

society, Mr. Speaker. I hope that some of the additional knowledge I provide in this debate may cause some who voted for this bill on second reading and who rejected motion No. 13 at report stage, to rethink their position. This vote will be the last chance they will have to represent the wishes of their constituents and at the same time halt some premeditated ruthless killers who have proclaimed they have nothing to lose if they kill again. I believe capital punishment is a deterrent, Mr. Speaker, and I shall explain that later. I am not making a token speech. Some such people have already served notice on our guards and police. Throughout the country the number of murders, attempted murders, vicious, assaults with rape is growing at an accelerated pace.

Perhaps one day in the future when we are advanced sociologically far beyond where we are now in our preventative correction—as was suggested by the hon. member who just spoke—we can face the abolition question and end hanging in Canada. We must not do it in the way of Bill C-84, however, which is an abomination in justice, a trade-off in brutality and cruelty.

When all our children are assured of safe passage into adulthood, when mature programs replace whimsical, hit and miss social work for preventing family breakdown and destruction of children, when our institutions—schools, hospitals, treatment centres and holding facilities—are competent to prevent and cure social ills before frustration, violence, paranoia, psychopathy and sociopathic ills develop, then I shall be the first—if I am still alive when that great day comes—to strive for abolition. I did work for abolition in the 1950's when every person who killed was sentenced to death if convicted.

Before I go on I want to discuss briefly the right of every member to participate fully in this debate. One or two members—perhaps three—have indicated that we on this side should only participate with token statements to let our constituents know we have taken a position in this debate. I suggest this was a reprehensible attempt to silence and intimidate us which reflects the superficiality of those—very, very few, I might say—who would say that. It only inspires me to greater determination to complete my intervention in this debate.

It is my understanding of parliament that this is the place for debate—that it is here that we make our points and if possible influence others who may have less knowledge or experience in the subjects under discussion—whether it be abolition or finance. Many talented people are gathered in this House and each has some knowledge, experience and wisdom in his or her own field to pass on to others. I have learned much from hearing and reading the debates; I must admit I have also learned a great deal about corn and balderdash.

I feel very strongly that I have every right to use my time in debate here, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe in the backroom lobbying that I have seen in this House. If the debate continues in the lobby, I will participate. But I do not believe in rigged votes whether in this House or in party conventions—that means the other parties and my party—where the advocates of one side pack the vote. It is a fraud on the people of Canada. Nor do I believe that inducements or threats should be used to influence people to change their vote—especially when this is a free vote.

Capital Punishment

Unfortunately, both the cabinet and the opposition shadow cabinet are toeing one line so we are not alone over here in the lack of a totally free vote. The NDP is even worse, toeing a party line on an issue as serious as this. Participatory democracy is thus frustrated, Mr. Speaker. Had this been a totally free vote the public wish for retention of the death penalty would have been fulfilled.

Perhaps this rush to get this bill through is so that some people can make history—Richard Nixon made history from his victory—and they are prepared to win by default, by limiting debate and witnesses in committee and trying to intimidate their opponents, thus imposing their wish on the people of Canada and denying the majority the right to the protection of the state.

Canadians today are perhaps more angry over parliament's—and that is both sides of this House—arrogance or elitism in overriding the wishes and demands of about 18 million of their 22 million constituency than they are over the issue itself. This is not the society of Edmund Burke. Ours is a public that is wise, educated and sees what we do within minutes of our actions. It judges us from a background of its own knowledge and experience which in the majority of cases is equal to if not superior and even better than, that of many of us here. In the majority of cases that knowledge and experience is equal to if not superior to that of many members of this House.

● (1130)

My remarks apply even to the media which tries to press its convictions on the public. I am thinking particularly of that segment of the Ontario group which imagines, amusing as that may be, that it is an opinion maker. It tried to establish an erroneous opinion on the Calgary Stampede. The hate mongering *Maclean's* magazine tried it with reports of anti-Americanism, which does not exist in the west. They have been found to be wrong. People of this ilk are writing this type of material on this issue which we have been reading. There are those in this eastern group of the media, and some stragglers from other areas of Canada, who attempt to press their convictions on us and on the public. Perhaps some may mistake this as public opinion. I do not. Most people recognize such writing for what it is, that of one single voice. The public also has the intellect to recognize the exaggeration, perversion of truth and the strange practice of reporters interviewing other reporters on events they all covered together. The Prime Minister described that as "Drinking each other's bath water."

I am disappointed at finding it necessary to say all this. Fortunately, there are some great reporters in this country who can call themselves part of the fourth estate. The others dare not take that name. They are a disgrace to the fourth estate.

There is emptiness in mere talking or writing and in never doing anything. There are those who verbalize about standards of behaviour and morality but cannot meet them themselves. There are those who express compassion for a concept such as abolition but would not fight for the life or freedom of one convicted person. I have seen this both in journalism and law. The very people who criticize my position today have never worked on a parole and never as lawyers or journalists cared a damn for the people locked in cages we call prisons. Nor have they attempted to listen