

*Capital Punishment*

deny the deterrent quality of the death penalty of a case that the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Morin) would probably have used in her speech as a retentionist had she been able to participate here. She was the one who told me the background on Leopold Dion. After he and his brother raped a girl in Quebec in 1940, he started to strangle the victim to death. His brother shouted: "If you kill her, Leo, you will hang." Leopold loosened his grip. The girl survived. She no doubt gave the evidence that convicted him.

Paroled in 1960, Leopold picked up four small boys aged about nine to 13, and one at a time assaulted them and forced them to their knees to pray before he murdered them. He was convicted of murder, his sentence commuted by cabinet, and his execution was carried out by the inmates of St. Vincent de Paul. But I suppose such executions are acceptable to the abolitionists, as long as the state does not do it, as if the state is not responsible. I am sure the original victim of Leopold Dion would tell you that capital punishment was the deterrent that saved her life.

By 1971-1972 police murderers and guard murderers were pretty sure they would never hang for their crime. Certainly by 1974 it was an absolute certainty. Thus, John Miller, 29, and Vincent Cockreill, 19, could feel secure in their plan to kill a policeman—any policeman. On March 29, 1974, RCMP Constable Roger Pierlett, 23, was ensnared by them in their plan for the senseless execution of a cop. The next day he was to celebrate his engagement. His parents, flying west from Montreal for the occasion, found him on a slab in the morgue. His assassins were protected by the law from the same fate. Roger's older brother, Luke, 29, who at the time did not know whether he was an abolitionist or not, recently said, referring to his brother's killers:

● (1150)

I am not bitter against them as persons. I don't even know them. But they should hang for the deed they did. When two men can kill a complete stranger, I maintain this behaviour is undermining our whole moral fabric. What the government is doing is giving everyone a licence to kill. They are devaluating the price of everybody's life.

I list these facts because abolitionists say that capital punishment is no deterrent. Somebody will no doubt be saying we shall have to mop up the floor of the House again. But I do not mind a little compassion being shown in this chamber.

Then there is the case of Rainier Peter Schuenemann, 27, who kidnapped Mrs Margaret Siborne, 53, on May 1, 1976. He left her in the woods to die, bound, gaged and tied to a tree, while he attempted to extort money from her husband. When picked up by the police, Schuenemann said:

I'm a dead man. The woman in the bush for three days without food or water must be dead.

Told Mrs. Siborne was alive, that she had escaped her bonds, the prisoner fell to his knees with his hands over his face and wept uncontrollably, according to witnesses at his trial. He knew that the only person who could identify him had survived to give evidence against him. He knew he would get the same sentence if she had died. But in that event there was a chance that no witness would appear against him and he might thus have escaped conviction.

We are speaking of deterrence. Since there is *de facto* abolition in Canada, perhaps the price demanded for

[Mrs. Holt.]

murder in Vancouver today will tell us something about the usefulness of the ultimate penalty as a deterrent. Life is very cheap in Vancouver today. In the 1950s and early 1960s when murder could bring the death penalty, the price of a contract to murder ran anywhere from \$2,500 to \$25,000. Today it is \$50 to \$500. Indeed, paid killings are now child's play since it is easy and the penalties are not too severe for hardened criminals to contemplate. Most killers are certain they can get away with it anyway.

Members may be interested to learn that a 10 year-old boy has built up a sophisticated crime gang among peers in Vancouver. He has formed a crime ring, organizing it in a way few older people could have done, and has advertised through the underworld that his gang is prepared to accept contracts to kill. A sidelight to this story is that social workers and civil libertarians, many of whom favour abolition, are upset that in the course of investigating the numerous crimes of this "child Fagin" the police decided to take his fingerprints.

Ernest Von Den Haag in his book "Punishing the Criminal"—and I wonder why the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) did not assign a local to debunk this work—said:

Life becomes cheaper as we become kinder to those who take it. The burden of proof should be on those who oppose the death penalty, not on those who favour it. . . . for say the death penalty does not deter; all we have lost in exacting it is the life of a convicted killer. But if the death penalty does deter, then by refusing to impose it we have consigned to death some future innocent victim.

In refutation of those who maintain capital punishment is not a deterrent, I can produce statements by the very people who use murder as a tool in crime—evidence which the abolitionists could find themselves with a bit of effort. How many times have hon. members read or known personally of cases where the robber got the loot he had come for, but killed anyhow? There was such a case in Burnaby, B.C., in the past week. Three brothers ordered a young clerk to lie face down on the floor while they carried out their crime. They robbed the company, Lumberland, and then they shot the young man in cold blood. They got what they wanted, but the slaying could add little to their penalty if they were caught; it was a gamble, and the murder was an outlet for their brutality.

I could give further proof of the deterrent value of capital punishment, but at the moment I will simply refer hon. members to other evidence which I have put on record in previous speeches. I challenge those who say it is not a deterrent, to prove their case. The onus is on them, not on the majority of Canadians. To quote Von Den Haag:

If the death penalty does deter, by refusing to impose it we have consigned to death some future innocent victim.

Apropos the dialogue on the deterrent effect, the day after the vote was taken on the second reading of Bill C-84, inmates in B.C. jails and in the B.C. penitentiary were jeering at the guards, shouting such things as, "You lost, we won." Some were saying, "Our quota: one cop a day, one guard a day," or "Careful, pig; we can slash your throat." One particularly violent inmate expressed himself in this way, "Careful, pig; we can slash your throat; we have nothing to lose. You had better start taking Dale Carnegie courses to improve your attitude, because we can cut your throat."