

longer alone. The scientists, as well as others, are now the leaders. Let me quote William Butler Yeats:

Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;  
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,  
the blood-dimmed tide is loosed. And everywhere  
The ceremony of innocence is drowned;  
The best lack of all conviction, while the worst  
Are full of passionate intensity.

That was said 40 years ago. Since then we have seen the Second World War, Korea, Viet Nam, four Middle East wars, Lebanon, Biafra, Bangla Desh, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the Berlin wall. We have seen assassinations, terrorism, indiscriminate murder. On the local level, there is an increase in crime, murder and flaunting of the law and growing civilian fears. Surely, no one can say we are getting better.

A call for the death penalty is not an emotional cry for vengeance. It is, rather, a call for the self-preservation of the human race. All of us need boundaries for our behaviour. To institute abolition of the death penalty for calculated and premeditated murder is to remove those boundaries, to give the murderer an indefinite "maybe". Capital punishment is a clear statement to all of us, wherever we are, that says, "This far, and no farther".

**Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, this is a serious debate that demands sober judgment. It has to do with life and death, justice and mercy, love and retribution, peace, orderliness, condemnation of evil, preservation of the state and the triumph of right. I have been impressed with the wisdom and the in-depth understanding that other members in debating this issue have shown. I have not always agreed with the premises or with the conclusions, and in some cases have disagreed with both; but for the most part it has been a high-level debate. The abolitionists have not been accused of being misguided do-gooders, and the retentionists for the most part have not been accused of being barbaric, sadistic or savage.

I intend, in the few minutes allotted to me, to put forth my own case, my own argument, not necessarily to rebut any particular member's point of view, but in doing so to let the debate fall where it may. In the spring-summer 1975 issue of *Inkhorn* was a quote that I think was very apropos to my remarks in this debate today. It is as follows:

Anyone with a facile pen and an axe to grind can write compellingly and exert much appeal. And since axe-grinding will always produce sparks, undiscerning readers will see only the flash of indignation.

In regard to this particular issue, as a lawmaker I must consider the fundamental task of government. Generally stated, the task of government is to uphold justice and to reinforce the freedoms of man; that is, of the body politic. It is important, however, to look at the historic perspective of other scholars and the contribution that they have made in dealing with the question: What is the purpose and the task of government? Since time will not allow me to make an exhaustive review of what other scholars have said, I am going to limit my comments to quotations from John Locke, Jefferson, Mill and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. John Locke, in his "Two Treaties of Government", has this to say:

And that all men may be restrained from invading others' rights, and from doing hurt to one another, and the law of Nature be observed,

### *Capital Punishment*

which willeth the peace and preservation of all mankind, the execution of the law of Nature is in that state put into every man's hands, whereby every one has a right to punish the transgressors of that law to such a degree as may hinder its violation. For the law of Nature would, as all other laws that concern men in this world, be in vain if there were nobody that in the state of Nature had a power to execute that law, and thereby preserve the innocent and restrain offenders—

Also, in the same essay John Locke has this to say:

In transgressing the law of Nature, the offender declares himself to live by another rule than that of reason and common equity . . .

By the same reason may a man in the state of Nature punish the lesser breaches of that law, it will, perhaps, be demanded, with death? I answer: Each transgression may be punished to that degree, and with so much severity, as will suffice to make it an ill bargain to the offender, give him cause to repent, and terrify others from doing the like.

According to Locke, wherever law ends, tyranny begins. My last quotation from John Locke in his "Two Treatises of Government" is this:

For laws not being made for themselves, but to be, by their execution, the bonds of the society to keep every part of the body politic in its due place and function; when that totally ceases, the government visibly ceases, and the people become a confused multitude without order or connection. Where there is no longer the administration of justice for the securing of men's rights, nor any remaining power within the community to direct the force, or provide for the necessities of the public, there certainly is no government left.

George Washington had this to say:

Towards the preservation of your Government, and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles.

He also said:

And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion.

I should also like to quote John Stuart Mill. I had occasion last Friday to quote John Stuart Mill, and unless some hon. members think that I am a disciple of John Stuart Mill, let me say it was coincidence of topic that led me to quote him rather than my discipleship to his theories. He has had this to say:

That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others.

That quotation is taken from his 1859 essay on liberty. In speaking of representative government, John Stuart Mill pointed out that one of the most positive evils of the representative system is the danger that it may be influenced by an interest that is not identical with the general welfare of the community. Abraham Lincoln, in his second inaugural address, quoted the Bible as follows:

● (1230)

Woe unto the world because of offenses! For it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh.

I now want to quote from a book that I will be referring to often in this debate. It has been a good source of information to me. It is a book called, "The Bible and the Life of the Christian". This is what that has to say in respect of the purpose of government:

In Psalm 119 we are instructed that all things abide today according to the ordinances of the Creator (Psalm 119:89-91). There is nothing that is not taken up into that stream of power which preserves the whole world from collapse. Sin cannot halt God's providence nor arrest His omnipotence. Generations of men come and go, fill their time with