

The Department has no deputy at that office. I believe Mr. Logan was in the employment of the postmaster previous to that date.

#### PACIFIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Has the Government expressed its willingness to contribute a subsidy in aid of the Pacific mail service, as announced by Lord Onslow in the House of Lords, on the 29th April? If so, to what amount? Is the proposed service to be fortnightly, tri-weekly, or monthly? What are the proposed terminal ports for the line?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the Imperial Government will grant a subsidy for a Pacific line of steamers of £60,000 sterling, the Canadian Government has expressed its willingness to ask the Canadian Parliament to contribute £15,000 annually to that amount. That matter is now under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government. It is hoped that with that sum we will get a good tri-weekly service.

Mr. EDGAR. Between what ports?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Between Vancouver and Hong Kong.

#### CUSTOMS OFFICER AT ST. GERMAIN DE RIMOUSKI

Mr. Fiset asked, What is the name (Christian and surname) of the officer of Customs appointed for the port of St. Germain de Rimouski, in the place of L. P. Gauvreau, deceased?

Mr. BOWELL. The name of the officer is Joseph Adhémar Martin.

#### WEST INDIA COMMISSION.

Mr. JONES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Finance when the report of the gentlemen who were sent to the West Indies, to open up trade with that country, will be laid on the Table.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I expect to be able to lay that on the Table to-morrow.

#### PUBLIC MORALS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend the Act respecting public morals and public convenience.—(Mr. Charlton).

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. CHARLTON. The Bill as passed by this House last Session, provided that any one unlawfully having connection with idiot or imbecile women or girls, is guilty of misdemeanor and liable to two years' imprisonment. Since then, representations have been made showing that insane women should also have been placed under the provisions of this Bill. I have had communications from the superintendents of various asylums in Ontario, on this point, and a Bill was introduced and became law which made the provision which this amendment proposes to cover—that the seduction of an insane woman shall be a misdemeanor as well as the seduction of an idiot or imbecile woman. It is merely adding "insane" after the words "idiot or imbecile."

On section 2,

Mr. CHARLTON. The Bill of last Session, as it passed this House, provided that the seduction of a female under Mr. McLELAN.

promise of marriage, the female being under the age of twenty-one, by a male over the age of eighteen, shall be a misdemeanor. The Bill was amended in the Senate, and as it passed that body it provided that the seduction of a female under the age of eighteen years, by a male over twenty-one, shall be a misdemeanor. I propose to restore the provision as it passed this House, viz.:

"Everyone above the age of eighteen years who, under promise of marriage, seduces and has illicit connection with any unmarried female of previously chaste character and under twenty-one years of age, is guilty of a misdemeanor and liable to two years' imprisonment."

Mr. THOMPSON. I presume the hon. gentleman will have no objection to amend the provision so as to read, "not to exceed two years' imprisonment," so as to leave some discretion with the court.

Mr. CHARLTON. That was the phraseology of the original Bill, and I am quite willing to accept the amendment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest that the age of the man should be placed at twenty-one and not at eighteen years. There is, in my opinion, quite as much risk of females of twenty-one seducing lads of eighteen or nineteen as there is the other way. Although I most heartily approve of the general principle of this measure, and I think the hon. gentleman has done great service to the community, I would suggest that the age limit be altered and the ages of the parties be made equal, at all events.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am perfectly willing to submit to the view of the committee with respect to changing the age to twenty-one. I do not know but that there is some force in what has been said by the hon. gentleman with respect to having the ages equal. Perhaps there might be cases where young men of eighteen or nineteen had not arrived at the age of discretion, but my observations in this country go to prove that young men of eighteen are pretty well informed as to the affairs of life. I should like an expression of opinion by the committee on this point.

Mr. BERGIN. I suggest that the proposal of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) be embodied in the Bill, and that, accordingly, another clause should be provided, by which young ladies of eighteen who seduce young gentlemen should be punished.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think there is no necessity for having this clause.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would point out that the Act at present only applied to females under eighteen years. I am willing that the age of the male shall be made twenty-one before he is liable to imprisonment; but it is important to give females the remedy up to the age of twenty-one years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman had better leave the clause as it is in the Act. A woman between eighteen and twenty-one is equal in age and worldly wisdom to a man of twenty-five years. I think that when girls are above eighteen they should protect themselves, and there is no need of special legislation. If the hon. gentleman presses this clause, the chances are that the whole Bill will be thrown out in the other branch of the Legislature, and we shall lose the advantage of a very great improvement in the first clause.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it very doubtful whether the other branch of the Legislature would, on account of this second clause, sacrifice the whole Bill. However, I cannot abstain from pressing it owing to any such possible contingency. I would point out that the general sentiment of the country which calls for legislation of this character considers the character of the Bill in this respect, as it now stands on the Statute-book, not a commendable one, and that