

have had to stand and be counted on this issue. For many of them it has been a difficult, frustrating, and tense time.

I admire my friends who have stood in the House knowing full well that their constituents and many other people in the country would not support them. I see them as men and women of leadership and courage. Many of them will be facing constituents who are angry and frustrated with them. I would ask those constituents to keep in mind the fact that the very people who had the courage to stand in the House and make speeches which were not in the majority opinion are the kind of people we should have in the House of Commons.

The next time we face a moral issue I may well not be in the majority position. However, I hope I have the same kind of courage as many of my friends have had.

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Madam Speaker, I begin by saying that I am not in favour of capital punishment and that I will not be supporting the resolution brought forth by the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) and seconded by his Parliamentary Secretary.

At the outset I want to say that this debate is important to all Canadians from coast to coast and to various interest groups with varying opinions on the subject matter. However, it is somewhat sad that we as parliamentarians, who happen to represent Canadians in the highest court in the land, will not have sufficient or additional time to debate the substance of the reinstatement of capital punishment.

A few Members have spoken and a few more will speak in the remaining hours, but it goes without saying that a majority of Members would like to participate, but the Government's closure motion precludes a free and open debate on a very important subject matter.

I have profound respect for Hon. Members opposite who have an opposing view to mine because they have been true to their convictions, as has the Hon. Member who has just spoken. I would not at any time want to question, nor to put in doubt, his integrity or judgment on the subject matter. Equally important, I hope Hon. Members opposite who share a different view on this important matter will not question my integrity or my convictions with regard to the reinstatement of capital punishment.

I begin this debate by going back to the comments of Edmund Burke who has been referred to many times in this great Chamber by members of all political Parties. To paraphrase Edmund Burke, he said that we owe our judgment to our constituents. It is my view that the majority in my constituency is perhaps in favour of reinstating capital punishment. However, I was not elected to the Parliament of Canada to be a rubber stamp. I was sent here by my constituents for a variety of reasons, one of which I believe in deeply and profoundly, that is, that I was sent here to exercise my judgment on their behalf.

Capital Punishment

Intellectually, I cannot morally accept the arguments in favour of reinstating capital punishment. Politically, it may not be feasible to be against the reinstatement of capital punishment. I say to those across the land who want to use this issue for political purposes to defeat Members of Parliament who are against the reinstatement of capital punishment that I am prepared for the fight, no matter what is the fight.

This is a debate which ought to occupy the minds of all Canadians and all Members of Parliament. In order to exercise our judgment, it only seems appropriate, logical, and inevitable that the governing Party would want to give ample opportunity to all parliamentarians to address the substance of the reinstatement of capital punishment.

• (1650)

What have the experts said? What have we heard in this great Chamber with regard to the pros and cons of the reinstatement of capital punishment? I want to talk about those experts, Madam Speaker. I will conclude my remarks about a real life situation in my constituency, in my province, affecting constituents and Canadians in that region of Canada. What of the experts? I go back some years ago when I had an opportunity as a student of law to hear some great orators. One of the best was the former President of the Conservative Party of Canada who came to Dalhousie Law School. I was the chairman of the speaker's committee. Arthur Maloney gave a speech before a body of young men and women who had differing views regarding the reinstatement of capital punishment. He said, as only Arthur Maloney could say, "Have you ever walked with a client to the gallows? Have you ever held the hand of a man or a woman who has been sentenced to have their life done away with?" That ought to go to the moral fibre of every Member of Parliament in this House.

It is one thing to say in the halls of Parliament or in the coffee shop that intellectually, yes, there are probably some reasons for which we ought to favour the reinstatement of capital punishment. But the question must remain. With the reinstatement of capital punishment, will it achieve the objectives of the previous Hon. Member in deterring homicides in Canada? Will it achieve the objectives of the Hon. Member who is leading the charge in this House for the reinstatement of capital punishment to prevent crimes against victims? The answer, and I say it with great respect to those Members, is no.

What of the experts, Madam Speaker? In the June edition of *Psychology Today*, Dan Archer, who has studied the subject matter of capital punishment and its effects for some 14 years and has surveyed in excess of 80 different nations, asked: "Does the death penalty deter potential killers?" In his judgment the answer is no, it does not. The death penalty does not deter homicidal criminals. When a nation does violence to human beings by conducting wars and executing criminals, it incites citizens to more criminal violence than they would otherwise commit, so the state can make violence the coin of its realm.