

*Amendments Respecting Death Sentence*

agree there is a great deal of risk involved and that they are not paid enough. I say we should pay them more to compensate them for the risk.

I do not think they should be put into a special category wherein their lives are set up as something more sacred than the life of a Jewish storekeeper, such as the one in Toronto who was shot in cold blood the other day and whose wife subsequently died of a broken heart. I believe that man's life is just as valuable and important as the life of any police officer or prison official that I know. I think if we paid them properly they would not mind undertaking the risks that they do; they would undertake them happily and willingly just as men in many walks of life undertake risks. What about nuclear scientists, what about radiation technologists, what about medical men in certain categories working with certain viruses, what about soldiers, what about pilots? They risk their lives every day.

Police officers and prison officials also risk their lives every day. I agree there are probably limited instances where people are channelled into lines of work that they do not particularly aspire to or desire, but in most instances they are in that line of work because they are motivated to it and at some level of their personality, mentality and psyche they are satisfied with the kind of work they are doing. They would certainly like, and expect to be compensated for the extra risk they are taking, but I suggest there is quite a discrepancy between monetary compensation and the kind of quasi-religious compensation that we are injecting into this proposed legislation.

In conclusion I should like to attest, for the sake of the Solicitor General, that I intend to vote for this bill. I intend to vote for it while agonized and torn by conscience. It does not satisfy my heart for one moment. I feel that my position may be construed in some quarters as a rather unfortunate one, in that at one level I think it could be suggested, as I said earlier in my remarks, that I am being used here in an exercise that is not really a true and legitimate expression of conscience on this question. But I believe the Solicitor General has conscientiously and sincerely in his heart laboured and toiled in these vineyards to produce a step along the path of Canadian social progress that I believe is necessary, desirable and worth while. Because in the two years I have been here the Solicitor General has impressed me as much

[Mr. Sherman.]

as anybody in this chamber, I intend to support the bill.

**Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to make some remarks about Bill No. C-168, an act to amend the Criminal Code. This bill introduced by the Solicitor General (Mr. Penell) the other day proposes to confine for an experimental period of only five years the possible imposition of the death penalty to murderers of police officers and prison guards while on duty. In short, the crux of this bill is a change in the definition of capital murder.

This new bill aims to repeal section 202A of the Criminal Code by stating that murder is capital murder only when a police officer or prison guard is murdered while on duty. This means that one class of our society is being favoured by the bill. The bill affords special protection, special treatment, favourable discrimination to people who are well trained to defend themselves, and people who are well armed.

The bill does not offer any of this special consideration to the helpless, innocent and undefended citizens such as the gentleman referred to by previous speakers, a tailor in my riding of Parkdale, who was shot to death last week. For this reason Bill No. C-168 I think can be regarded as objectionable and unfair.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is logically indefensible. Because the basis of the bill is that capital punishment does not and will not protect anyone, I ask: Why preserve capital punishment for the murderers of policemen or prison guards only?

Arguments have been made in the house that the death penalty should be abolished because life is sacred; but facts do not bear this out. The law of our country permits the police to shoot to kill if they are apprehending a suspected criminal. It also permits us to shoot to kill in self-defence, and it sends members of our armed forces to war and to kill. If life is really sacred and inviolable, logic dictates that we make no exceptions, that we carry out this principle to its full logical conclusions.

I also truly believe that this bill is ill-timed. It is ill-timed and premature because the Canadian Committee on Corrections, established by this government in June, 1965, under the chairmanship of Hon. Mr. Justice Roger Quimet is still studying a broad field