

Capital Punishment

the people and governments are in opposition, and not only at the federal level, I might add.

● (2020)

Our people are concerned about the lack of control on individual licence in respect of drugs, pornography, murder and virtually all aspects of life. This abolitionist government, however, is determined to obtain its way. The very interesting amendments in committee showed their true colours. It is too bad the amendments were not accepted because then the government could have been held totally responsible for what would follow. But the amendments of the Solicitor General and the cabinet were ruled out of order.

These amendments advocated complete abolition, a position opposed by fully 88 per cent of those polled in the Niagara Falls riding. Over 55,000 people replied to the questionnaire sent out in this riding. The amendments were introduced with the concurrence of the cabinet, I presume in the belief that the true aims of the cabinet could be realized in legislation as well as in executive decree because of the 14-vote spread on this bill when it received second reading. This debate should have been delayed until the fall when people would have had a full interest in politics and public concern could have manifested itself more fully.

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Hueglin: Of course, you are not interested in the people. It has been introduced now when many electors are more concerned with living their private lives—

An hon. Member: Talk about yourself.

Mr. Hueglin: Mr. Speaker, let the hon. member at least attack me if he is going to speak. Otherwise I hope he remains quiet. It has been introduced now when many electors are more concerned with living their private lives and when our actions here fall on fewer ears than usual. This debate should have been held in the fall, but that it is held now is the government's will supported ably by some backbenchers.

We are addressing ourselves to the first amendment. This amendment does not go as far as the people wish. It will not allay all the concerns. However, it is a step in the right direction. If this amendment should pass, and I hope it will, it will be interesting to see whether, if a murder should occur under this provision, the law will be honoured, or whether the expressed will of the cabinet will prevail.

Almost three years ago now Canada was greatly upset by what was called a threat to our life as a nation. Lately we have seen the last of those who were accused of murdering Pierre Laporte convicted of a crime, but so late after the fact and so limited in gravity that little satisfaction is derived by those who have followed the case. Indeed, there is some discontent. The country was unsettled by the situation which developed in October 1970, and it is still unsettled because the rehabilitation of the individual rather than the protection of society is the priority of this government. The individual feels threatened. He must be granted security if life is to be lived in

[Mr. Hueglin.]

freedom from fear. The people of this country demand security. The government has denied them this. This amendment provides some deterrence to kidnapping and rape. For this reason it has merit and therefore I shall support it fully.

In his defence of abolition the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) introduced history to support his position. He said we move from barbarism to enlightenment and that this should be stressed. He said we should look for good and not evil. History will show periods of refinement and enlightenment.

History shows that man is a mixture of good and evil. The good must be fostered, but if the evil is not controlled by society, individual licence will destroy a civilization. We are in a period of permissiveness in which individual freedoms and demands dominate. But these are infringing on the paths of those who seek only to live their lives in peace and security and have no causes to promote. In the minds of the people the death penalty is the keystone; it is the ultimate sanction against anti-social acts. Let hon. members poll their constituents and they will find this is so. Let them prove whether the people fear, or whether, as the hon. member for Broadview says, the people walk the streets with no fear.

Our people want and need a strong statement from their leaders that society will be maintained, that permissiveness will end, and that order will be restored. It is my hope that this amendment will pass. It will perhaps deter some people from killing, and if it is put into effect it will certainly bring retribution to those who disregard society. This bill is an abomination. It should be withdrawn and replaced by the true feeling of the cabinet as shown by the amendments of the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand). It should be a bill of complete abolition. This amendment improves the bill, but allows others who commit premeditated murders to escape their just reward.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks on Bill C-2 entitled An Act to amend the Criminal Code. This bill was sent back to the House by the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs with two proposed amendments, one of which by the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Morin). May I be dispensed from reading it since the Chair has already done so.

I can understand that it was difficult for the members of the committee to pass those amendments according to the wishes of the members while respecting the Standing Orders. That explains the confusion at one point, of which the public was not made too much aware.

Still, the amendment of the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Morin) adds to the provisions of the act two types of murders which could be punished by death. And I commend the hon. member who made this afternoon a most convincing speech in support of her amendment. It was a speech by a true mother who knows life and who wants at all costs to see it respected in this country. And whoever jeopardizes the right to live in a truly Christian society should be punished.