Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED-I do not know whether any communication has been made to the department as to the law being insufficient as it is. Has my hon. friend any communication on that point to show that the law is defective?

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT-I am not aware that there have been any communications of that kind made. There have been no doubt representations made by certain organizations or societies calling for the suppression of these evils, but whether this penalty can be enforced or not, I should say would be a matter of grave doubt, and one thing I am perfectly certain of, is, that it may have the result of very considerable blackmail.

Hon. Mr. POWER-If I may be allowed to repeat myself, the difficulty is this; in a large city like Montreal, a seaport town, or in a place like Quebec, also a seaport town, and garrison towns like Halifax and Quebec, where you have a large number of single men gathered together, there will necessarily be, until the millenium comes, a considerable amount of this conduct. The question is whether that shall take place in kouses of ill-fame and houses that are known to be of that character, or whether it shall take place in other places where it does much more mischief. I think it better not to undertake to legislate in a way that would simply spread the evil broadcast amongst many who are now respectable members of society. Section 3 goes far enough. The clause in the Bill reads:
By inserting immediately after section 228 the following section:-
" 228 a. Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to six months' imprisonment who is an inmate or habitual frequenter of a common bawdy house."

This is sentimental. We are undertaking to legislate at the dictation of associations made up of unpractical and sentimental people. I do not think it is the right thing for the hon. gentleman to hold up the bishops and priests of my church in terrorem over me. They are very well in their own way, but they are not the most practical business men.
Hon. Mr. WATSON-They have not been around with the boys.
Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex).-I think this clause should stand.

What is to be gained by laxity of enforcement of law and laxity of standard of morals? Everybody admits the evil, which is a terrible one. The greater the city the greater the veil. If we draw the line more tightly, there is no doubt we shall restrain people from going to these places, and if we punish the inmates you will restrain them from inviting and soliciting people to improper conduct. I think the Senate would not do itself any credit by relaxing the lines by which morality is enforced, and this is one of the greatest evils that has to be contended with. This Bill passed the House of Commons, and it will be a reflection on us that we have less exalted ideas of the enforcement of law and of the punishment of criminals, for this is a criminal offence and an indictable offence, and of the maintenance of a high standard of morals than the Commons. I think the Senate should not repeal this clause.
The amendment was carried on a standing vote.
Yeas, 17. Nay, 13.
Hon. Mr. SCOTT.-We shall have the names on record on the third reading.
Hon. Mr. POWER.-The hon. gentleman should not make that statement.

The clause was struck out.
On section 292.
Soction 292.-By adding thereto the following paragraph:-
(c) assaults and beats his wife or any other female and thereby occasions her actual bodily harm:"
Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.-This clause provides that a party who beats his wife, under section 292, is held to be guilty of an indictable offence and two years' imprisonment, or to be fined.
Hon. Mr. DAVIS.-Anything about the woman who beats her husband?
Hon. Mr. POWER-Section 292 of the Criminal Code provides the penalties for certain very gross offences, 'Any one who indecently assaults any female' and so on. An indecent assault is a very serious offence; but this legislation, which I look upon as something of the same character as the last, provides that if a man assaults his wife and thereby occasions her actual bo-

Hon. Mr. POWER.

