

Mr. EULER: Is it within the discretion of the magistrate or the court to impose a sentence of less than a year, or can he pass a suspended sentence, or anything of that sort?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Of course a judge has power to suspend sentence, unless we take away that power. But the idea was that a man who is carrying concealed weapons should be subject to a term of one year for the offence but not more than five. I am sorry to say that according to the reports from the police associations of various cities in Canada the number of persons found carrying pistols and revolvers has in recent years very largely increased. It is the commonest thing now when a man is arrested for crime, upon searching him in the police court, to discover that he has in his possession a pistol or revolver. He may be a man with a long criminal record. The present penalties for carrying such a weapon are not considered very severe. It is felt that if restrictions are placed upon the sale, and greater penalties are imposed for the offence of carrying, the traffic in these weapons will at least be considerably diminished.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Section 1 replaces eleven sections of the criminal code by new sections. I suggest that we should take every section individually.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It does not replace them all by new sections. Many are just repetitions of the old.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But it is better to adopt each one separately.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I understand this action is being taken largely on the recommendation of the various police associations?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No; I did not intend to convey that idea. I consulted some police associations, but the action is taken on the representation of city councils, boards of trade and other organizations of the kind throughout Canada.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have no objection whatever to making the law as stringent as may be necessary, with regard to the carrying of arms. But there is one point I should like to raise, and it is this: What sort of regulation is there with regard to the carrying of revolvers and pistols by the police themselves? In the old country, as a good many know, the ordinary police constables do not carry revolvers. They have batons merely. A few days ago in the city of Montreal there was brought to our notice an outrageous case of

a man being shot during the course of an eviction. I understand he was shot in the back by a police constable named Zappa. According to the press it seems there was a man there who had got behind in his rent owing to the compensation board not being prompt in paying him, and he was being evicted. A boarder went to the house to rescue some of his own personal belongings. Just what took place is not clear; according to the police he resisted; according to bystanders he had nothing whatever in his hand, and made no resistance. However, the fact is he was shot. Later there was a most disgraceful scene: It seems to be established by the reports of nearly all the papers in Montreal that at the time of the funeral, when some of the friends and sympathizers of the man who had thus been shot were proceeding with the cortege, the police intervened and broke up the funeral procession, using extreme violence, women and children being brutally knocked down. There was said by the papers to be no riot whatever and nothing in the way of disorder in the procession until the police intervened. That particular incident, to which a great deal of publicity was given in all the Montreal papers, both English and French, seems to point to the need of some supervision of the police themselves. If we are going to insist, as I think we should, that ordinary civilians do not go around armed with revolvers, I do not think it is fair that the police should be armed without having definite restrictions placed upon them. As I said a while ago, we talk about British traditions; police constables in England are not armed, they are in the United States, and apparently we are introducing that kind of thing here. I submit that one of the reasons we have armed criminals in this country is that they know they have to deal with constables who are armed with lethal weapons. I would like to see the government hold the police responsible.

Mr. HANBURY: May it be the reverse, that the police are armed because so many people are armed?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Well, I do not want to be misunderstood—I hope this measure passes. At the same time I think there ought to be very much more definite control of the police themselves. That one instance of a man shot in the back without any clear evidence that he was resisting arrest is sufficient, I think, to make any one who has any idea of British traditions rebel against the idea of the police being given such a free hand. This policeman, according to his own