

*Capital Punishment*

election ending up dead in prisons or on the streets, that will reactivate this issue, and it will not go away if a one-time killer, as has been demonstrated here in debate—and I am not going to review all the cases—kills again.

The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway did not mention the case which switched me, but it happened in British Columbia. I refer to the case of the two-time killer who killed a third time, in that case a little girl. That finally switched me, because in my opinion the pendulum has swung too far in redress for the accused and not protection for society. I think that was the fundamental reason.

I can argue the sanctity of life philosophically, on either side of the coin, but other than in the Evans' case in England back in the 1950s, a known case in the Commonwealth of a man convicted of murder, put to death and then later proved to be innocent, hon. members cannot use the argument of wrongful execution. That may have happened in the judicial system before the Second World War or immediately afterward, but the sad thing which has happened is that abolitionists keep saying that we do not want to make a permanent mistake by putting to death someone who cannot afterwards be resurrected.

On the other side of the coin, since 1961 there have been four cases of one-time killers who have been let out of our prisons or who have not observed weekend passes and killed a second time. I think that for some of these reasons this issue will stay alive and hon. members will have to be prepared to live with it.

In conclusion, there is a funny paradox—not funny “ha, ha”, but funny “sad, sad”—that while this House was voting on one of the amendments the other night as to whether there should be capital punishment for the murderers of prison guards or policemen, or whether there should be capital punishment for acts of terrorism or insurrection against the Queen, the Israeli cabinet, which is one of the most liberal in terms of small “l” governments in the world, and which created a country almost out of the ashes of many millions of their race, whilst still believing in the sanctity of life is seriously considering exacting capital punishment on convicted terrorists where lives have been lost. They are not necessarily arguing the sanctity of life; they have argued that and have lived through it.

The state of Israel was created after millions of Jews were hideously brutalized and had gone to gas chambers. They are not debating the sanctity of life, but they do not want to be put into a position which we have witnessed from afar. That is what makes it so easy for some of us to debate philosophically this issue; we really have not been confronted with some of the realities of the world. Nor do they want to be placed in the Uganda situation again, where 43 convicted terrorists were held within their jails. Whether they were all terrorists who had killed, or whether they were all crimes committed in Israel, I am not sure. They do not want to get into the position again of having hijackers keeping citizens of their country as hostages in exchange for the transfer and release of convicted terrorists who have killed citizens of that state. It is an interesting paradox that we, in the abstract, not having gone through the pain of birth that that state has and the agonies of so many of its citizens, can sit here and have this philosophical debate. That state which has lived through hell, and grew up through the smoke of hell, is

[Mr. Nowlan.]

thinking of bringing back capital punishment for that kind of crime.

● (1240)

Mr. Speaker, I have been on both sides of this issue, but this time when I vote against Bill C-84 it will be with more conviction than I have ever had before. I believe fundamentally in the potential of the ultimate penalty for the ultimate crime. It is not likely that any prime minister is going to sign the paper, figuratively speaking, for capital punishment on the first occasion, should the bill be defeated. In the mood of this country, it would have to be a heinous crime, with no extenuating circumstances, for the penalty of capital punishment to be exacted, but the fact that it was on the books might set a standard for a stricter administration of justice.

I do not want to digress, Mr. Speaker, and I should end right there, but I am confronted with a problem. The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) mentioned that hon. members should be present on Wednesday for the vote on third reading, which I suspect may be a closer vote than some of the others would indicate. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday Her Majesty is going to be in my home town at two o'clock in the afternoon when the vote is to be taken. I may resolve the conflict if I can be paired with a fervent abolitionist who will also be away. But I might very well be here, because I am rather irritated and I believe that the people of Annapolis Valley have been insulted by some of the arrangements made for the royal tour. Due to sloppy planning at the least, or to petty politics at the most, on the part of those making the arrangements, which I believe to be the premier's office in Halifax, but they must have been advised by Ottawa—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order, please. I suggest the hon. member return to the terms of Bill C-84.

**Mr. Nowlan:** My remarks are relevant, Mr. Speaker. I am explaining why I might well not be here on Wednesday. On the other hand, the reason I may be here is that I am so irritated and the people of the Annapolis Valley are so insulted by the arrangements which may be due to sloppy planning or petty politics. According to protocol, a member of the House of Commons ranks ahead of even a provincial cabinet minister. Yet I have not been invited to one of the functions taking place on the day Her Majesty visits my riding. I have only been invited to a luncheon because I am a member of the board of governors of Acadia University. This is the fault of the provincial government in Halifax, unless I can move around from Greenwood to Wolfville to Windsor and be there when she visits the premier's home town. There is no reason why I, as the member for Annapolis Valley, who ranks ahead of an MLA, the mayors and other elected officials, should not have an opportunity to be present when Her Majesty visits, rather than to be at table No. 10 at a luncheon with several hundred other people.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta that this issue will not go away even though we are coming to what is supposed to be the final vote. Members of parliament are going to live with this vote and the issue will come back to the House of Commons on another day. I certainly believe that several mem-