

*Criminal Code*

bank and then shot down two policemen as he came out. He escaped and then was captured. After a preliminary inquiry, he was brought to trial first before the court of the Queen's bench and then before the court of appeal. He was granted two appeals before the supreme court and not once was clemency recommended on his behalf. In spite of that, the cabinet commuted his death sentence to life imprisonment. That was a grave mistake and the cabinet had no right to intervene like that. No, the cabinet has no right, especially in a case where there is no recommendation for clemency on the part of the jury, to change the sentence, unless a reasonable doubt exists.

The same thing happened in Quebec. A murderer was freed. Doctors, psychiatrists considered him to be cured and he was allowed back in society. What happened? Well, he came back to society and murdered four more. He was then sentenced to death, but he probably will not be hanged.

Mr. Speaker, the matter must be studied seriously. There has been too much noisy publicity about it. The greatest evil is not capital punishment, but the banning of religious instruction in our schools. And now that we have ecumenism, it seems to me Protestants and Catholics should join in giving such religious teaching as might be acceptable to both groups, in all Catholic and Protestant schools across Canada. The existence of God and the fundamental laws to be observed by man could be taught. In my opinion, provincial authorities should agree with the religious authorities, Catholic and Protestant alike, in an effort to give all our schools across Canada acceptable religious instruction.

Indeed, as I once said in Toronto a few years ago, a bishop of the Anglican church deplores the fact that there is no longer any religious instruction in our schools. Religion is no longer taught in the schools, and Sunday school is no longer attended. What is not taught in school is not taught at all elsewhere. Without religious principles, nothing really matters; there is a willingness to abolish and destroy everything.

Mr. Speaker, I could produce innumerable documents to prove I am right, but time does not allow me to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we should stipulate that nobody be allowed to alter the sentence of any person sentenced to life imprisonment. In my opinion, this convicted murderer should work

[Mr. Caron.]

to earn money to provide for the needs of the family stricken by the murder which he committed. We could lock him up for life, not give him his freedom, and thus the stricken family would receive something. We should also sentence to life imprisonment the man who rapes a young girl of 12 or 13 years of age or less. That man should get the rope. I do not understand how this can be struck off our statute books. The same should apply to armed bandits, as I said a moment ago, and to narcotics distributors in high places who are responsible for many murders. The poor soul who makes use of those narcotics may be ill, but the man who sold them to him gets off easy.

Mr. Speaker, I gave you the main arguments. I do not wish to go further at this time because I would need at least fifteen minutes more and I know other hon. members want to speak. Mr. Speaker, we have to give serious consideration to this matter. We must not fall for the sentimentality of those who ignore the victim and the stricken family and who think only about this poor murderer before whom we should kneel down and beg forgiveness.

I say we should retain capital punishment in the best interests of society, for it is society that we must protect. We are here to protect society and it is our absolute duty to continue protecting it through the retention of capital punishment.

● (4:50 p.m.)

[English]

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just spoken has made it very clear that he favours the retention of capital punishment.

**An hon. Member:** Oh, you did understand that?

**Mr. Winch:** At least, that was the impression I gathered. I listened most attentively to his interesting and emotional remarks. I, sir, favour the abolition of capital punishment and undoubtedly can, and perhaps will, become just as emotional. But I want to make it clear at the outset that I base my position in support of abolition not too much on emotion but on the facts which are in front of us if we have the intelligence to look at them and understand them.

I could not help noting that both the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Caron) and the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) began their remarks by pointing