

Canadians, I am heartsick at listening to the quotes of so-called research experts who will go to any length to rehabilitate, at the expense of the taxpayers, killers who in many cases have proven themselves, by repeated crimes, unworthy of such consideration.

I ask the government to prepare a plebiscite for the next national election on the abolition of capital punishment. Let the people of Canada decide what they want to do with their murderers. To this end, I have introduced a private member's bill, No. C-117, an act to provide for a national plebiscite on the abolition of capital punishment. I hope the government will see fit, before my bill comes up for debate, to adopt this proposal for the next election so that the people of Canada can decide on this very serious moral issue.

I certainly believe in rehabilitation of the criminal, but some of the acts of this government in the past four years have just gone too far for the average Canadian to take. I should like, just for a couple of minutes, to discuss our new bail reform laws.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) in a press release issued a few weeks ago stated, and I quote:

Although the new bail laws have not been in operation long enough to judge accurately the impact and results, there was general agreement across Canada that the new regulations were working well and offered a significant improvement in personal liberty over the previous existing laws and practices.

Where has the minister been? Certainly not out in British Columbia. Has he talked to any judges or policemen? The new Bail Reform Act is a farce, and I suggest to the minister that he must be having too many meetings with the so-called research experts. The government should stop listening to these bleeding hearts. Mr. Speaker, can you believe that four convicts in British Columbia were given a \$10,000 LIP grant to do a study on heroin? The result of the study, other than many free hours outside their cells, was a recommendation by the four convicts to legalize heroin and abolish prisons! I guess this could seem humorous to some people, Mr. Speaker, but I feel it is totally irresponsible. Donald Anderson, who is 48 years old and head of the project, disappeared with a 17-year-old girl and \$3,000 at the end of the program.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member in the midst of his speech, but it does seem to me he is straying away from the question of capital punishment. I ask him to address himself to the subject under consideration.

Mr. Reynolds: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am just trying to show, with the aid of these examples, why the present bill is not working.

Now, I would like to get down to some facts. Many members in favour of abolition stood up and said the whole world is abolishing the death penalty. Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that Canada is one of 58 countries which retains the death penalty. At last count, authorities in 27 countries had given up the death penalty either by law or by virtue of simply not executing anyone. That is a fact. Another fact: two countries are experiencing strong support for the return of the death penalty. In Britain, where capital punishment was abolished except for treason after a five-year period in 1969, and also in West

Capital Punishment

Germany, there is strong feeling for the return of the death penalty. I think the reason for these reinstatement movements in Britain and West Germany is that the people of these countries feel like the people of Canada—that the hard-core criminal who does not want to live by the standards society sets should go to jail, and that a hard-core murderer who wants to murder an innocent victim should pay with his own life.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to review a couple of murder cases in British Columbia. The first is that of a Mr. Rene Castellani who was sentenced in 1966 for the murder of his wife. His method of murder was putting arsenic in milk shakes during a period of 13 months. Our laws state that 10 years must be served before parole, but Mr. Castellani is living in Abbotsford, B.C., and working in a bookstore. I understand he checks into the prison once or twice a week, and punches the time-clock like a regular working man. What kind of punishment is this for a man who committed such a brutal crime?

The second case, Mr. Speaker, concerns Mr. Lorenzo Hiscock who was sent to Kingston in December, 1962, for the murder of his first wife. This charge was later reduced to one of manslaughter and he was sentenced to 14 years. Mr. Hiscock was paroled from Joyceville on January 19, 1968. He was readmitted to penitentiary in British Columbia on July 5, 1972 and has been charged with the murder of his common-law wife. This case shows that the death penalty can be a deterrent.

In one of my previous comments I mentioned the words "research experts" once or twice. I think I would refer to them rather as bleeding hearts. I would like to read into the record of this House of Commons a letter I have in my possession. It is written on Canadian penitentiary stationery. The heading is: British Columbia Penitentiary, Box 150, New Westminster, B.C. The letter is addressed to the District Representative, The National Parole Service, 2nd floor, 32988 South Fraser Way, Abbotsford, B.C. The reference number is 3808—Head CDG. Mr. Speaker, the comments in this letter are about Charles Head, the same Charles Head who has been mentioned in this House of Commons by some hon. members many times; the Charles Head who on four different occasions was convicted of brutal, sexual assaults on girls between the ages of six and nine years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member poses an interesting question. It is usually the practice here that when a document is read into the record, a letter, for example, the author is identified. Perhaps the hon. member could assist me in reaching a decision as to whether the letter should be read into the record. Is he prepared to identify the author?

Mr. Reynolds: I do not have the name of the author but I do have a copy of the letter in my files. If you wish, I could paraphrase the letter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It seems to me that it names somebody who has been before the courts and who has been convicted of the crime of murder. I really should like to hear some argument from hon. members before I would be prepared to permit the hon. member to read a statement which has apparently been written about somebody else