

*Capital Punishment*

Canadians are urging those who supported the bill on second reading to reconsider their position. They are asking members of parliament who supported it on second reading to oppose it now. Believe me, public opinion is important and must be taken into consideration. When public opinion on this bill is so clear and of such significance, it is no time for concern for personal promotion within party ranks or for considering personal opportunities. It is contemptuous not to adhere to public opinion in a situation of this kind.

Now is the time to vote to kill this bill, and for the government to bring forward a bill for the complete reinstatement of capital punishment for premeditated murder and to show a proper sense of direction, responsibility and stability, for a change. It occurs to me that probably the only way to obtain a free vote would be for the hon. member for Moncton, yours truly, to present a bill for the reinstatement of capital punishment at the next session. Then, just maybe, we might have a free vote because I am the one member of parliament in the House today who, by virtue of the exercise of freedom of choice, would have a non-partisan vote.

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe):** Mr. Speaker,—

**An hon. Member:** You are slow on your feet.

**Mr. Caccia:** A new speech, please.

**Mr. Stevens:** In speaking at third reading on this bill I would first like to say, in reply to the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia), that I would be very interested to hear him make a speech trying to justify his position on the vote at second reading.

**Mr. Caccia:** I did.

**Mr. Stevens:** The fact is that the hon. member is a very ambitious member in the Liberal caucus and he knows only too well that he must toe the party line with respect to this bill, rather than show any free will or free conscience.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** All we hear is his master's voice.

**Mr. Stevens:** I referred to the hon. member for Davenport, but I could refer to several hon. members from metropolitan Toronto.

**Mr. Caccia:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) knows well enough how we on this side of the House have voted, as well as hon. members on his side of the House. By imputing to us motives as to how we voted, he is really not doing justice to the spirit with which we have approached this debate, namely, to try to find the answer we think is best for the country. I think he should at least withdraw the comment he just made as to the motives which inspired the intervention I made at second reading and the way I voted. I do not think that this is within the spirit and the direction of the rules which govern debates in this House.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

[Mr. Jones.]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) that he is skating on thin ice again. I think he should withdraw that last remark.

**Mr. Stevens:** If I may ask, Mr. Speaker, what last remark?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** The hon. member did impute motives. He implied that there was pressure applied to the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia).

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Stevens:** Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that just prior to our lunch break this question came up with regard to another hon. member who suggested that there was pressure brought to bear on hon. members opposite with respect to their votes, and Mr. Speaker at that time held quite clearly that that was just a question of debate and that this is a debating chamber. That is what parliament means.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stevens:** It is only natural that hon. members, especially in a so-called free vote, might apply pressure upon one another in order to try to influence them to their way of thinking. My comment was simply provoked by the hon. member for Davenport who made a comment when I rose to speak. I am simply challenging him. If he wishes to speak and try to persuade hon. members as to why they should vote for abolition at third reading of this bill, as opposed to what I suggest, which is retention, he should do so.

**Mr. Caccia:** I must repeat the same question of privilege, because earlier the hon. member for York-Simcoe imputed to me motives and ambition as guiding elements and factors in my making a speech at second reading and my manner of voting. Therefore, he has imputed motives with regard to my pattern of voting. I again ask Your Honour to ask the hon. member to withdraw his comments.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I suppose every day in this House motives are imputed to hon. members. One of those motives may be to curry favour with authority. There could be a motive, from time to time, to curry favour with the Chair. There could be a motive, from time to time, to vote in accordance with one's conscience, or it might be a motive to vote in accordance with the wishes of one's constituents. There may be a motive to speak and act in order to get out of this place early, or to stay late, depending upon one's point of view. This House operates, and hon. members make up their minds with respect to motives, and the imputing of motives is certainly not contrary to the rules. It is contrary to Standing Order 35 for any member to reflect upon any vote of the House; not upon individual members in the House but upon votes of the House of Commons.

● (1530)

I am repeating something I said before the luncheon break to the hon. gentleman who then occupied the chair and who ruled, as the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr.