

*Capital Punishment*

**Mr. Robinson:** Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps the Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) would like to advise the House that the judge in question also said that women have no brains before the age of 30. It is the same judge—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** That is not a point of order. The Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) has the floor.

**Mr. Domm:** I predict two things today—and these are not matters that I came to lightly. I predict, first, that Parliament will be required to amend the Criminal Code, bringing in stiffer penalties, including capital punishment in certain circumstances, as a result of this debate; and secondly, I predict that, if the Senate refuses to pass the Criminal Code amendments as passed by the elected representatives of the people, supported by the majority of the Canadian people, the Government will embark on a program of major Senate reform, urged by the Canadian people to do just that.

In our parliamentary system of Government, the Government has the responsibility to represent constituents. When it comes to an issue of conscience, I realize the difficulties involved. I was raised as an abolitionist, the son of a United Church minister. I know the positions taken by abolitionists, and I respect those positions. What bothers me is that the abolitionists tend, very often, to personalize the debate, going so far as to call those who do not agree with them anti-Christian.

I have yet to hear a retentionist in Canada call another church leader anti-Christian because of that leader's support for abolition. Why do the abolitionists persist in this low-level debate, personalizing positions rather than discussing conscience?

A question raised earlier today was: Is there any deterrence effect in having capital punishment on the books?

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Domm:** I can give you the names of 14 people who would be alive today, innocent people who would be alive today, had that first-time murderer been executed.

Those are 14 crimes that would have been prevented. For those who bring up the half-way house case in Ottawa, the Sweeney case—I am not dealing with Sweeney because it is now under appeal—I remind those individuals that the father of the victim in that case is a determined and devout abolitionist, and I respect that position. But the mother of that girl who was raped and murdered in the half-way house now supports capital punishment. That is something that should be mentioned. The mother of that girl went on national television to voice her support for capital punishment.

Just this past month, we have learned of a series of chain-saw murders in Montreal. We had 17 pieces found of one victim of a chain-saw murder.

I am sick to death of reading in our newspapers and hearing on radio and television about the suffering of someone who was executed. What about the 11 children in British Columbia who were raped and murdered and then buried along the highway? What about the Montreal victim whose body was cut up into 17 pieces? What about the young girl who was raped and murdered in the half-way house? What about Eli Guay? What about the six convicted murderers who, having been paroled, murdered again? What about the judges? What about the jurors? What about these judicial reviews?

If an individual, having gone through all of the steps in our criminal justice system, is found guilty of first-degree murder, that individual should be executed. We do not have one known case of wrongful execution in Canada since Confederation. No such case has ever been produced to me. Yet, I can produce dozens of names of innocent people who have been murdered as a result of the judicial review process. The same judiciary who say we should not execute because we may execute the wrong person have caused, indirectly, the murder of dozens of innocent people because of their judgment as to who should and who should not be paroled.

Is it more ethical to be bigoted when it comes to judicial review than when it comes to murder? I support capital punishment for planned, deliberate, premeditated murder; murder arising from a hijacking or hostage-taking incident; contract killers, hired guns; and for serial killers. As well, I support capital punishment for the killing of police officers and law enforcement agents, and prison guards.

Until this debate ends, whenever it ends, I will be fighting for the return of capital punishment for those six offences. I am prepared to produce, name for name, those in support versus those opposed. I think the people need to be heard, and the Government needs to respond. This Government, the Progressive Conservative Government, has shown some responsibility in this respect. This will be the first true free vote on this matter since Confederation. All of the other "free votes" had solid blocks of cabinet Ministers voting for abolition. We have one individual sitting in this House who was a member of the Cabinet at the time of the last "free vote" on capital punishment, and he at that time, notwithstanding that he was a retentionist, voted for abolition as part of the cabinet block of votes; and I can give you the names of two others who were in a similar circumstance in 1976. Had those three individuals voted for retention in 1976, we would still have capital punishment on the books today. All we needed were three more votes, and we had three supporters of capital punishment who voted for abolition. These three individuals polled their constituents and came out and said they supported capital punishment, and in fact spoke in support of it. Yet, as part of the cabinet block of votes, they voted against it.

The Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mulroney) has now offered the Canadian people the opportunity to have their elected representatives cast a free vote on this question. The elected representatives of this country are responsible to their