

Capital Punishment

An hon. Member: You are getting more ridiculous all the time; keep going.

Mr. Caccia: Will you please call the House to order, Mr. Speaker. It is the time of the opposition that is being wasted anyway, Mr. Speaker.

For those reasons, inevitably members on this side of the House and the Canadian public have to come to the conclusion that what is before us is a caving in on the part of the Leader of the Official Opposition to pressures within his caucus. He does not believe in this motion and he has said that himself. He does not believe in capital punishment, but he cannot resist the pressures from the Neanderthals in his own backbenches.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Caccia: That is a fact. It is a reality.

An hon. Member: He is doing it for the gallery.

Mr. Caccia: As I listened to the speeches this afternoon—

Mr. Domm: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I recognize the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) on a point of order.

Mr. Domm: Mr. Speaker, in fairness to the mover and seconder of the motion, it is totally in error for a speaker on the government side to say that the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Clark) does not believe in his own motion. That is in error.

An hon. Member: That is what he said.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) for realizing that the position of his party is so frail that a remark by a Liberal backbencher must provoke his intervention to demonstrate to us that his leader really means this.

Let me get on with my remarks. When listening to the speeches this afternoon I was making some quick notes on what would have been an alternative subject for an opposition day of the official opposition. I recall the hon. member for Edmonton South (Mr. Roche) writing a very fine article which appeared in *The Globe and Mail* a few days ago in which he complained about the fact that somehow this Parliament has denied him, and most of us who are interested in international affairs and foreign matters, a debate of several days on the issue. Evidently he was sitting in his seat looking not very enthusiastic or excited about the choice of topic for today's debate. Evidently he would prefer to have another topic for debate, judging from what he wrote in *The Globe and Mail* the other day. We know the hon. member for Edmonton South would prefer to have had a debate on North-South issues, in which he as well as some other of his colleagues and members of all parties in this House are interested. I jotted down the names of a number of other members who would like to have a debate on East-West relations. There are members who would

like, for the benefit of Canadians watching us on television, to have a debate on the devastating effect of Washington's monetary policy on Canada and western European nations. Why not have a debate on urea-formaldehyde foam which is affecting the lives of many Canadians?

● (1730)

An hon. Member: Bring it in.

Mr. Caccia: I will go on, Mr. Speaker, with a few more quick draft proposals for the official opposition. Why not have a debate on jobs and the consistent and chronic vacancies in certain industries in this country? Why not have a debate, for the benefit of the official opposition, on nuclear armament and the need to get a handle on this tough issue? Why not have a debate on labour management and government and the desirability of intensifying consultations between these three sectors so as to achieve certain national goals? Why not, Mr. Speaker, have a debate on acid rain, or on food additives and artificial colours and what they do in the long run to the health of Canadians?

An hon. Member: Ask your own caucus.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, why not have a debate on propane and methanol and other substitutes that would help reduce our dependence on costly imported oil? Why not have a debate on the spread between interest rates on loans and the rates paid on non-chequing deposits? Why not have a debate on the desirability of covering under social security programs Canadians who have part-time jobs? Why not have a debate on the performance of multinationals in Canada whose policies on world product manufacturing leads to unemployment among our workers who have given, in some cases, over 20 years of their life to their company, as is the case with employees of CGE in Toronto, and that company's decision to stop production of transformers?

Mr. Lawrence: This is quite a condemnation of the government.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, why not have a debate on where we are on multiculturalism ten years after the announcement of this policy? Why not have a debate on marketing boards and whether they serve public interests? Mr. Speaker, why does the opposition not choose a debate on the long-term effect on the health of Canadians of the use of pesticides in agriculture? Why not have a debate on the improvement of ground transportation services in Canada, or a debate on how parliamentary reform would help to better serve the interests of Canadians, or a debate on quotas on imports, whether they help the industries concerned and the consumer? How about having a debate on a reduction in the spending on arms, which amounts to something like \$500 billion a year?

An hon. Member: Speak to the Russians first.

Mr. Caccia: This would lead to greater development aid to needy countries. Mr. Speaker, why did I make this list?