

In simple terms, as Yvon Deschamps would say, my mother was decisive, in other words, she gave me a good hiding, while my father, who was more the lecturing kind, would sit me down and talk to me for hours on end. He would talk to me about maturity and responsibility. My father developed with strength and relevancy such basic notions as human freedom and responsibility. He was always emphasizing the need to measure the final consequences of one's actions. My father told me about fundamental justice and reminded me that each one of us must pay the price or reap the rewards for our actions. For him, freedom and responsibility were impossible to separate. For him, these principles were the living proof of maturity. For him, freedom and responsibility were the very basis of our family unit and the cornerstone of this country. Madam Speaker, it is in fact because of these two inseparable notions of freedom and responsibility that I consider reinstatement of the death penalty essential in this country.

Naturally, Madam Speaker, I have looked carefully at the statistical arguments of the abolitionists. Some of these arguments have a certain value, and it is true that the deterrent effect of capital punishment is not a valid argument, that the threat of having their own life taken away does not prevent criminals from committing crimes. The death penalty scares only people like you and me, Madam Speaker, it scares only law-abiding citizens, not the criminals. The criminals think about it only later, not before, unlike our policemen, who have to ask questions to the criminals before, even though the answer they might receive could be a bullet in the head.

It is also true that the argument of using the death penalty as an example cannot be supported and that the bloody spectacle of hanging, electrocution or other means of execution is more an act of savagery and voyeurism than anything else. As for me, I believe that it would be too much of an honour for the criminals to give them the front page of our newspapers or a chance to appear on television. They do not deserve that much. They do not even deserve our scorn. If the motion is adopted this evening, I would be satisfied if we used a small injection or a glass of water and a pill to rid us of those who no longer deserve the right to live.

Madam Speaker, I have also listened to the argument to the effect that we must respect human life. Is it not strange, Madam Speaker, and I would like to have some statistics about this, that the most ardent abolitionists are often those who are most in favour of abortion on demand! Such incongruous contrasts can only occur in politics. On the one hand, criminals should be protected because we must respect human life, but there is no problem in promoting the killing of new life. As for me, Madame Speaker, in all conscience, I cannot accept that a murderer should go unpunished, I cannot understand that someone who would stab an 80-year-old man 50 times to rob him of \$50, or someone who raped a young girl in a moment of mental aberration should go unpunished. "Sorry, Your Honour, it was a moment of mental aberration." Then, realizing what he had done in a moment of aberration, as he realized that his victim might denounce him, he killed

Capital Punishment

her. I find it incredible that we should accept such situations, even though the figures tell us that they do in fact exist. Are we going to base our justice system on statistics? Is this a society founded only on statistics?

People have always tried to establish a direct relationship between the crime committed and the penalty which should be imposed. And we would now refuse to apply the same principles to the capital crime, which this time would not deserve capital punishment! We have established in our courts of justice a code that states that for robbery X or Y, for a criminal act of such or such a type there shall be such or such a penalty. But when it comes to the capital crime, oh no! we won't apply capital punishment.

If we take the view that criminals and crime are a permanent illness in our society that absolve the authors of any responsibility, if we become supporters of Jean-Jacques Rousseau who taught that any man is good and society corrupts him, what the heck are we doing with our courts of justice? At the limit, let us empty prisons and accelerate what is now going on. At the limit, let us be consistent. Just the same, they allow self defence apparently. Even abolitionists say: In self-defence, it is absolutely normal that one defends oneself and kills one's aggressor, if it comes to that. But society as such has no right to self-defence against those who committed murders against its members? It is funny how we get ourselves an army, with instruments of death. We get ourselves an army with instruments of death to protect our sovereignty, to protect the collective vitality of Canadians on our soil. We get ourselves instruments of death and we say that in case of war it is normal to shoot at the enemy, to kill the enemy. And as Canada itself assumes the right to kill its external enemies—to kill even the enemies of its allies—and has done so in the past, when it comes to its domestic allies, its own community, it deprives itself of that right. That is utterly inconsistent in my view. You must be consistently wrong, my math teacher used to say. I had the wrong answer but was consistent in my error, but on this issue we are not consistent, and this seems illogical to me.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, it is my view that capital punishment is self-defence, defending honest citizens in this country. And there can be no claim to consistency if in the final analysis there is no possibility, in exceptional, unjustifiable circumstances, when people no longer deserve the right to live, when they are unamendable as they themselves proved it, I believe that we must at least give ourselves that possibility. I for one completely trust judges and juries to decide in the best circumstances. This country gave itself a Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Unfortunately, and this may be a reflection on the times, not many countries gave themselves a Charter of Rights, Freedoms and Responsibilities. Apparently there is more emphasis on the rights of criminals than on the rights of victims. We couldn't care less about victims finally. It is unbelievable that mental suffering is not assessed in courts of justice. That is not recognized. It is unbelievable. Recently,