

streets of one of our cities, and no one coming to her protection. This is what may happen in Canada. When the policeman calls "Assist me because I am unable to tackle this gang", do you know what a citizen is going to say? He will answer that he refuses to assist because of a law which was passed in parliament. How can we have any respect for this law? Better to make it entirely in favour of abolition, because this is a bad law and hon. gentlemen opposite are making a mockery of justice.

If a citizen fails to come forward and assist the police when requested, he can be charged and sent to gaol for two years. Will the minister tell us that he intends to see that this law is carried out, or that the attorneys general of the various provinces will implement this particular provision? I question it. As far as I am concerned, there is no foundation for such a bad law. If it is intended to make an exemption, let us make a logical and reasonable exemption. Otherwise this is just a device used to get a measure through this house, no matter how bad it is, no matter that it lacks all principle. It is simply a matter of expediency.

I heard one hon. member say "oh". I do not believe the Acting Prime Minister will take that attitude. I believe he realizes that my stand is a correct one. When we pass laws, let us make sure they are reasonable laws. I have voted in favour of retention but I am prepared to vote for complete abolition rather than vote for such a version as this.

An hon. Member: Why didn't you?

Mr. Woolliams: I will answer that question. I thought the Solicitor General would accept the amendment—that he would appreciate the weakness in the bill as drafted. I do not think this weakness was realized until I raised the point, and the hon. gentleman's colleagues are now saying to him: "Do not change it; we will railroad the bill through, bad or not." They say it is to be a free vote. I leave that to the consciences of everyone here. I have read out the relevant sections of the code, and I say the government is legislating to establish two classes of people tonight. Remember, we are not dealing with unimportant situations; we are dealing with a matter which affects the morality of the country, the criminal law and the administration of justice.

● (8:20 p.m.)

If the citizens of the country do not respect law, then the first seeds of that which brings

Amendments Respecting Death Sentence

about riots and other conditions in society have been sown. This is what has happened in the United States. Therefore, I intend to move my amendment now. I move:

That after the words "employed for" in the eleventh line of section 1 subsection (2) (a) will be added the words "or engaged in" and the word "duties" in the same subsection line 13 be deleted and the word "duty" be substituted therefor.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I again enter into this debate. It was with reluctance I discovered that the subject of capital punishment was to come before us again this year, after having been decided by the house a year and a half ago. Two weeks ago when I on short notice participated in the debate on second reading I was reluctant to do so because of the subject matter. Well, despite that feeling on my part, I am obliged tonight to enter into the discussion because of the nature of the debate generally and the way in which the Solicitor General is resisting a reasonable approach on this occasion.

Before the adjournment for the supper hour I expressed some regret at the nature of the contribution that was made by the Prime Minister when he spoke on this bill, and when he emphasized that retaliation was one of the main points, apparently, of those who favoured retention, and that deterrence was the other. He gave the greater emphasis to deterrence. I pointed out how he had failed to deal with the other arguments which had been produced in this house, and certainly the argument which I made concerning the protection of society.

I am not at all concerned about retaliation; I reject that. On the subject matter of deterrence I have said in the past that I thought the statistics quoted on each side of the problem were not convincing. I rejected the statement of those who said that fear of punishment or fear of death was not a factor with regard to those who committed crimes. I still remain unconvinced with regard to that argument.

I notice, sir, that over in Great Britain where the abolition of capital punishment has been in effect for two years there has been an increase in crimes of capital murder. I think the Solicitor General, when he was giving us figures the other day, should have drawn that to our attention. I happened to be in England a month ago. In the newspapers I read a public letter by Duncan Sandys, member of parliament, which pointed out that the five year experimental abolition of capital punishment in England was to come to an