

I say this is an abuse of the prerogatives of a provincial attorney general.

I objected to the law being changed in 1967 because it seemed to me at that time that a double-cross had been played on parliament. A year earlier, on a private member's resolution concerning the question of abolition or retention, the House had divided strongly in favour of the retention of capital punishment. Yet less than a year later the government came back with a bill, on which there was no free vote allowed for government members, introducing the present moratorium. Oh, they threw in a sop about prison guards and policemen, a sop which abused every argument used by government speakers in support of abolition, that is, the assertion that it is morally wrong to take the life of a convicted murderer. All of the arguments, esoteric and otherwise, in favour of the abolition of capital punishment were swept aside by the government when it introduced the equivalent of Bill C-2 in 1967.

I find the consequences extremely difficult to explain to any citizen of Canada. A few cases immediately occur to me. What about an old age pensioner who is mortally wounded in an exchange of fire during a robbery at a bank or a credit union? What about a bank employee, male or female, who is killed during a bank robbery? What about the grocer at the little corner store who is attacked by a couple of hoodlums and knifed or bludgeoned to death? What about the case in Toronto the other day when a 75-year-old woman was assaulted by two or three men and kicked repeatedly in the head, over a matter of a few dollars? She was grievously injured. If she dies, is there any reason the treatment of those cowards who attacked her should be any different from the treatment meted out to one who shoots a policeman or kills a prison guard? I just cannot see the reason for any difference. Whose life is the more sacrosanct—that of a peace officer or that of an ordinary citizen?

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[Translation]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member. Pursuant to Standing Order 40, it is my duty to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Hales)—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—Recovery of income tax from employees stationed in United States—Refusal by corporation—Position of minister; the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom)—Agriculture—Farm machinery—Implementation of recommendations of Barber Commission—Action to increase imports; the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche)—Transport—Alleged deterioration in western Canada railway passenger service—Request for investigation.

### Disclosure of Documents

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely public bills, private bills and notices of motions (papers).

[English]

Since there are no private members' bills for discussion, the House will proceed to consider notices of motion for the production of papers. I will call upon the hon. member for Bellechasse.

**Mr. Reid:** Mr. Speaker, there might be agreement to consider motion No. 87 on the order paper.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

• (1700)

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

### INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE

REQUEST FOR COPY OF PROGRAMS FORECAST OF  
DEPARTMENT, INCLUDING BUDGETS A, B, X

**Mr. Terry Grier (Toronto-Lakeshore)** moved:

That an order of the House do issue for a complete copy (including budgets A, B, X) of the Program Forecast (Program Review) by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce for the latest year for which parliament approved departmental expenditures.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** The hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore.

[Translation]

**Mr. Rondeau:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) on a point of order.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to you that, since we did not have time to consult the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert), who had a motion on the order paper, I should be glad if we might agree to pass on to Notice of Motion No. 87 for the production of papers, with the provision that we will return as soon as possible to Notice of Motion No. 78 in the name of the hon. member for Bellechasse.

[English]

**Mr. Reid:** Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations in the usual manner as to what motions would be called, and I can assure the hon. member for Shefford that the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Bellechasse will stand and retain its position.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order. I must point out however to the hon. member that as a result of an