

its condemnation of abortion. That is what I meant by "hypocritical".

If anybody is hypocritical in here, maybe it is in his mind. I think my comments stand and they are very clear.

Further, he went on to say other things such as favouring revenge or retribution. I never used the word. It was not in my speech. I do not know from where he is getting it. It is in his mind. If he could not follow the logic, maybe the problem is in his mind, in his flawed logic. Perhaps that is where the problem resides.

What I am trying to say is that there is a time when the crime of premeditated murder requires a just response. To me the only just response to a premeditated murder is to take the person's life who ignored the sanctity of life and thereby restore the value of life.

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, the preceding speaker has quoted certain verses from the Bible which he believes justify the execution of those who commit first degree murder. Although I respect his attention to the Scripture and to the detail of the argument which he and the associates in his riding to whom he referred have developed, I will not be trading verse for verse argument with him, because I also live and work within the context of my church, the Anglican Church, in which we study the Bible thoroughly.

The Anglican Church, like the United Church, the Roman Catholic Church, and most Christian bodies, finds that the Christian tradition including the Bible opposes the death penalty, and I oppose it.

I would add also, by the way, that at least two police chiefs oppose it. I do not know what their religious views may be. One of them is responsible for Quebec City; the other is responsible for the City of Montreal. I hardly think that one can accuse either of them of being naive about the problems associated with murder, and they oppose the death penalty.

What I find quite curious about this debate is that in the middle of March an Angus Reid poll showed that Canadians were asked to indicate the most important issues facing Canada. Only 5 per cent of those who responded cited capital punishment as the most important issue. They placed capital punishment at the bottom, after unemployment, after the economy, after refugees and immigration, after the deficit, after disarmament, and after the question of government honesty. I think it is unfortunate that at a time when we are pressed for time to accomplish government business, the Government has chosen to enforce that this shall be debated ahead of many of those urgent subjects.

However, since the Government has so ordered, I wish to make my comments within the time left to me now, and I hope I will be able to pick up my remaining time on Monday morning.

Capital Punishment

Although I regret the fact that this debate is happening because I think it is unnecessary in the basic sense, nevertheless there may be some good result coming out of it. It may be that we have to ask ourselves: Why does this come up again and again?

As the debate has moved along inside and outside Parliament, I can see that many people are being forced to examine not just the theoretical subject but their own feelings and approaches to the subject. We can all be enabled to examine ourselves on the question of why this question has arisen again.

Three years ago, when I spoke against a Private Member's Bill which would have restored the death penalty, I spoke about anger as a motivation. We know that anger may be justified by events. It may be natural and necessary to feel anger as a response to some evil action. However, what we do with that anger, what action we take arising out of it, is something else.

Personally I know that too often in the last half century I have not handled my feelings of anger very well. Some Hon. Members of course have heard me say things in anger that I then regretted. I regretted it not only if someone hit back at me, but even if they did not; sometimes more so if they did not. In other words, there are times when I know I have done more harm to myself personally by my anger than to anyone else.

I also spoke about the anger of people who are upset that people are killed in auto accidents partly caused by booze, partly caused sometimes by automobiles negligently built in an unsafe way. They are upset by people who are killed by safety hazards at work that were known to the employer before the accidents happened and could have been corrected but were left unsafe in order to save money. We have yet to hear in our country of an employer being appropriately prosecuted, certainly an employer accused of manslaughter, let alone murder, in cases like that.

That sort of anger left unremedied, unanswered, unsatisfied, can affect a whole society. It can embitter working relations. It can embitter our social relations. It can even skew the administration of justice itself. That sort of anger, when we do not deal with it in some remedial way—and that is the important point I want to stress—can express itself in a violent spirit that looks for a scapegoat. Find someone, punish him and that will make us all feel better for the moment. Find anyone, preferably someone without friends and hurt him, kill him, hang him, nuke him, nuke all of them. That is the situation that must be remedied and I hope to go on with that subject on Monday morning because I believe it is now 2 p.m.

● (1400)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being two o'clock, pursuant to order made June 12, 1987, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.