

is no law, or existing law is not enforced, the "law of the jungle" obtains—there is no order, and the liberty of a majority of the citizens is assailed without restraint. And so law and order have come to be almost synonymous terms, and the expression conveys a single idea.

Mr. Speaker, those who now apply capital punishment—crooks and criminals—endanger the liberty of other citizens; when you read the newspapers, you see that scarcely a day goes by in just the city or region of Montreal without the most sordid murders' endangering the lives of citizens, to such an extent that you dare not venture into certain districts and certain streets in the evening or at night. It is the same in the larger towns, and very often even in the country. Why is that? It is precisely because a certain number of the individuals who make up society refuse to obey its laws.

Later on in the same book, there is a reflection by Charles Reith, quoted from *The Police Idea*.

The fundamental problem which confronts the world today is the finding of means of providing authority with force which will compel respect for its laws and without which, as all history knows, it must inevitably and repeatedly fail to function.

Now that strength no longer exists nowadays in the police force because it no longer has the authority needed to indict those people and bring them before the court. Even if capital punishment still applies whenever a police officer is murdered, some police officers risk their life every day in attempting to arrest those criminals and when they commit them for trial, those criminals are often released on bail and the following day, those same individuals thumb their nose at the police officers who arrested them the day before and who risked their life doing so. And when those individuals come back before the court, they are sentenced to a few years' imprisonment.

That is what we call a life sentence, which is absolutely false because the maximum is 20 years. And people who committed as horrible a crime as murder seldom serve their sentence. Therefore people are puzzled and rightly so.

Again in the Montreal newspaper *La Presse*, Guy Cormier wrote a very interesting article and I quote:

Most of the arguments for the abolition of capital punishment are acceptable . . .

That does not mean that people in favour of the abolition of the death penalty are always wrong. Our society is ill, that is a fact.

I come back to the quotation:

They have been so often analyzed under so many aspects in books, articles, letters and manifestoes that in trying to summarize them, one could not make head or tail of them. Considering the irrevocable character of a punishment determined by a naturally fallible human reason, that alone would tell in favour of reducing as much as possible the number of cases where it should apply.

In those last words, Guy Cormier recommends prudence and I believe everybody agrees with him. The article says further on:

Because, if any error can be rectified on earth, no one will ever manage to compensate for the loss of life unjustly inflicted. Now, the black book of punishments contains cases where it had been impossible to establish beyond the shadow of a doubt the guilt of the defendant.

Capital Punishment

Nevertheless, there is an aspect of this matter which should embarrass convinced abolitionists.

Indeed, since the state has relieved the executioner from his duties, one notes that criminals make up the only category of citizens who persist in preserving the former tradition.

I said so a while ago.

Again I quote:

They have not abolished the death penalty; they go on applying it with gruesome briskness. Since 1967, when Canada temporarily ceased to send convicted murderers to the gallows, the criminals have, on their own account, applied the death penalty to the rate of 376 annually. Naturally, we are referring to murders. Those abominations happen in the dark, unwitnessed and even without a semblance of justice.

And I will add without any kind of trial. Mr. Guy Cormier goes on to write:

The victims, you know them, their bodies are on the front pages of tabloids specialized in daily horror. Last week, it was a young girl of 22. She crawled 200 feet before dying. That comes under the heading "miscellaneous".

I would like the tender hearted who are quickly softened by the murderers' fate and the leagues dedicated to the defense of human rights to subdue their campaign addressed to the public, to turn at last towards the real party, that is the murderers themselves. Let them try to convince those people to abandon their barbarous and cruel methods of taking their "law" into their own hands. Because the assassins are the ones who persist in applying themselves capital punishment to the detriment of innocent people most of the time.

● (2020)

Does that mean that we must come back to old, rigid methods and multiply gallows? Certainly not. But we must act with discrimination.

The suspension of capital punishment decided in 1967 for a five year trial period did not apply in principle to bandits killing policemen. That exception is logical: it still is. Because if you do not punish by death the murderer of a policeman there is no reason for having a police force at all in a country. Killers of children should also be sent to the gallows. Cases of kidnapping and piracy should be dealt with the same severity.

Since the beginning of time, humanity had to drag along incurable outcasts. Such people are to be eliminated from society. It is not even worth taking the risk of confining them to a prison that they will leave one day by escaping from it or because of a stupid or complacent official.

We have seen a lot of stupid or complacent officials not too long ago.

Pardoning a man who should be put to death is condemning the widow, the orphans, the parents of the victim to pay taxes to house, feed, clothe, entertain the assassin for the rest of his life. That injustice is added to the first one.

Mr. Speaker, as I said in my opening remarks before the House took recess, I will be voting against Bill C-2 precisely because I have not been convinced that the abolition of capital punishment would meet a need in our society.

The death penalty was maintained for the murder of a policeman or a prison guard.

I personally think, Mr. Speaker, that a bank manager or a drugstore manager or any businessman who are also family heads are as much in danger as any policeman or prison guard because in many cases what criminals are interested in is mainly the money in the cash boxes behind the counters and they will shrink from nothing to try to get it.