

It is well taken but, in my opinion, I should not put the motion he suggests at this time.

Mr. Woolliams: May I speak further to that question of privilege, Mr. Speaker? My motion is based on the question of privilege, one which affects every member of this chamber. It has always been the practice that when a debate of this nature, or, indeed, of any other, is in progress, one or two cabinet ministers, at least, are present. Members of the ministry have today seen fit to ignore this debate completely. As I say, this is a matter which affects the privileges of every member of this House. I ask that the motion be put.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I repeat that there is some propriety to the comments which have been made, but the hon. member has heard the decision of the Chair and the Chair has no alternative but to call on the hon. member for Peel South.

Mr. Nesbitt: On a point of order. I move that this House do now adjourn.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I am again informed that such procedure is not provided for under our rules. An hon. member is not able to rise on a point of order and then move a motion to adjourn the House, as the hon. member seeks to do. It is my feeling, if not my experience, that if this were to be allowed then at any moment during any debate, for any reason at all, an hon. member could get up, raise a point of order and move the adjournment of the House. Accordingly, it is my intention to adhere to my earlier decision and call upon the hon. member for Peel South.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would invite Your Honour to reconsider your decision with regard to this particular question. I said nothing on the subject during my speech, although my speech was interrupted while the point of order was originally raised. Nothing was said by me at that time, but the matter has now been raised at the first opportunity. I put it to Your Honour that a point of order with regard to attendance in the House is admissible at any time and, therefore, that the motion is not out of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I wish to remind the hon. member for Edmonton West that the point of order raised while he was speaking was not followed by a motion. It was well taken, and, indeed, the point of order raised by another of his hon. friends was well taken. I have rendered a decision. I am ready to take this question under consideration with the Speaker for another occasion but, from the advice I have received until now, I have no choice other than to call on the next speaker who is the hon. member for Peel South.

Mr. Baldwin: Before we leave this point, may I say this: I see several assorted Parliamentary Secretaries present; they might possibly send for a minister so that the cabinet might be represented.

The Address—Mr. Chappell

Mr. Hyl Chappell (Peel South): At the outset of these observations, Mr. Speaker, might I offer my congratulations to all those who have spoken before me and in particular to the mover (Mr. Trudel) and the seconder (Mr. Douglas, (Assiniboia) of the motion before us?

Some have criticized the Speech from the Throne, but I think when one considers it together with the list of proposed legislation tabled by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on October 8, it is a most comprehensive and excellent document. A debate on the Address gives each of us an opportunity to speak on what he believes to be the most important issue facing us. Mine is the need for quick and substantial changes to our criminal law.

Last year, at this time, I spoke of the need for discipline in democracy. Thinking of the George Williams University affair, the LaPalme lawlessness, the bombing and the airport riots, I said we had seen a glimpse of chaos which amounted to a gun pointed at democracy and I expressed the view that unless democracy immediately developed a stronger discipline we were on the way to a dictatorship. I thought then that we had five or ten years in which to make our choice. Now, one year later, we do not have any time left. The challenge is here, now. Democracy in Canada is threatened. Can we quickly produce the teeth and muscle to save it? The eyes of the world are upon us. The stake is not just our national reputation but our way of life—democracy itself.

To obtain freedom, each of us gave up his jungle right to behave as he wished and submitted to a code of conduct called laws, in return for protection from those who refused to follow the code. Equal freedom of action and opportunity should exist within these rules. The criminal law deals with those who interfere with our rights within these rules. Without that protection, we are without freedom. The question is: can democracy provide it, or will we slip into dictatorship to provide the discipline and save us from mob rule or revolution?

Our criminal law mainly deals with those who interfere with the life or security of another individual or who steal from the state. These people usually have had protection from, and obeyed, the laws in other respects. For many years we have been humanizing the use of the criminal law sanction, hoping to rehabilitate criminals by more positive and less punitive treatment. This attitude led to the suspension of the death penalty except in very limited circumstances. What we are faced with today in the bombings, air piracy and kidnapping for ransom is very different from ordinary criminal activity. These groups would destroy the whole basis of our law and society. They fight to take away democracy and force their will upon us. Is the concept which we have developed for the criminal sanction of the individual suitable for application to these groups, or must we introduce a whole new concept?

So many Canadians have said in the last two or three years that this is the greatest country in the world. How many have thought to themselves that mob rule and organized gangsterism can not happen here, but only in faraway places. Some will now say, what a disturbing or unpleasant thought and brush it off in the hope that the