

*Criminal Code*

make alcoholic beverages disappear off the face of the earth. They achieved only one thing: they helped the underworld by encouraging the bootleggers. As a result of that attitude, alcoholism grew, bootleggers became rich, women took to liquor through the "hip flask" carried in one's pocket, and since that time women have grown used to liquor. We have witnessed the development of a "caponian" spirit with the murders and everything it entails. Still, the prohibitionists were seeking the welfare of the population. They were honest people, intent on helping the whole population; instead, those good people helped the gangsters in their activities.

Today, we have the same thing. Good people, gentlefolk, religious people, devout people, well-meaning and well-thinking, like in 1917, are asking for abolition of capital punishment. They are, in this, asking the same thing as the underworld, abolition of the death penalty. And yet, communists also request it. Indeed, the communist party in Canada sent me messages requesting the abolition of capital punishment. They are using the same ideas, the same arguments, that will lead them to do exactly what Karl Marx advocated in the past. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we must not forget that requesting the abolition of capital punishment is not something new. In fact, it was requested in the 15th century, the 16th century, just like today.

In France, Voltaire and Jean-Jacques Rousseau advocated the same thing as our abolitionists do today. In Italy, Vico and Beccaria, in Germany, Savigny, Karl Marx and Kelsen, in England, Hume and Bentam, in the United States, Franklin and Payne, were all abolitionists who spent their lives campaigning in favour of abolition. Fortunately, they were not successful everywhere. On the other hand, twenty American states abolished the death penalty, but eleven restored it, because of the large increase in the number of crimes.

The same arguments are put forward everywhere. It is suggested first of all that it is a matter of conscience. Yet, as stated by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, the Bible distinguishes clearly between the individual and society. The individual is told: Thou shalt not kill. But society is told to put to death any person guilty of killing another. Chapter IX, verse 6, of Genesis, as well as the King James' version, provide that:

Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.

[Mr. Caron.]

And looking through the Bible, one finds several references to the effect that if someone strikes any man a fatal blow, he will be put to death himself.

I do not wish to delay the house, but in nine or ten instances, the Bible says that a killer is liable to the death penalty. It does not say that an individual has the right to kill; on the contrary, it admits that he does not have that right. On the other hand, it states that society not only has the right but also the duty to put a murderer to death.

If, for one, it is a question of conscience, one should rely on the Bible. Yet, certain verses are quoted from the Bible about the individual but not about society. Still, society has a responsibility in this field.

Mr. Speaker, as a second argument, it is said that this is barbaric. Well, what about the murderers who kill through sentiment? What about those who do not give their victims a chance to defend themselves? They are attacked without warning and shot through the head. The man is dead, his family suffers but the poor murderer is pitied. How unfortunate to kill another man. That, I say, is barbaric. I feel that claims of barbarism are not justified. It is also said that this is vengeance. Vengeance is an act by which evil is returned for evil. Now, there is no question of vengeance in the case of society. Society is responsible for punishment and does not commit murder in such case. It punishes and castigates the one who has committed murder. It is a responsibility of society which cannot be reneged nor avoided. It is its own responsibility. It is not something that can be called vengeance, but just retribution.

Fourth, it is claimed that it is not a deterrent. But will life imprisonment be a deterrent? Will it deter the criminal to know that he will be permitted to live freely after committing a murder? Not at all. I claim that the only sentence appropriate in the case of a murderer is the death sentence. In England, capital punishment was abolished in 1964 and the very next year, in 1965, there was a 30 per cent increase in the murder rate.

**Mr. Lewis:** That is not so.

**Mr. Caron:** That is what English newspapers reported.

**Mr. Lewis:** That is not so.

**Mr. Caron:** You can say it is not true as much as you like, but I will tell you that