

as we are to-day. As we sit alone to-day facing France at the treaty table, so we then sat alone and faced those different nations of Europe. I could mention them all. Within the last five or six years twenty-two countries, I think, have been granted most-favoured-nation treatment.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: In our tariff?

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: By special treaty.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: But if we do not purport to cover these subjects we rest where we were before.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: Are we covered by Great Britain?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. Shipping interests, for example, would come under the Imperial Shipping Act.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: We are covered now.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, we are covered now.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: And as regards protection of the person?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: And the holding of property?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: There would be the common law of nations, or a special treaty made by Great Britain on behalf of British subjects.

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

### 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.

### APPROPRIATION BILL NO. 5

#### SECOND AND THIRD READINGS

Bill 109, an Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1934.—Right Hon. Mr. Meighen.

### CRIMINAL CODE BILL

#### COMMONS DISAGREEMENT WITH SENATE AMENDMENT

On the Order:

Consideration of a message from the House of Commons to acquaint this House that they disagree with the amendment made to Bill 71, an Act to amend the Criminal Code.

53721—36½

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Honourable senators, I move:

That the Senate do not insist on its first amendment to Bill 71, intituled "An Act to amend the Criminal Code," but substitute the following in lieu of the said amendment:

Page 2, line 14. Add the following as a proviso to subsection 2 of section 3:

Provided that this subsection shall not apply in the case of two persons who though in fact living in adultery are living apparently respectably as man and wife and where the children affected are the children of such union.

This addition to subsection 2 would entirely remove from the purview of the Bill the kind of case referred to by the honourable gentleman opposite (Hon. Mr. Dandurand). That being so, I think this House would have no objection to subsection 3, which we previously thought should be deleted. That is the subsection which makes it an irrebuttable presumption that a child is in danger of being or becoming immoral in certain circumstances.

While on my feet may I call attention to the fact that the House of Commons, in its message informing us of its disagreement with our amendment to section 3, has made no reference at all to our other amendments to this Bill. There appears to have been an inadvertent omission, and I ask that you, Mr. Speaker, call the attention of the House of Commons to this omission.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: My summise would be that our other amendments are concurred in.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: But there must be a specific statement.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: The right honourable leader has moved that we do not insist upon our previous amendment to section 3, but that we add to subsection 2 of that section the proviso which he has read. I am not the only member of this Chamber who feels that there is some danger in the latitude which the Bill gives to magistrates. Very much will depend upon the spirit in which the law is applied. However, the important consideration is the protection of children, and for this reason I intend to register no opposition to the procedure suggested by the right honourable gentleman.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: I have asked the Clerk to prepare a message to the House of Commons drawing attention to the omission to refer to a number of amendments made by the Senate to this Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at 3 p.m.