

order to lower, I would say, the quality of protection of our Canadian citizens.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this bill is passed, it means that, as soon as it is proclaimed, criminals will be free to murder even the Solicitor General, since he is not a member, I would think, of the police force or a jail guard. They could murder a minister, a senator, a member of parliament or a judge; they could kill right and left, except police officers and prison guards.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks here. I believe I have said clearly enough that I am still in favour of the retention of the death penalty for capital murders.

This act is in existence since 1961 only, I think. Sentences were then mitigated, and I do not think they should be amended. It is clearly stipulated in the act that if there is a doubt, evidence of insanity or if the person is a minor, then the offence is not considered as capital murder and the person is not sentenced to death.

I submit that the death penalty should be retained in the case of capital murder. The act should be kept as it has stood since 1961 and it should not only be kept but applied, because it has not been applied since 1963 and the government is disregarding the laws of the land.

Therefore, in order to allow people to live, to have a better idea of their laws as a whole, I think that steps should be taken to rehabilitate criminals, look after those who can be rehabilitated and pass legislation to facilitate their rehabilitation. As for those who have stooped to murdering those who stood in their way, so to speak—that is what I call capital murder—they should be eliminated completely because they are, in my opinion, undesirables in society.

Mr. Speaker, I shall conclude with a remark which I made on April 5, during a similar debate, and which can be found on page 3879 of *Hansard*, and I quote:

It is time to assume our responsibilities and to stop feeling that this should concern others, but not us. We should react as equal and responsible men and women. We should face the problem and realize that our children and our children's children should not be made to suffer for our follies. We should give up the idea that science can replace morals and progress replace hard work and that, for instance, the well-known tranquilizers can replace peace of mind and the well-known dope, mental toil. We should give up the idea that pills can master the soul. We should give up our faith in so-called progress that sends satellites into space but cannot, because of politics, prevent two men out of three from going hungry. Finally, we should understand and spread the understanding around

Amendments Respecting Death Sentence

us and make the mighty that lead us understand that science without conscience will ruin the soul and that a world without a soul is doomed.

Mr. Speaker, we are asked to abolish capital punishment, to make it easier to use drugs, to legalize abortion, to legalize contraceptives, and there is even talk, in today's papers, of the possibility of a bill being introduced that would legalize homosexuality.

I wonder where we are going with all that, Mr. Speaker, if this really tends to upgrade the quality of our citizens, or rather to lower their morality?

Mr. Speaker, after due consideration I think that not only must capital punishment be maintained in the form it has had since 1961, but that it must be carried out. That is the way I intend to vote.

[English]

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to express my personal respect for the Solicitor General (Mr. Pennell) in the position which he has enunciated today. His sincerity and the evidence of his conviction are such that although I differ with his conclusion I do not for one moment question the motives that moved him to introduce this bill and to speak as eloquently as he has today.

There is a paradox, however, in the introduction of Bill C-168, a bill which is a compromise with last year's bill in that it recommends capital punishment for those who kill policemen and prison guards. The obvious reason for retaining capital punishment in these specified instances must be that the minister believes it has some deterrent effect. If the minister believes this, then it logically follows that capital punishment must also have a deterrent value in other instances. To those who are thinking of changing their position from the one they took in the vote last year I suggest with all sincerity that if they had any doubts whether or not there was any deterrent value in capital punishment, then this bill is evidence of it because if it has a deterrent value in one respect then I cannot see how anyone can be so illogical as to assume that it might not have a deterrent value in other respects.

Surely the minister must agree that if it is necessary to protect the lives of policemen, wardens and prison guards through the retention of capital punishment, then it automatically follows that it is necessary also to protect girls killed in sex murders. What is the difference between a policeman who is murdered in a bank robbery and a girl who