

Why is it then that within our society we seem willing to ignore the fact that there is a threat to the established norm? We seem content to ignore the fact that there are people within our society who cannot live in accordance with those norms and who challenge the system we have created for ourselves, the system which has evolved.

I also find it difficult to understand what is happening in the global community. Looking back on the wars, of 200, 300 or 400 years ago and comparing them with the wars of today with all the sophisticated weaponry and tools of destruction we have spread throughout the world, it seems to me that as we have evolved as a global community we have designed tools of destruction more sophisticated and deadly than any formerly used, weapons which can kill 100,000 people at one time. And then, because no one actually chops off a man's head—someone sits in an aeroplane and discharges a bomb and by the time it hits he is far away—nobody seems to worry too much about it. The same is true in a different area.

I cannot put into context the ideas of those of my colleagues who favour abolition. Many of my colleagues are in favour of abolition of capital punishment, yet when they talk about the other great emotional issue, that of abortion, their views seem to be directly opposed to any one might expect—one of the hon. members from the Social Credit party has touched on this point today. He found it difficult to understand why it would be that a person who is so determined to preserve life at all costs, even at the cost of innocent life, would also at the same time be prepared to destroy life that has not even had a chance yet to commit any act.

● (1750)

I make this comparison between those who design these tools of aggression and tools of destruction because they are meant to destroy something we do not really see. The doctor makes an intrusion in a private room or an operating room in the hospital. He reaches in some place with a tool, and it all ends up in a garbage can. Just because we do not see what is being done we do not really have to worry about it. It does not offend us any longer. Yes, there were some pictures published of a garbage can in a hospital in Winnipeg containing the bodies of these human babies, three of them wriggling around as captured by the cameraman. That offended us because that was not very nice. It offended our charitable instincts as it appeared in the newspapers, but it was soon forgotten.

What makes these people tick? What makes them think? We have a right and a responsibility, if we are successfully to perpetuate and preserve what we have achieved in a human and responsible way through a voluntary process in the global community of society. We must have the fortitude to accept the responsibility of recognizing and identifying those who have become subversive, and we must act in a way similar to the way we act in respect of cancer in the human body. We must identify the sickness, and we have the responsibility to find cures. We must work hard and diligently to learn and understand more about the human mind.

When we have identified one of these cancers as incurable, after we have gone through the process of examining all the possible cures, all the possible methods of leniency

Capital Punishment

and mercy and there is no recommendation from any source, and no hope that there is any cure for this particular cancer, then we have the responsibility to remove that cancer from the otherwise healthy body. We must protect the healthy body from the spread of this cancer. This is not something new. It has always been that way. This is part of life, part of our system, and part of the burden that those who have elected us have placed on our shoulders. They have the right to protection, the right to security, the right to enjoy the fruits of their labours, the freedoms of our system, and the sanctuary of their homes. They have the right to feel free, with the security to send their children out on the streets at night.

When this feeling of security erodes, as it has in recent years in our country, our whole society is threatened. We place between ourselves and those who threaten our system from within, people who are paid and equipped to protect us against those who perpetrate crimes against us. As we are confronted by the criminal element in our homes and on the streets we do not take direct action. As a matter of fact it is illegal to take direct action. Even though we do as citizens of Canada have the right to arm ourselves under proper licensing provisions, we do not have the right to take another life. We do have the responsibility to call on the law enforcement agencies to take over from us.

Sometimes we are partially to blame because we have put ourselves into a position that creates the difficulty we face. Then we find ourselves confronted by the criminal element and looking down the barrel of a gun. Perhaps we have left the home unlocked, or maybe we have left some material thing lying around that attracted the eye of the criminal. Perhaps we have offended the criminal and he is seeking revenge. When this does happen we get to the telephone and ask someone to intervene on our behalf. Inevitably a member of the law enforcement agency will come and take over the problem, putting himself between the criminal and us.

A policeman is a public servant and has accepted his responsibility voluntarily. In this country we have people who are members of the armed forces. These people like to think they are providing a service, doing something very special in the carrying out of their duties. The very special thing they are doing is protecting society, protecting the achievements of society, and preserving our moral values against offenders.

In return we have the responsibility to protect those people because we lay down specific guidelines on how they shall conduct themselves in their jobs. We tell them when we give them a pistol or a rifle to be very cautious in the use of that weapon. As a matter of fact when a criminal is confronted and is killed in an attempt to escape, we have a very rigorous procedure through which the policeman is put. He must defend his action in taking the life of another.

As we now renege on this responsibility to protect those we ask to intervene on our behalf, I wonder how they will react. I wonder what will happen after the death penalty is abolished. I can imagine myself being in a back alley some place attempting to arrest a criminal, starting the judicial process, then appearing as a witness in court, with the result that the individual is condemned to 25 years, five years or ten years in prison. I wonder what I might be