

must be destroyed. Not only abuse of early parole and weekend passes is responsible for this insecurity, but also the manner in which the so-called bail reform act has been implemented. Time and time again, when men are apprehended in the commission of a crime, with no thought as to their past record, they are returned immediately to society under this bail reform act. When they go beyond their normal occupations of drug pushers and thieves and become murderers as well, does the government accept blame for the fact that they are at large? Not likely!

Not only will the government not accept any blame, but the police are accused by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) of attempting to subvert the act by returning these men to society. Not content with this, this same minister who is responsible for justice tells judges who criticize his policies that they are to remain silent, that they are not to comment on this government's policies. Surely it is irresponsible for a minister, when faced with the patent failure of a law to protect the public—however much it may be protecting the criminal—to further increase the insecurity of an already jittery public by attacking the very men upon whom our security rests on a day to day basis.

In this I do not exaggerate. Some of my people are concerned about the fact that under prevailing conditions it may no longer be possible to attract good men into our police force. It is clear that the present government has acted in such a manner that the police are seriously inhibited in the performance of their functions, and that this has engendered such insecurity that retentionist sentiment has grown.

The easy return of criminals into society is the greatest cause of insecurity, but the general tone of permissiveness that this government has engendered has played its part as well. Parents are concerned about the world into which their children are growing. The people of Niagara riding are concerned about drug abuse because they see its effects upon many of our young people. But the LeDain commission and the Committee on Youth are all for legalization. The Prime Minister stated "there is little difference between marijuana and alcohol use," and the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) said that Rochdale is "an experiment worth continuing." The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) downgrades the drug problem by making alcohol the prime concern. These acts by the government have not gone unnoticed. In fact, they have led to many suggestions that drug pushers should be executed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) wishes to rise on a question of privilege?

Mr. Allmand: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the hon. member would want to mislead the House, but neither the LeDain commission, the government, the Minister of Justice nor the Minister of National Health and Welfare have ever suggested that marijuana should be legalized. I suggest that the hon. member read the report of the LeDain commission. It did not make that recommendation, nor did any members of the government.

Capital Punishment

M. Hueglin: I did not mislead the House. I did not say that they said it should be legalized—the LeDain commission said that.

Mr. Allmand: It did not. It suggested that the penalties should be changed.

Mr. Hueglin: What is the difference?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. Unless these kinds of interventions are made so as to correct a misunderstanding, they are not in order.

Mr. Hueglin: I take the matter under advisement, Mr. Speaker. If the minister wishes to make a distinction between removing the penalties and making marijuana legal, then I am prepared to accept the criticism. It makes no difference in the minds of the people.

● (1710)

"Doing your own thing" until the October 30 election was the theme of the government, and while it has not been so pronounced during this Parliament, the damage of four years has taken its toll. Average law-abiding citizens are concerned about the direction of the society in which they and their children are living. But what assurance did they get from the government, even as late as the Speech from the Throne? They got the reassurance that rehabilitation of the criminal element came first and that protection of society came second. First comes the individual, even though he has already outlawed himself, and only then comes society. Most Canadians are tired of being used as guinea pigs for fancy theories.

It is strange that even the argument used to justify the release of prisoners has come back to haunt the government: Save money by releasing prisoners. Save thousands of dollars per head. Well, this argument is now advanced by many who have been influenced by such propaganda, but in this form—if it costs so much to incarcerate a murderer, let him hang. Ironic, isn't it, how governments' arguments are of times used against them? Try as he will, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister cannot make this question academic. He cannot do so because our citizens are concerned about the safety of their families and they perceive the law relating to premeditated murder as the keystone in the arch of justice, a keystone that if removed will cause the whole arch to tumble and leave them defenceless at the hands of criminals. In the words of Bernard Cohen, published in *Chitty's Law Journal* of March, 1972:

Nowadays, by common consent, murder is considered as no more than the principle highlight in a broad spectrum of impermissible acts. Since the intention is that everyone be penalized in proportion to the gravity of his offence, scarcely any sociological commitment is required on the part of anyone, to discover that the scaling down of the traditional penalty for murder, in all logic, ought to be attended also by some adjustment of penalties for secondary crimes such as manslaughter, rape, theft, and so forth; and this adjustment has indeed taken place. The cancellation of the death penalty for murder can be said to have marked the beginning of, and set the stage for, our present era of *laissez faire* towards all crimes and criminals.

Peace, order and good government are the primary responsibilities of the federal government of Canada under the written section of our constitution. That the