

and that the state must make its indispensable contribution towards its achievement. But there is another imperative task, the burden of which must be assumed by the state, and that is contributing to the security of the public. There is more than that, Mr. Speaker.

Not only is it the prime duty of the state to ensure the security of the public but it is also its duty to see to it that there is a feeling of security; in other words, not only is it the right of the people to have the protection which they may normally expect from society, but it is also their right to feel protected. The higher crime rate, its violent and brutal manifestations, the numerous prison breaks decrease the feeling of security among the population. The role of the state, as I said, is not only to ensure an effective degree of security but also to strengthen the feeling of security, that is to say the population has the right to be protected and also to feel protected.

What is happening today with all the measures which the people feel will improve the lot of the criminals? All of them contribute to decrease the feeling of security, and even if the people are effectively and truly protected, it remains that they are losing more and more the feeling of security and they feel less protected.

For that reason, I would say that it is essential, before initiating any reform in depth, to enlighten public opinion. Even though the abolitionists' argument be philosophically right and well grounded upon facts or statistics, if the public is worried, concerned, and doubtful as to the protection and security to which they are entitled from the state, abolition becomes improper and its advocates are wrong; it is necessary to reassure the people. Mr. Speaker, even if the abolition of the death penalty may be justified, the government has not completely fulfilled its task if the Canadian people still feel worried and insecure. This is why I say the government should launch a widespread campaign of education to prove that its action is appropriate, so that the people may feel more secure.

When we visit our ridings, rural ones in particular, we see that a great many country people are afraid. I think this fright could lead to social confusion, Mr. Speaker, and even to collective panic. Not only must the government ensure a real and effective protection, it must also provide a feeling of security which is lacking at the present time.

The people who are not very well informed and who hear about all sorts of bills to ease

Amendments Respecting Death Sentence
the burden or the condition of criminals wonder to what extent they are being protected. Mr. Speaker I repeat that even if they are really protected, the state must do more than just that. It must give them the feeling that they are protected and that they live in security.

That is why I urge the government, in implementing all the amendments to the Criminal Code, to undertake an information campaign to show the people that they are well protected; to shed light on the maximum security system which exists in some of our prisons and penitentiaries; to illustrate the efficiency of our police force. Otherwise, the feeling of insecurity may bring about a social breakdown and a collective panic.

Secondly, I feel that the bill, even though I am not satisfied with it, deserves to be supported for the simple reason that I am against hypocritical laws. I cannot accept a law which departs from its true significance.

There exists now, on the one hand, a law which is not enforced and, on the other hand, a state of affairs which contradicts the existence of this law; in other words, capital punishment has in practice been abolished. Therefore, it is abnormal that our statutes should contain a provision which is never enforced and that is why, being against hypocritical laws, I feel I should support this measure in the form in which it has been presented to the house, so that the law may be amended in accordance with the existing state of affairs.

However, this bill has a shortcoming in that it makes no distinction, practically speaking, between capital and non-capital murder. Capital murder implies premeditation and this is explained in section 202 (a), which is to be amended; in other words, according to this section as it now stands, capital murder is premeditated, and non-capital murder is not.

With such an amendment that distinction no longer exists and it is precisely in the case of policemen's murders that there is more often a lack of premeditation, because criminals will immediately murder policemen, when caught red-handed, to permit or facilitate their escape. There is then no premeditation. This is why the oversight in the bill is such that the distinction between capital murder and non-capital murder does not exist for all practical purposes.

However, I object and intend to move an amendment before third reading, because I think that any person convicted of premeditated murder—if capital punishment is to be