

Capital Punishment

only do seven or ten years for this. I don't want to die. No matter what happens, you want to live another day.

[Translation]

I could supply a long list of confessions by criminals with files in various police departments, who have said time and time again that the death penalty was a deterrent against more serious crimes.

And the article ends as follows:

[English]

That society which coddles criminals and does not consider the victims of crime needs to rethink its system of justice.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, in the *Christian Crusade Newsletter* of April 1, 1973, one could also read a very interesting article on the deterrent effect of capital punishment on murder. It said:

[English]

Most sensible people remain convinced that fear of the penalty of death will deter some people who may be considering committing homicide. Most of us know that the possibility of the death penalty would deter us if we were tempted to such a horrendous act.

The abolition of the death penalty has created an incentive to kill. Consider a criminal engaged in a major crime such as kidnapping or armed robbery. He is anxious to escape capture and punishment. If he is caught and convicted, the penalty is substantially the same whether he has killed or not. His security is enhanced if no witnesses survive who can identify him for the police and give evidence against him in court. The abolition of the death penalty has placed the lives of many innocent people in jeopardy. It illustrates the paradox that characterizes this epoch: intense concern for the rights and well-being of the criminal; little concern for the rights and well-being of the victim.

A shock of horror swept this nation when in Khartoum, the capital city of the Sudan, the Black September group of Palestinian guerrillas cold-bloodedly and brutally murdered the U.S. Ambassador to the Sudan, Cleo A. Noel, Jr., and the Chargé d'Affaires, George C. Moore. Those who have succeeded in abolishing the death penalty in the U.S. share some of the responsibility for these deaths.

The guerrillas claim they killed because their demands were rejected. One of these demands was that Sirhan Sirhan, Arab assassin of Senator Kennedy, be freed. This demand was possible because Sirhan Sirhan is alive. After the death of Senator Kennedy, he was arrested, tried, convicted and sentenced to death. This sentence was commuted to life imprisonment when the death penalty was abolished. His presence in prison provided an incentive for the crime.

Most violent criminals have colleagues and friends who are also violent. Doubtless many ruthless men are presently considering their choice of victims to kidnap in order to force the release of some imprisoned murderer. One successful venture would trigger an epidemic.

Many thinking people throughout the world must have been startled when the U.S. Secretary of State, William P. Rogers, urged the Sudanese authorities to execute the murderers of Cleo A. Noel and George C. Moore. They knew that the American authorities could not have executed the assassins if the crime had been committed on American soil. To them this must have seemed imperialist hypocrisy, flavoured with colonialism and racism—one law for the rich, the U.S.A.—another for the poor, the Sudan.

Whatever their motives, those who have succeeded in abolishing the death penalty in this country, have merely substituted the deaths of the innocent for the guilty.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, any criminal who intends to commit any criminal act thinks about the consequences he might

[Mr. Rondeau.]

suffer. If the law is very liberal, as some people want to keep it in Canada, and his act or acts cannot possibly put him in a serious predicament he will make little of the consequences resulting from the act he intends to commit. In any case, a law that is too liberal, too permissive is the main cause of murder.

Mr. Speaker, it is strange to see how some members like to quote excerpts from statements by individuals who never had anything to do with criminals. For example, most judges in Canada have asked for retention of the death penalty on several occasions; a brief submitted to Parliament in January by the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police included recommendations on capital punishment. I am very surprised to see that up to now this government has disregarded the recommendations made by those with the most experience with criminals, those who have to chase them. Policemen in Canada highly recommend capital punishment for criminals, not only for murderers of policemen but for any individual, any Canadian. They consider that if the law is to protect policemen it should also protect all members of society without any form of discrimination.

On page 15 of the brief submitted to the House of Commons early in January 1973, one could read, and I quote:

● (2100)

[English]

The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police go on record at this time as stating publicly that unless the voice of the people is heard and that the comments made by this association, as a result of practical experience, are seriously considered and acted upon accordingly, society might well tend to take the law into its own hands and create more problems than the abolitionists' suggestions would propose to solve.

It is sad that in this day and age people are starting to think that they will have to take whatever means necessary to defend themselves rather than rely on the law and the courts.

Acceptability of the death penalty is also maintained by the overwhelming majority of judges who surely must be recognized for their sense of justice, impartiality and fair play.

[Translation]

And, on page 3 of that same brief, the Chiefs of Police of Canada had this to say:

[English]

Is society justified in taking away a life? This question can be answered by another question, is society justified in making war? There is a fundamental answer which even from the philosophical point of view cannot be refuted and this applies in all cases! Society does have the right to protect itself by whatever means are necessary.

In supporting the retention of the death penalty, the strongest argument probably lies in the fact that the objections submitted by abolitionists are based on argument and debate. On the other hand, the retentionists rely on simple facts... our system of government is based on the will of society. Independently of what the legislators think or feel and independently of what academics may advance, if we accept the principle of democracy we must accept the will of the people. It would appear that the eloquent description of Lincoln of a democratic government referred to in the introduction of this brief has not been given full value of late. We do have a government "for the people" and "of the people" but certainly not "by the people", since their wish, as so openly expressed, for the retention of the death penalty as well as the imposition of that death penalty for which legislation presently exists has constantly been ignored.