

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shall section 44 stand?

Mr. POULIOT: Before this section stands, let me say I do not see why we have such compassion for people who are unworthy of it. So long as the death penalty exists, I do not see why we should have compassion for these men who act like brutes, who attack young children and who kill them. Why should there be such compassion for them? Is it by virtue of human rights? Why did the hon. member for Lake Centre quote what happened at Westminster recently with regard to death penalties? Death penalties existed in England when England was considered a civilized country.

The hon. member reminds me of a former member from Montreal whose name started with B. That is the only thing I remember about him. Some years ago all he was interested in was the suppression of the death penalty. Every session he placed on the order paper a motion to suppress the death penalty. That member died; the death penalty is still here.

In my view the death penalty is a rampart against crime. I was surprised when I read the bill and saw in it the section giving powers to justices of the peace in respect of cases where persons are about to commit crimes. Does the hon. member for Lake Centre or the hon. member for Calgary West know a justice of the peace who is a mind reader?

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I do not; I will answer right now.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not know anyone of that kind. I remember when Senator Roebuck was attorney general of Ontario, and he dismissed ten thousand of them with a stroke of the pen. I say he deserved the thanks of the country for that. It is dangerous to give big powers to persons with no legal information; and when I refer to legal information I do not mean lectures given at universities. I mean contact with men, and an understanding of the men with whom one has contact.

At the present time we treat these criminals just the same as those who suffer accidents when they fall on the street, from a window or from a roof, men who suffer civil damage. These men are a menace to society; why should they be handled with white gloves? They are monsters whom society cannot endure.

I can understand a man who has a quarrel with someone else. That quarrel becomes worse and worse, and finally one man kills the other. That is something which has been understood since the time of Cain and Abel. But

to think that one who is supposed to have attained the age of reason would attack a young boy or a young girl and kill him or kill her—why, that is something which reminds one of barbarism, of the barbaric ages. It is worse than what happened in the stone age.

Then we would hear some stand up and be lenient—"Oh, that poor fellow; he is not well!" Or they will say, "He has human rights we must respect." The question of human rights makes some people crazy. "He has human rights; we must respect his human rights!" That man is dangerous to society. Does not the child who is bestially attacked by a much older person have human rights? That child has had human rights since he was born. What about the parents of the child; have they no human rights? But no, we pay no attention to them; we pay attention only to the human rights of the criminal, the bestial criminal offender.

I am surprised that the Minister of Justice, with his sense of justice, has allowed such provisions to enter this draft bill; and I urge upon him the necessity of withdrawing them as soon as he can.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Chairman, just let me disabuse the mind of the hon. member for Temiscouata of any idea that anything is to be relaxed here. The hon. member seems to think some relaxation is provided in this section. On the contrary, a minimum sentence of two years, which does not exist with respect to any of these offences, is provided now by this section. In addition there is provision for an indeterminate sentence which may last for life. There is the provision that the Minister of Justice will review the case every three years.

My hon. friend may rest assured that there is no sentimentality and no relaxation whatever in this section. I want to make that clear to all members of the house. But it would be contemplated that if some course of treatment could be given that would be of benefit to these persons, they should receive it. I do not think there is anything wrong with that.

Mr. COCKERAM: Anybody who is human would do that.

Mr. POULIOT: I am not familiar with streamlined modern law. But according to the law I read when I was a student at law, rape was classed with murder.

Mr. ILSLEY: My hon. friend has a point there, but in an earlier section which was scarcely noticed the punishment for rape has been made life imprisonment instead of