

guilty of an offence and liable, on summary conviction before two justices, to a penalty not exceeding fifty dollars and not less than ten dollars, or to imprisonment for any term not exceeding three months, with or without hard labour, or to both, and in default of payment of such penalty, to a term or a further term of imprisonment not exceeding three months with or without hard labour.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—This increases the term of imprisonment.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—It seems to me that three months is a very small maximum imprisonment for the committal of a crime which has become prevalent of late in Canada, namely the use of the knife.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—There is a possibility of the offender getting another three months. The clause for which this is substituted, provides a penalty not exceeding \$50 and, in default, imprisonment for 30 days.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—A man who uses a knife should be sent down for three years at least.

Hon. Mr. POWER—While I have the greatest sympathy with the leader of the opposition with respect to prize fighting, I cannot say that I agree with him as to this particular enactment. A man might have about his person a bowie-knife or slung-shot, or instrument loaded at the end; it is a very objectionable thing, and he renders himself liable to a fine of \$50 and to be imprisoned for three months.

The clause was adopted.

On clause 228a.

By inserting immediately after section 228 the following section:—

"228A. 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."

Hon. Mr. POWER.—There is a good deal of doubt as to the policy of such an enactment as this. As the law stands now, the keeper of a house is guilty of an indictable offence, but the woman who is an inmate of the House is not liable to any severe penalty. The effect of passing this enactment, if it is enforced, will be that the inmates of those places, instead of being gathered in houses of that character, will be spread through the community, and I think that is a highly objectionable thing. Further, if one who goes to a place of that

kind is made liable to this penalty, the probabilities are that he would indulge his inclinations in some place where he would do much more mischief. I think we should eliminate this clause.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.—I do not agree with my hon. friend. We cannot be too severe in punishing such offences. Take the city of Montreal for instance. There the bishops and priests have recently issued manifestoes endeavouring to suppress those houses; but the number of such places is increasing day by day. It is a terrible scandal in Montreal.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—We are indulging in a lot of maudlin sentiment, in reference to offences which certainly cannot be suppressed. In my judgment, the only way to do is to have proper police regulations to control houses of this kind. It is an easy matter to establish that a man is a habitual frequenter, to render him liable to six months' imprisonment if we impose the excessive penalty for the offence provided for in this section. The law goes sufficiently far as we find it, if it were only enforced. The difficulty is that it is not enforced, and when there is non-enforcement of a law, Parliament is deluged with petitions from all kinds of organizations, calling for the suppression of vice. The idea seems to be that by legislating we can put an end to these evils, and we are cultivating in the public mind the idea that by placing heavy penalties upon the statute book we can usher in the millenium. That is entirely wrong. I move to strike that out.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It will be a shock to the community that the Senate should oppose any legislation of this kind, when they know that disreputable houses are growing so bold that they bribe the police and are allowed to continue. In the last ten years, they increased very largely in all parts of Canada, simply because they are not punished.

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN—Instead of saying 'liable to six months,' should we not amend it and say, 'Not to exceed six months' imprisonment.'

Hon. Mr. POWER—That is what it means. That does not change the meaning at all.