

Criminal Code

building up defences against the Communists. We train people to kill and spend billions of dollars doing it. Why? It is to protect Canada and the western world. You must always remember that society is organized for the benefit and the good of the greatest number. Laws must be made to carry out that purpose.

I was very happy today to see the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), who has so much responsibility, spend so many hours in the chamber. I am glad he brought this question before the House of Commons but I would point out to the country through you, Mr. Speaker, that we have had abolition already. We have had *de facto* abolition if not *de jure* abolition because all death sentences have been commuted in recent times.

Today in Canada, as in the United States, we are dealing with a new type of criminal, a new type of murderer who has syndicated his evil. Here I come to grips with my argument because this is what bothers me. Gangsters today are syndicated. Murder is their business. They plan, they plot, they premeditate. As a result we get the murder of Francois Payette and the murder of seven others, murders which are still unsolved, murders by syndicated gangsters. Maybe I am wrong, but I think this is no time to mollycoddle those vicious, corrupt, evil men whose sole purpose is to destroy Canada and society.

When we talk about a deterrent against crime I have a few things to say. The only deterrent against crime is what every police officer knows. First of all, you must have quick detection. Second, you must have swift apprehension and, third, you must have proper punishment. Having those three things in mind, let me ask these questions of the abolitionists and retentionists. Should we abolish capital punishment for treason? What about the sale of scientific information on the atomic bomb? Should we abolish capital punishment for repeaters? I am not suggesting that the Dionne case was one which was a repetition of murder but as I understand the facts the man was incarcerated for certain sex crimes and paroled. Picture those three young boys before him—someone says four—begging for their lives, but he destroyed their lives. Should we abolish capital punishment for repeaters and, if we do, when we say there must be life imprisonment does it mean imprisonment until death? What parole board or what executive can say that a man will not repeat a crime?

[Mr. Woolliams.]

I am against a statement made by the Prime Minister that we should put the matter of parole in the hands of the executive. I am not critical of that statement because he is a Liberal Prime Minister, but I have wondered about it. Some on this side of the house may agree with him, but I say it would be a very dangerous course because it would put parole in the field of politics. It puts too much responsibility on the executive because, if the Prime Minister lets somebody out on parole and that person duplicates his crime, one can see the political implications.

Should we abolish capital punishment for those who are syndicated gangsters? I know that in the place where I used to practise law before I went to Calgary and even in Calgary that kind of crime may not occur. It may not occur in smaller places, possibly because of climatic and sociological factors, but in the great metropolitan centres of this continent and Europe syndicated gangsters operate in places like Vancouver, Montreal, Chicago, New York—

Mr. Winkler: Contracted crime.

Mr. Woolliams: Somebody says "contracted crime". Their business is murder. Their business is evil. Their business is corruption. Their business is crime for material gain.

Should we abolish capital punishment for murder which is planned, which is deliberate? We have had cases where murderers have placed bombs on aircraft. Some 50 people in an aircraft have been blown up, people unconnected with the hate which the murderer felt for one person. We have had cases of the gradual but effective poisoning of a person over a period of time.

The hon. member for Vancouver East dealt with police officers. He quoted statistics. Can life imprisonment, meaning imprisonment until death, be a satisfactory substitute for the death penalty? I am sure there will be amendments to this motion. Must we when we make our decision make a statutory declaration according to our consciences that we have done the right thing and left out all political considerations?

There are political considerations because the government finds itself in the position where it has commuted a certain number of sentences and there are at present 10 or 14 people under sentence of death waiting for appeals or commutation. Are the men who have been dealt with in the last two years to get a different deal from those who are now