

Capital Punishment

● (1620)

Then at page 254 of the evidence there is this question from the Crown attorney:

All right. Would you like to go back into the box. What was the accused's attitude during the time you were in his company?

A. He was very nonchalant, sir. He asked me for a cigarette, and then when we were leaving the scene, or the car was leaving the scene in the police car W.H.Q.

That is Windsor headquarters. The questioning continued:

Q. Did you get the cigarette?

A. I looked at him—

Meaning Dwyer.

—and said, "You guys are crazy; just had a gun to my head and now you want a cigarette." He said—

Again, meaning Dwyer.

—"I would not shoot you, I would hang for that."

I believe, therefore, that capital punishment is a deterrent. This police officer was alive to tell the tale because he was not shot. He was not shot because Dwyer did not want to hang, and he said so in sworn evidence. I do not care what people say about statistics, Mr. Speaker. I say that if you talk to individual people you will find capital punishment is a deterrent. I am not saying it is a deterrent in 100 per cent of the cases, but here is evidence that at least one person is alive because it was a deterrent.

I want to close by making two further points. I do not believe the government has been honest with the Canadian people because it has not carried out the law during the five-year period of abolition of capital punishment in the case of the murder of police officers and prison guards. They did not give the law a true trial. When the period was extended in 1973, again the government was not honest. In fact, before the bill was out of committee the Solicitor General tried to change it to an abolition bill entirely. The government does not invoke the law and, as a result, it has been laughed at ever since. The government's trickery and manipulation has continued.

In addition, the government has been using the Canadian taxpayers' money to try to force the opinion of cabinet, which is for abolition, on the people. For example, in question No. 5,348 I asked the Solicitor General about the monthly magazine *Liaison*, volume 2, No. 2 for March, 1976, which dealt with the peace and security legislation, a governmental piece of propaganda if ever there was one. In this magazine the government speaks of capital punishment and its "great" gun control bill, to which the Solicitor General has now introduced 43 amendments since, having listened to people, he has found out it is not so great.

The government has spent \$8,252 of the taxpayers' money on trying to convince people that abolition was the right thing and to support the cabinet's case. Some 9,300 copies of this magazine were printed, and a copy was distributed to every member of parliament.

I thought it only fair, if the government wants to be fair and to take a reasoned look at this question, to allow the other side of the coin to be explained also at taxpayers' expense, so in the fifth part of my question I asked whether the government intended to publish the next issue containing views contrary to the government's own politi-

[Mr. Dick.]

cal views relating to peace and security, as set out in Bill C-83 and Bill C-84. The answer, Mr. Speaker, screams; it is "No". As I say, this is a departmental publication paid by the taxpayers. People who receive *Liaison* do so free of charge, and it puts only one side of the question, that of abolition, which is the view of the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice. The government does not want to discuss and will not provide space at taxpayers' expense for the other side of the question. I think this is cheap, rotten trickery on behalf of the Solicitor General and is completely in line with his own steadfast view on abolition and "I don't want to hear about anything else".

The government would not, of course, want to publish what has been published on other occasions, such as the view of University of Chicago economist Professor Ehrlich that from 1935 to 1969 each additional execution per year may have resulted in seven to eight fewer murders being committed. They do not print such figures because it is contrary to their view. Although this article has been challenged by a number of abolitionists and others who deal with statistics, and indeed has been found to be statistically complicated, it nevertheless happens to be a view. If the government wants to have reasonable discussion of the question it should give us a balanced view, especially when every member in this place knows that 78 per cent of the taxpayers happen to disagree with the government. Yet the government spends taxpayers' money against the taxpayers' wishes.

There is little more that I can say, Mr. Speaker. I have tried to outline the areas that concern me. People continually misrepresent murder. When they should be talking of homicide, they talk of murder. Any death that results from a premeditated criminal act should be classified as a case of murder; this should be so in all cases, not just in the case of prison guards and police officers. I have stated that the government have undermined the judicial system. They have not concentrated upon rehabilitation. Through the parole system and weak bail laws, they have over the years undercut the sense of security that people had. They have commuted 100 per cent of the death sentences that have been handed down—and this is wrong. I believe capital punishment is a deterrent, and I have quoted from a court record evidence that I believe bolsters that opinion. I think the Solicitor General has been absolutely wrong in spending the taxpayers' money to outline his and the cabinet's side of the issue without giving equal time and space to the other side.

I should like to repeat something that I said in 1973. I used to be an abolitionist until I became a Crown attorney and prosecuted criminals every day for almost three years. Having prosecuted and dealt with criminals in that atmosphere, and knowing them as the professionals that they consider themselves to be and their attitude to the law, I reluctantly changed my view. I will become an abolitionist again when the people of this country regain their sense of peace and security.

I believe that if the government implemented many of the protective measures in Bill C-83 and Bill C-84 for the good of society—though I should add there is an awful lot of junk in the bills as well—and allowed a period of, say, five or six years to go by so that society could regain its self-confidence and sense of security, then no matter what