

offence. If, during the process of assisting the policeman the citizen is shot and killed, the consequences are as follows. If the accused is convicted, he will be liable to life imprisonment. On the other hand, if the police officer is killed, the accused, if convicted, will be sentenced to hang.

Therein lies the root of one of the great problems not only in Canada but in the United States. People do not wish to become involved. In Canada they do not become involved, largely because we pussy-footed on this issue when it was before Parliament. If one were to go to Montreal and to the very place where the crime against Mr. Laporte was committed, one would see that people do not want to become involved. The reason for that, in my opinion, is the great mistake that we made in the law when we said that a person convicted of killing a police officer will hang, but if he is convicted of killing a person who is helping the police officer he will not hang. To me that was a very great mistake. I believe the argument, however, is relevant.

We are now dealing with a very sensitive problem, the problem of the permissive society. There must be some indictment and perhaps some reproaches in respect of our permissive society. As I pointed out this afternoon when reading from the report of the Royal Commission on Security, the government two-years-ago knew the situation was as bad as it now is, yet they did nothing. Because they vacillated and procrastinated we are now in this mess.

● (9:00 p.m.)

I shall vote for the amendment. I believe it is right to do so because the law as it now stands is discriminatory. I believe that every member from the province of Quebec, if they vote according to their conscience, will vote for the amendment.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of heat in this debate. There is little doubt that it is a most serious matter. One member who has really tried to deal with it in a factual way is the hon. member for Greenwood, who made a brief statement of fact to which there has been no reply. Those of us who are seriously concerned about dealing with terrorist activities must present some kind of evidence. The hon. member for Greenwood referred to the fact, and there is evidence to support this, that capital punishment is not a deterrent. There have been many studies in the past—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: It would be appreciated if hon. members would listen. In the past capital punishment was not a deterrent. There are many stories about pickpockets being caught while witnessing executions of people convicted of pickpocketing.

If this has been the case in the past, what evidence do those in favour of capital punishment have to present to those of us who are prepared to listen? I emphasize that. If it can be shown that capital punishment will deter this kind of terroristic activity, I will be prepared to listen because it is a serious matter.

Public Order Act, 1970

In terms of modern psychology, all available evidence is in the other direction. What type of person becomes involved in this kind of politics? There is the pathological type whom many psychiatrists say is looking for punishment, the man who is guilt-ridden. The more the punishment is increased, the more likely it is that he will enter into this kind of political activity. That argument cannot be dismissed. If members want to argue against it, they should provide evidence and not just an emotional, silly reaction.

The other type of person likely to become involved in such politics, although not pathological or sick none the less takes a very violent view of politics. Rightly or wrongly—and I think it is wrongly—some people believe that violence is essential for political change. If someone has that conviction, does anyone in this House seriously maintain that he will be deterred by capital punishment? My personal view is that the answer is no. A man who accepts violence as a legitimate form of politics will not be deterred by capital punishment. Because of these two basic facts, the pathological case on the one hand and the ideological commitment to violence on the other, I conclude that even on the ground of deterrence there is not a sound reason for a rational man accepting the reinstatement of capital punishment.

[Translation]

Mr. Leblanc (Laurier): Mr. Chairman, at the time of the debate on the death penalty a few years ago. I was against such abolition. I was discussing a few minutes ago with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Béchard) the problem we have most at heart, namely the problem of the FLQ in the province of Quebec. I feel we should reestablish capital penalty when there has been kidnapping and loss of life, or when the explosion of a bomb results in loss of life.

I will therefore vote in favour of the amendment put forward by my friends of the Ralliement créditiste, although I am not in full agreement with it. I am not prepared to give unqualified support to the minister's arguments because I was and still am against abolishing the death penalty although, in conformity with democratic principles, I had to yield to the views of the majority who voted for the measure.

Recently, I have been making inquiries in my riding about the identity card which the Quebec Attorney General wishes to make compulsory. He has adopted my idea and I appreciate it.

I have also made a survey about the death penalty and, once again, my electors are ready to support my stand that we should have retained capital punishment. It may not be the perfect remedy for all the ills that are now being felt in Quebec, but, in the circumstances, I believe that I shall have to vote against the government and for the amendment before us.

This is a temporary measure, of course, as indicated in the bill itself, and when the revoking of the amendment to the Criminal Code is introduced, then of course we will have an opportunity to develop our arguments further.