

S. O. 21

However, we must not confuse an aggressive impulse, emotively produced, with justice. Such primordial aggressive, emotional, violent aspects of human nature exist, and I believe will always exist, but as human beings living in society we must guard against these, not indulge them. Surely as lawmakers, we in particular must bear this in mind.

Consider the responses of some people most immediately affected by murder recently. If anyone can be thought to be entitled to act on the impulse of vengeance, it would surely be a member of the family of, or one who is close to a victim of murder. I personally found most moving and touching some of the responses of those victims in our own country to horrible acts of murder inflicted on dear ones and family members.

The daughter of Gerald Ruygrok of Ottawa was brutally murdered at a halfway house, a daughter fondly and deeply regarded by her father. Did he respond with an act of vengeance? Did he say that we must have an eye for an eye? No. He said: "We should use reason rather than instinct". He opposes the reintroduction of capital punishment.

Esther Aucoin is the widow of New Brunswick patrolman Manny Aucoin who was shot on duty not long ago. Did she respond with vengeance? Not at all. She requested that a letter be read at her husband's funeral making it clear that she opposed the reintroduction of capital punishment.

A third example of this is Leslie Parrott of Toronto. Her daughter Alison was murdered in Toronto last year and the killer, the one who committed a brutal, terminal, horrible act, is still at large. Leslie Parrott has written to all Members of Parliament, I believe. I received a letter as did other Hon. Members not long ago. She does not respond with vengeance, seeking an eye for an eye. She knows that she will not be compensated for the loss of her daughter by the loss of the life of the person who killed her daughter and who has not yet even been apprehended. I would like to read a short paragraph from her letter:

Alison's murder has given me a very personal and agonizing experience of the horror of violence and killing. It has more than ever convinced me that we as a society cannot ever and must not ever condone killing, whether by state or individual, in any shape or form.

She too is opposed to capital punishment.

One can make other arguments about this horrible instrument that is open to the state to use. Not only in Canada but in virtually every other country there is the possibility that an innocent person may be executed. It is also very important that, as we know from studies done at home and abroad, it is the person of a minority or the poor in society that is most likely to be convicted when charged with murder. The rich, the affluent and the powerful are frequently able to hire better lawyers. They are least likely to be convicted. In this act of justice which involves a human life above all others, surely we ought not risk the destruction of another human being, particularly if this destruction is much more likely to occur in the poorest elements of society. I say, a number of other arguments could be elaborated upon, and no doubt they will be. I attempted to deal with the central argument and the

question of deterrents. I have argued that the evidence is not there and therefore one should not support capital punishment for that reason.

Before concluding, I would like to make two points. First, all of us in the House on both sides of the issue see murder for the horrible act that it is, and we should all be redoubling our efforts to try to understand those causes that can be removed, as some of them can be, and to accept the probable reality that because human beings are the violent creatures we are from time to time, there will likely and definitely be murders to deal with in the history of society. However, we should do what we can to ensure that those who commit murder are appropriately punished. As I said, that is not the central issue of this debate. The issue is whether or not there is a moral argument that would justify bringing back capital punishment.

I would like to conclude by saying that capital punishment simply adds to the degree of brutalization that is going on in society. In coldly taking the life of a murderer, the state would simply compound the moral unacceptability of the original violent act. We need less, not more violence in Canada. We need justice, not vengeance. We should encourage life, not death. We should oppose the restoration of capital punishment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being 1 p.m., I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m. this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION
ENTRY OF BRAZILIANS UNDER FALSE PRETENCES

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have now learned that false refugee claimants from Brazil have entered our country thanks to unscrupulous immigration consultants in Canada and abroad, and especially thanks to the Conservative Government's foot-dragging in effectively stopping these illegal and intolerable activities.

In January, 1987, five months after initially receiving bogus refugee applicants from Turkey, the Government realized it was being duped. Since the Portuguese visa problems last summer Canadian immigration officials were allegedly linked to an extensive immigration scam for peddling visas for \$4,000 this March. Following that, shady travel consultants sold visas abroad for \$6,500 to Lebanese individuals wanting to come to Canada.