

Doherty). He is a good man; he has been on the Bench and he knows something about these things. If he does not, then one of his successors will. The time has come in Canada when legalized murder should be discontinued. As I have said, two alternatives are open to us: what Moses did, and what the Lord did. Which shall we choose?

I have asked the Government to give this legislation a trial. No harm can be done by making the experiment between the close of one session and the beginning of another. Let us make the experiment, and I venture to say that if we do so we shall never again go back to capital punishment. I will go further and say that if the Government will agree to give this legislation a trial and it is found that I am mistaken, I will resign my seat in this House. This shows how sure I am that if capital punishment is abolished in Canada it will never be re-established.

I do hope that the Prime Minister will see the necessity of giving this legislation a trial. Let me close by saying that Moses shed the blood of his enemies, while the Lord shed his blood for his enemies.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris): Undoubtedly the hon. gentleman has given this question a great deal of thought and research. He made two very strong, if not bold, assertions. If I understood the hon. gentleman aright, he said that capital punishment is a stimulus to murder rather than a deterrent. I should like to know how the hon. gentleman came to that conclusion. One other question. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that if we are going to have capital punishment, the more public the form this punishment takes, the better.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I did not say that. I said that if you contend that capital punishment is a deterrent, then the more public it is the better.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Looking upon 'deterrent' as applying personally to the individual concerned, I do not see how capital punishment would be a greater deterrent if the man who committed the murder were punished publicly than if the punishment were administered in private.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: If the hon. gentleman himself believes—and I know he does—that capital punishment is a deterrent, then it should be made as public as possible; hang the poor man up where everyone can see him.

[Mr. Bickerdike.]

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): While I do not agree with the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, I do him the credit—and I think every member in this House will do so—for the earnestness and sincerity with which he advocates what he believes to be right.

The question of capital punishment may be considered from several different viewpoints; I am going to deal with it only from one. Considering it from the viewpoint of punishment for a crime committed, I think there are worse things than hanging. If the hon. gentleman argues that the worst thing you can do to a man is to put a rope round his neck and by that means send him into eternity, then I take issue with him. After all, what are the circumstances? Occasionally a man who has committed the crime of murder pays the penalty by being hanged. Why make a fuss about an occasional hanging? Why make a fuss about the occasional taking of life in that way? Men are being murdered by the dozen in a worse way than that in our penitentiaries—the result of the administration, or mal-administration, of justice at the present time. If hanging is a crime, then I submit that worse crimes than that are committed against men. To place a man in a prison and take away from him everything but the breath of life—and that is being done right along, and apparently is being approved right along—is, in my estimation, even worse than actually to take a man's life. The hon. gentleman mentioned the case of a murder committed in the Pacific coast province, in which two men were involved. He says that only one shot was fired, and that, therefore, at least one of these men was wrongfully hanged. While I am not a lawyer, I think that the hon. gentleman is wrong in that respect; these men were both committing an unlawful act, and, consequently, were both responsible. But supposing only one of them had been hanged, and that the other had been mercifully saved and sent, we will say, to Kingston penitentiary. Let us follow the career of the poor unfortunate who goes to Kingston penitentiary. He is confined in a cell, and is allowed to go out for exercise and fresh air. He is not permitted to utter a sound; to speak a word to a guard or to a fellow convict is a misdemeanour. He is probably put on the stone pile, cracking stone month after month and year after year. He is subjected to tauntings and goadings and tor-