

Mr. Lambert:—an absolute increase in this with the absolute consent from the Chair, which is an abuse of the principles of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I think there are a number of abuses in the House at this point. First of all, it seems to me there is a standing tradition that when the person occupying the chair stands, then it is expected of hon. members that they will seat themselves. That is the first thing.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I am not here to defend my particular ego on the subject; I am here rather to express what I think is the necessary respect due to the Chair.

The second thing is that it is understood that the person occupying the chair and an hon. member do not speak at the same time. I find myself disturbed in that I have to address an hon. member who is a former Speaker and to remind him of that.

Mr. Lambert:—disgrace. The rule is a disgrace.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The hon. member continues in this fashion, I will have very little choice but to look to the rules and apply them. I am embarrassed that they should have to be applied to a former Speaker.

Mr. Lambert: That's fine.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I want to apologize to the hon. member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie). I indicated to him earlier that he would be the next speaker. This is an opposition motion, however, so I would have to ask him if he would not mind waiting and I will recognize the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Bradley).

Mr. Bud Bradley (Haldimand-Norfolk): I rise to speak on this motion, Mr. Speaker, in respect of my own views and in respect of the views of my constituents. I personally favour some form of capital punishment. I feel in my heart that it is a deterrent. However, I was also elected by the constituents of Haldimand-Norfolk to represent them and their views in this House.

● (2020)

In a recent questionnaire to my constituents, one of eleven varied questions read:

Do you feel that capital punishment should be reinstated? Yes; No; Undecided.

In response to that questionnaire, 85.6 per cent indicated yes, 5 per cent were undecided and only 9.4 per cent indicated no. I doubt if my constituency varies greatly from others in this country.

Capital Punishment

People in Haldimand-Norfolk have the same concerns as others across this land: concern for their children, concern for their friends and relations, and that concern is growing.

There has been much talk this evening about statistics on murder. In fact, the number of attempted murders has increased tremendously. There are other factors affecting the number of murders committed. Consider such things as improved equipment and improved skills of medical personnel such as those the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Hudecki) possesses. I am sure he is well aware that countless lives of attempted murder victims can now be saved which possibly could not have been saved 20 years ago. That is evidence we must consider.

We live in a democratic society where the majority should rule. I suggest that the people's voice should be heard. Abolition has failed to convince them. People are demanding a return to capital punishment. We must be a responsible government. We must be mindful of the wishes of our people or we will have failed.

Is capital punishment a deterrent? What is a deterrent? If you are found guilty of impaired driving, you lose your licence. That is a deterrent. When I went to school many years ago if a child was found guilty of an infraction by a teacher, that child was strapped. That was a deterrent. Our society has been built on deterrents. We are a society of rewards and punishments. If the punishments are reduced, it is only natural that people reap the rewards legally and illegally. Too many of our deterrents are being removed from society today.

Is it not time that we started replacing our deterrents and re-educating ourselves toward respect, respect for ourselves, respect for others and respect for the standards expected of mankind?

Individuals in our society today still hold the belief that crime must be punished. The question is to what degree? Society once held that the greater the crime, the greater the punishment; the ultimate crime, the ultimate punishment. Should we not return to that belief? Should the punishment not match the crime?

Certainly one has the right to life, but should he not also forfeit that right if he wantonly denies another of his right?

What was wrong when capital murder drew the death penalty and non-capital murder drew life in prison? One major fear was that of errors by the jury.

In reality, if any doubt was in the judge's mind, not a reasonable doubt but any doubt, he would withdraw the capital charge, convert it to a non-capital charge, and the only charge on the jury was to decide guilt or innocence. We have a great judiciary in Canada. Let us give it the trust, the respect and the support it should have.

Other protections are provided. The courts provide protection for insanity, which is not knowing that what was done was wrong, and they provide protection from provocation.

I am not asking you today to agree with my views. I am only asking that you agree that changes in society have taken place,