

is just the opposite. Through the Justice Department in the United States, reports have been printed of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the U.S. Department of Justice in Washington, D.C., which take the same period during which abolitionists maintain that violent crime and murder were on the increase. The truth of the matter is that every year since 1980 in those states which have capital punishment there has been an annual on-graph decrease in homicide rates. From 1980 through until 1984, according to the Justice Department in the United States, as published by the Canadian report I referred to earlier, the United States has had a decrease in homicide rates on an annual basis all through the 1980s, while Canada has had an increase.

First degree homicides in Canada, which have been published now for the first time in 15 years, have gone up every solitary year since capital punishment was abolished in Canada. In the United States, it has gone down every year since capital punishment was reinstated in 1977, after 10 years of court challenges of that law. To add reinforcement to the other side of the story, we can now prove, without any doubt at all, that the figures used by the abolitionists have been dead wrong.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): How would you bring Marshall back?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. This is Private Members' Business. It is Hon. Members' own business, and I cannot hear the Hon. Member speak.

Mr. Orlikow: He is not worth hearing.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would hope you would all give him an opportunity to finish his remarks.

Mr. Domm: I guess that because I am starting to show some evidence of what has happened in the past, and the statistics which have been funnelled out by those Hon. Members over the last seven years are in error, they do not even wish to hear it. They have been quoting StatsCan for 10 years since we abolished capital punishment and they have fudged and misled the Canadian people.

Ms. Copps: You have.

Mr. Gauthier: You have.

Mr. Domm: We now have the facts from StatsCan. StatsCan claims that when first degree and second degree homicides are broken down, there is a remarkable increase. This will give, without any element of doubt, some satisfaction to those who argue it could possibly be a deterrent. It does not deter every homicide, but there is a possibility that it deters some. If we go back to the 10 years prior to 1977—from 1966 to 1977 when the United States executed no one because of court challenges—we find during that period that homicides in the United States, not in isolation but on graph, went up 38 per cent. Those figures are from the American Justice Department. If we consider the period of time in which capital

punishment was brought back in 1977 through 1985 when there were executions in the United States, we find that, on graph, there was a 23 per cent decrease nationally in homicides. The figures cannot be denied. They are there. They are not debatable. They are fact. But they are whole facts rather than the parts of facts that we have been getting for 10 years.

• (1710)

In conclusion, not only is there new evidence which needs to be heard, but Members opposite can no longer continue to filibuster the right to be heard, the right that these organizations which want to be heard have.

Members opposite are not speaking for the abolitionists when they say that they do not want to be heard. The Catholic Council of Churches has just raised \$50,000 in order that it can be heard, because Parliament slammed the door. Members opposite have that on their conscience. As our homicide rate goes up, as the rate of first degree crimes go up and as innocent people, bystanders, shop owners, bank tellers and policemen, are murdered on the streets, Members opposite will have this to carry on their consciences. They cannot look across here and blame us because we can show that it has a deterrent effect.

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we are not talking about first degree and second degree murder. We are talking about first degree hypocrisy on behalf of the Government. In my view, the reason the Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) has brought this motion before the House is that he does not believe the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). The Prime Minister made a commitment during the last election campaign—and Members opposite know where I stand—on the issue of capital punishment. However, the Prime Minister, with whom I happen to agree on the issue of capital punishment, made a promise during the last election campaign that there would be a free vote in the House of Commons on the issue.

Here we are about two and a half years after that particular promise was made and we have yet to vote on the subject of capital punishment. I can understand the frustrations felt by the Hon. Member for Peterborough. If he had faith and trust in his boss, the Prime Minister of Canada, he would not be here this afternoon asking the House of Commons to pass a motion to have the Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General consider the issue of capital punishment. If he believed the Prime Minister, then he would have patience. He would wait for the Prime Minister to fulfil his promise to have a vote here in the House of Commons.

We on this side of the House understand the frustrations of the Hon. Member, his frustration with the Prime Minister for not keeping his promises. I say to the Hon. Member: "Welcome aboard. We know how you feel because the Prime Minister has made many promises which he has not kept over the last two and a half years". As I look across the great divide here in the House I know that many, many members of the