

*Capital Punishment*

in wholesale lots to those who have not earned it by repentance, then we cheapen both mercy and justice. We offend God's law, rather than act in accordance with it. The Bible teaches us that God is a merciful God, but it teaches us that he is first of all a just God. The Bible has a lot to say about life, mercy and forgiveness, but it never questions the essential justice of execution for murder. Again and again it reiterates what the consequences of murder are: "He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall be surely put to death". Also, "and they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword"; "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed". In Acts 25:11, the Apostle Paul said:

If then I am a criminal, and have committed anything for which I deserve to die, I do not beg off and seek to escape death.

What the ancient societies knew and accepted, today we doubt and deny, and in so doing we have abdicated justice. Capital punishment is horrible, of course it is, and who can deny it. But is not the nature of all punishment horrible? No penalty can be both sophisticated and effective at the same time, but that does not make it any less necessary or just. To abolish it is to sacrifice the element of justice inherent in it, to be weak when we should be strong, to lack the courage that is required by our convictions of what is just and right.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member, it being five o'clock.

**Mr. Masniuk:** Mr. Speaker, may I continue for another minute and a half and complete my speech?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Does the House allow the hon. member to complete his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

**Mr. Masniuk:** I thank hon. members for their courtesy. I have only a few more comments to make. We live in a society which operates on the rule of law, as I have stated, and one of the basic tenets of both God's law and man's law is that human life is precious and important, the most precious of all human possessions. What is just penalty for the murderer who kills another, who deprives another being of his life, if not the forfeiture of his own? To require any less is to say that we do not really believe in justice, nor do we really believe that life is all that precious. Capital punishment for murder affirms our belief in justice and declares, in unequivocal terms, how important we regard life when we require that one who deprives another person of his life should thereby forfeit his own right to live.

• (1700)

We either live in a society where justice prevails, or we live in a society which without justice is not worth living in at all, because if there is no justice then life has no meaning. We either believe in the value of human life and are willing to affirm that belief by executing murderers, or we indicate, by failing to affirm this belief by not executing murderers, that life is both valueless and meaningless. I choose to live in a society in which justice does prevail and in which life does have meaning. I desire a society which has the courage to affirm its belief in justice and the

[Mr. Masniuk.]

importance of human life, and therefore I am unable to support this abolitionist, government bill.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek)—Sports—Reason for alleged double standard in dealing with South Africa; the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard)—Health—Measures to protect visitors to Olympic Games against polio—possible use of Sabin oral vaccine; the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez)—External Affairs—Mining nickel from seabed—Involvement of workers in developing strategy for negotiations—Position taken by INCO.

It being five o'clock, pursuant to order made on Friday, February 27, 1976, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, private bills and notices of motion.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

**Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It has been agreed through the usual channels that subject to a subsequent challenge today we are to deal with order No. 44 on page 32 of last Monday's order paper, that is, Bill C-244 standing in the name of the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson).

**Mr. Paproski:** That is so agreed, with the usual challenge.

**Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I rose at this time on a point of order you indicated that you would take the matter under advisement. I gave notice at that time that I would rise today to amplify and complete my argument to attempt to illustrate that we are not following the intent of the Standing Orders of this House or that, at best, those Standing Orders are being misinterpreted. Let me say at the outset that my point of order is in no way intended to reflect on the subject matter of today's private members' hour or, for that matter, on the subject matter selected for any previous private members' hour. The point of order refers to the treatment or disposal of the bills or orders which precede on the order paper the item which is called for debate.