

*Criminal Code*

I continue:

The true reason for abolishing it is that at this time, more than ever, revolutionaries are getting ready to overthrow the rule of law and order by resorting to murder, assassination and bombings. As it is possible—and it has happened—that some of those professional killers, agents of the international revolutionaries, will be caught after a crime some people want them to get as the supreme punishment detention in so-called humane conditions where the prisoners will enjoy all the privileges, comforts and amenities of home.

So, if the revolutionary group for which this murderer is working succeeds in assuming power through another *coup d'état*, not only this murderer is freed, but he is decorated, honoured, rewarded and finally he is offered a key position. Now, this is only possible if capital punishment is abolished.

Let us take an actual case of rather recent date:

When Fidel Castro was arrested in Bogota—several years before the revolution in Cuba—during a revolutionary demonstration, he said at the police station . . . "I had a full day, I killed two priests" . . . Well, if capital punishment had been applied, he would never have returned to Cuba to slaughter people like he did. A very significant fact must be kept in mind: these revolutionaries who kill and murder—applying capital punishment as they see fit—say or have other simple-minded parrots say that the death penalty should be abolished. But if they come into power immediately, they execute those they consider as their enemies even though they are not guilty of any murder.

Another instance: At 31, Robespierre was a judge in France in the Pas-de-Calais department. Being of a sensitive nature, he resigned as a judge, because he was against capital punishment. But once in power, he established the Terror, had tens of thousands of patriots guillotined, and even said once: "I shall destroy 80 per cent of the population, if necessary, so that the remaining 20 per cent will make up a true revolutionary people."

To my knowledge, the campaign against capital punishment is nothing new. Over 30 years ago, such a campaign made quite a stir in Europe.

And our public prevaricator, Jacques Hébert, brings nothing new in the field; he uses the same tactics as the European propagandists, he has nothing to teach us.

If one or two innocent persons have been eliminated by capital punishment within two centuries, what does it amount to compared to the thousands of victims, also innocent, these professional killers and murderers in the revolutionary international brigades have assassinated, after sham trials.

These patented and imported revolutionaries who come here to rouse our youth and incite them to terrorism should be deported unmercifully and we want order to be maintained here. You can be sure that those people have no mercy when they kill those they consider a hindrance to their devilish plans.

Anyone with his eyes open cannot fail to see these basic truths. There are some truths that must courageously be stated.

● (6:20 p.m.)

And the letter is signed G. Monet, Shawinigan.

Mr. Speaker, there are certainly miscarriages of justice and, in the past, innocent

people surely have been sentenced to hang, people who had not killed. But today, or rather since 1960, 1961, it seems to me legislation concerning commutation is clear enough. If the resolution clearly stated that the ensuing legislation would enable us to determine that generally, the abolition of capital punishment would be accepted and that, in special cases, the death penalty would still be resorted to in Canada, then, I feel, we could support the resolution. But in view of the fact that we do not have this assurance, I for one—and my colleagues of the Ralliement *Créditiste* are completely free to vote according to their conscience, since the vote is a free one—will have to vote according to my own conscience, which means I will have to vote for the protection of the Canadian society, that is against resolution No. 66 as long as we do not have the assurance that capital punishment will be retained in some cases.

Mr. Speaker, there have undoubtedly been miscarriage of justice in the past. For instance, I am convinced that there was a miscarriage of justice in the case of Donald Perrault, who came from my own area. He had taken part in a break-and-entry theft or an armed robbery. He had accompanied a certain Cloutier, who shot at policemen and people.

I think he killed one or two persons. Perrault was sitting in his car outside the bank. He was waiting for his accomplice. Once in the car, after one or two persons had been killed, the two escaped. The police caught up with them and eventually Cloutier was sentenced to the gallows. Perrault was also sentenced to hang, it being alleged that the man who held the bag was as guilty as the one who filled it up. I suggest that such a conviction was entirely unjustified, for in this case there had been no slaughter nor murder committed by the man.

Let us consider another case, that of Wilbert Coffin, which raised much interest, not only in the province of Quebec but throughout the country. It was never clearly or precisely established that Coffin was a murderer. Then, I suggest, if there is a shadow of a doubt, capital punishment should not be imposed.

In the past our judicial system was defective. I hope we will be able to improve it. We will necessarily remain human and, during this debate, we will certainly hear people who may see this question of the murderer or the man who is harmful to society in a different light. However, in the interest of