

aggressor. These days, one must be able to face an aggressor, because it is the only way to protect one's life. This should be the case with drivers of every public vehicle, while on the job. Why do so many honest citizens fall victims to their aggressors? Simply because they were attacked by a well-armed individual. If they had been armed, if they had been holding a firearm licence while on the job, most probably the murderer would have been the first to fall. This would have relieved society, without the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) being able to save the murderer at the victim's expense. Everyone should have the right to self defence against the one who wants to take his life. That is the right to live, Mr. Speaker. This is the right that honest people have to keep their life.

Several people will be surprised by such a liberalization, but it is the only way, Mr. Speaker, to have law and order respected as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) advocated this afternoon, in this era of liberalism we live in, when the greatest offenders are favoured by the greatest judiciary protection ever seen in Canada. We demand that protection for the honest and peaceful man be guaranteed. Is it asking too much from our Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker? In the ridiculous judicial system we live in, government authorities continually pity our criminals while thousands of victims are left without any protection, when their name is not even mentioned.

● (2050)

When shall we have legal reform that gives priority to the victims of criminals? Today, we worry about the criminals, but we never think about their thousands of victims. They are never mentioned. Let them fend for themselves, let them organize themselves. For instance, we show concern for the criminals, we think that we do not give them enough, that we should build houses for them and allow them to go out two or three times a week, and send them women at least every night to console them, but we never talk about the thousands of victims of these same criminals. Today, we multiply paroles and allow the killers sentenced to life imprisonment—the term is “life imprisonment”—to commit one, two, three and even four murders, or we allow the numerous organized escapes which have well-known consequences.

The first reform should therefore be to consider the conditions of the victims of crime, which are often very painful. The government has introduced no legislation to compensate the victims. We have talked about this quite often, but there is still no legislation to help and compensate these victims. What is the minister waiting for? When shall we stop orienting our justice simply towards the rehabilitation of criminals, and bring help to the hundreds of victims which remain marked and often handicapped for life. On the contrary, the minister seems to want to give criminals a medal.

When shall we finally amend our legislation so as to give more protection and security to police officers when they are dealing with criminals? Our police officers have to wait for the bandit to shoot at them before they can shoot back. This is equivalent to condemning police officers to suicide. And what about police officers who appear as witnesses in criminal cases. The evidence of the criminal is more highly considered than that of the police officer. I have occasionally followed the work of certain police

Measures Against Crime

officers in murder cases, and I came out of the court disillusioned, because our laws give all the protection wanted to the murderers and nothing to the police officers. They are often ridiculed. After such events, we have a tendency to blame the judge, but it is our laws that we should blame.

I have myself often had the tendency to be dissatisfied with certain judges, but when examining the whole facts, I realized that the laws were responsible after I had discussed the matter with the judge and after he had told me: I could not do otherwise. The laws must be corrected. There is a lack in that respect at present in our laws.

If we want order, we must first protect those who are appointed to maintain order. I heard someone say earlier that policemen must come under the same terms as others. That is not true, Mr. Speaker. Policemen are men of law who must not be considered as plain civilians. They have rights. They have powers. They must be a tool for them. This bill proposes to increase the number of parole commissioners to 26. I will say in passing—without taking too much time although I would like very much to discuss those famous paroles more at length—that most members recognize today that paroles have become ridiculous; I wonder whether it is changed today or if we still continue to release all prisoners to allow them to go and commit other murders or armed robberies.

Increasing the number of commissioners will not solve the problem. It will be solved when the government will do something—I say the government because we know that the minister always has the last word, just like the Solicitor General always has the last word and may release whomever he wants.

I read in the paper that a guy sentenced to life did four years in prison. Imagine how painful it must be for a murderer to do four years in prison! The Solicitor General can do that, or the minister can intervene in paroles. There is no need to ask ourselves why today we see so many robberies and murders; it is because of the famous paroles. We want to rehabilitate prisoners. But when a person has been sentenced to 5, 10 or 15 years in jail, let him serve his time. If he has been sentenced to 15 years in prison, let him stay there for 15 years!

I say that parole should not even exist. We should instead give a just sentence. Some judges, considering that parole is so easy to obtain, say to themselves: We will give a criminal 10 years in prison, and he will serve four. But that is not right. If we want fair justice, let us give a sentence of three or four years, but let the prisoner serve it. We should not follow the example of unions in wage settlements. Organized workers say: We will ask for \$8 to get \$5. That is not justice. If it is three years, it is three years, if it is five, it is five.

When the person convicted has been sentenced to five years, it is not the role of a board, in spite of the judge's decision, to release the prisoner after two years in jail. Then why do we have judges? Thus we do not need judges any more; let us ask immediately the opinion of the parole board to see how long a prisoner must stay in jail. I think this is ridiculing our judicial system. As long as the appointment of commissions or judges will be political, and this is true in any area, we will have political results.