

brought this matter before the House during this hot time of the year assuming a lot of those opposed to the bill would be home in their ridings. I for one would like a holiday, but I am quite prepared to stay here during the entire summer and right through until Christmas, and I know I speak for many others. I certainly feel that this bill should be brought to a head right now; we should get rid of it and then get on with more important business.

Mr. Joe Hueglin (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I find it very good that the mini-caucus has broken up and hon. members are paying some attention.

In entering this debate in favour of the proposed amendments I do so in the hope that some of those who voted for the bill on second reading will be willing to see the terms for which capital punishment can be brought down enlarged. I know there is no hope of persuading members of the cabinet because they voted as a block, not as individuals, and as such will not accept any amendments. Neither is there much hope of influencing our friends, the hon. members to the left. Their speeches earlier today showed clearly how befogged their minds are by emotion.

There is hope, however, in respect of private members in the government party. They are not bound by cabinet decision. Indeed, the very fact that this amendment was introduced by the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Morin) shows that some retain their independence, and for this she and others are to be congratulated.

I support this amendment not because it fulfils my personal belief, but because it will afford some better punishment and deterrent than otherwise would be the case. It offers protection to persons other than prison guards and policemen. It will give no fit punishment for a hired killer and it will not punish or deter someone killing for personal profit or premeditated revenge.

But while it will not prevent a woman being raped, or men, women or children being kidnapped, it will, if passed and if executed—and this is important—protect their lives once the act has been consummated. While the Nelles kidnappers, had they received the money they sought, would have had no fear of the sentence for kidnapping which they subsequently served, they would have thoughts about destroying evidence if their lives depended upon it. Certainly the sentences served for rape and kidnapping, and even murder, have no deterrent today, but the loss of life would.

Members have suggested that the hon. member for Louis-Hébert is acting as an irrational and emotional woman in bringing in these amendments. May I say as a husband and a father that I share her concern, not out of an irrational fear but out of a very real fear for the lives and safety of my own kith and kin, and those of others.

I have known students of mine who have been attacked, and have witnessed the effect it has had upon their lives and the lives of their families, and it has not been very nice. Let the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) be as objectively emotional as he will. Let him say women often provoke men to rape. Let him call it "perfectly frank, the result of invitation", that these things happen. But I say that no girl ever invited her own death. Many, many girls are accosted, women are accosted, mothers and

Capital Punishment

wives are accosted, as they mind their own lives, as they wend their own way home on our streets.

It is not death for rape that we are speaking of in this amendment, though as a result of replies I have from my riding I believe many more would support this than some would think; it is murder during rape. The hon. member for Greenwood surely misunderstood the amendment, misrepresented it, or knows little in suggesting that women wish to vindicate their reputations by inviting murder. We are so concerned about the murderer these days, but if one person is saved by the deterrent effect of this amendment, it is well worth the while.

The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), if I interpreted him correctly, stated there is little fear among our people as they move about our streets. If this is a correct statement of his views—and I stand to be corrected—he has surely had little contact with his people, or has not sought their attitudes; or else his part of Toronto gives a stronger impression of security than Niagara Falls does to my people.

The first debate on this bill, which took place in a time period when people were politically aware and not engaged in pursuing their own holiday pleasures, engendered great response among my people. Be it in a store, a senior citizens' centre, a hotel or a women's gathering, the same statements emerge: "We lost, didn't we? It used to be safe to walk home. How is it that the Commons voted against what the people want"?

It mattered not to whom I spoke in the weeks since that debate—young, old, well-to-do or struggling—the overwhelming consensus was that the death penalty should be preserved, not because these are blood-thirsty fanatics, but because they perceive their lives to be in peril.

The hon. member for York East (Mr. Arrol) has stated his concern and hope that we do not reach the state of our neighbours to the south, where shoot-outs and murder and local armed guards are everyday occurrences. When someone from Toronto phones through to Detroit and says we have had 24 murders, they think of this as being on a weekend rather than in a whole year. My people share his concern and I share theirs.

Some will say that Americans who come to our great cities feel free from care. But it is a relative freedom, and our people perceive this diminishing year by year as permissiveness for the individual overcomes concern for the common good of society.

Have the abolitionists consulted their people? Have they asked them their opinions? If so, let them enter this debate and give us their statistics. Some, like the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik), in their newsletters have written their constituents of their opinions, but I wonder if they have consulted them.

Some argue that Parliament must lead the people. This is true, but it must be in directions that the people feel comfortable with, that rest their minds and that commend themselves to the people. We have had five years of leading, and it has been rejected totally by the people of Canada. It has been said that in the U.K. abolition has been brought in; but it has been by the will of parliament, and people are demanding the return of the death penalty. In the United States it is by the fiat of the courts; but both