. AUGER called attention to the fact that the hour assigned to Private Bills had passed.

Mr. SPEAKER. My attention having been called to this fact, I must now call Public Bills in order.

PUNISHMENT OF ADULTERY, SEDUCTION, &c.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Cameron (Victoria), that the Bill (No. 13) to provide for the punishment of Adultery, Seduction, and like offences be not now considered, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend the same.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McCARTHY, for Mr. CAMERON (Victoria), moved that the following words be added at the end of clause 4: "Proving the offence to have been committed."

Mr. CHARLTON. The wish and temper of the House have been particularly manifested on this matter, and I have no desire to attempt to accomplish what is impossible under the circumstances. The charge made against this clause was that this clause was altogether too vague in the

matter of corroborative testimony. I had some conversation with the hon. gentleman who moved this amendment, after the Speaker left the Chair—I regret he is not here to-night—and I understood he would be satisfied with the clause which I am about to submit as a substitute for clause four. The clause which I propose is as follows:—

"Provided that the evidence of the female in respect of whom the alleged offence is allowed to have been committed shall be corroborated by some other material evidence in support of the alleged promise of marriage, seduction, inveiglement, or enticement."

It removes the objection that corroborative evidence on some immaterial point would be held to be corroborative evidence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it is almost impossible for the House to decide hurriedly on the amendment. We cannot at the moment see what will be the bearing and effect of it. I am very strongly in favor of the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Victoria, which, I believe, will meet the justice of the case.

Mr. WELDON. The same objection which the hon. member for North Victoria took, applies to the amendment just moved: it might extend so far as to destroy the evidence of the female. When the law respecting actions for breach of promise of marriage in England was changed so as to allow the plaintiff to be called as a witness, similar language was introduced to that now suggested. Now, I think that is the language of the English Act; and in this Act it would seem also to be conveyed in the words "promise of marriage and seduction," in the first section; in the second section the seduction in the case of the tutor, or teacher; and in the third clause, in the enticement of a female. It seems to me, that these words convey the exact idea of the hon. member for North Victoria, as to finding corroborative evidence regarding the material facts necessary to prove cases brought; and it is the language of the English Act as I have pointed out.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me exceedingly dangerous for us now to meddle with this matter. The Committee will remember that the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) gave notice of this amendment, so that the House might consider the facts; and for that purpose, the debate was adjourned. But now, after notice has been given, and the matter is to come up again, the House is asked deliberately to vote for an amendment which ought to be made in the sense which the hon. member for North Victoria proposed; and to make this alteration now, it seems to me, would be in violence of what we voted necessary the other day—that we should have opportunity to consider the whole subject. In the hasty glance which I have been able to give to the matter, it strikes me that the amendment suggested is not at all such as this House desires should be made. The amendment says:

"Provided that the evidence of the female, in respect of whom the alleged offence is allowed to have been committed, shall be corroborated by some other material evidence in support of the alleged promise of marriage, seduction, inveiglement or enticement."

That is exactly what we thought as to the other evidence; but that is not what we thought ought to be corroborated. It relates to an immaterial part of the offence, and is not what ought to be corroborated; and yet the hon. gentleman now suggests that this is a matter which is material, and which alone should be corroborated. Other words follow; but still they do not follow, as I understand they should follow, in this clause, but are made applicable to the different sections. There are three or four sections—one, two, and three of the Bill—and these three sections were all intended to be met.

Mr. CHARLTON. Seduction and promise of marriage are the offences provided against in section 1, seduction in section 2, and enticement in section 3; and all these