

the deprived and the disadvantaged. I ask some of my wealthy friends in the House who are intending to vote for capital punishment to think very carefully about who, in the main, they will be sending to the gallows.

My seventh question is this. Will we save money by bringing back capital punishment? I have heard some people say, "Hang them, execute them, you will save money. Look at how much it costs to keep someone in jail. It costs thousands of dollars to keep someone in jail". Once again I say that that is a wrong argument. It is wrong to even base this type of argument on financial matters.

However, even if it is based on financial matters, I argue that it would cost the state more to bring in capital punishment than it would to keep someone in jail. There would be appeal after appeal, and millions and millions of dollars would be spent in the appeal process which would, once again, cost the Canadian people a great deal of money.

The next question I want to ask my fellow MPs who are thinking seriously about voting in favour of the return of capital punishment is this. Even if we bring back capital punishment, even if we bring back the hangman, will people be executed anyway? My answer to that is probably not. I cannot foresee any Prime Minister of Canada in the next number of years who will want to have on his conscience the fact that he had not commuted the death sentence for some Canadian. When we pass a Bill on capital punishment I assume that the power to commute a death sentence would rest with the Cabinet.

I cannot see the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) ever agreeing because he believes in abolition. He does not believe in vengeance. He does not believe in capital punishment. In my opinion the present Prime Minister would never in effect, sign a death warrant, to have blood on his hands by agreeing to have someone sent to the gallows. That would not happen if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) were Prime Minister. It would not happen if the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Broadbent) were Prime Minister. It did not happen with the former Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau. It did not happen with the Prime Minister before that, the current Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark).

I am also proud to say that the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) has strongly hinted to the people of Canada that he would have to reconsider staying in his post as Minister of Justice if capital punishment were brought back and if he was faced with the possibility of having to send someone to the gallows.

Again, if we pass a resolution to establish a Bill to bring back capital punishment we will be setting up a process whereby legally we will have capital punishment but the final result will be that we will not send people to the gallows.

I ask another question of Hon. Members. Supposing someone in the family of an Hon. Member was convicted of murder, what would they do? I suspect there is not a single

Capital Punishment

person in the House who would not fight as hard as possible and use all the money they had to try to free that particular person. I want once again to quote Mr. Eisler's letter as it appeared in the Catholic Church's *Prairie Messenger*:

I have one question for those favouring a return of the death penalty. God forbid, but if some member of their family were charged with murder, would they still be in favour of capital punishment? Or would they be willing to spend their last dollar to prevent the ultimate? If not, I would hesitate to refer to them as caring and loving parents.

How can I promote capital punishment for someone else's son or daughter when I refuse to accept it for one of my own?

I think that is a very strong and compelling argument. There are a great many other arguments. There are a great many churches and a great many people who want to make those arguments. Because of that I want to move an amendment to the motion before the House, an amendment that will give the churches and the people of Canada more time to present their cases. My amendment is seconded by the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) and it reads as follows:

That the word "three" in lines 5 and 14 be deleted and that the word "six" be substituted therefor.

This amendment would mean that instead of having three months to study the issue of capital punishment the committee would take six months to study it. The people of Canada, namely, the churches, which have shown tremendous leadership on this issue, would have more time to talk to Canadians about how wrong it is in a decent and civilized society to bring back capital punishment, to provide the same laws in our country as exist in the Soviet Union, China, Iraq, Iran, Libya, Chile, and other countries in South America. Surely to goodness we can strive for higher ideals and higher moral values than there are in some of the countries I have just named. I appeal to my friends in the House not adopt the same mentality as those in the Soviet Union, Chile, South Africa, Iraq or Iran. For God's sake, we are a more decent, democratic and civilized society than some of those countries.

I say that it is not morally right to have capital punishment in Canada. It is not morally right, and the churches have said that to us. The Catholic Church has said time and time again that it is not right, as has the Anglican Church, the Lutheran Church, the United Church, the Mennonites and other churches. Representing the moral leadership of the country they have said no, no, no to capital punishment on moral terms. This House should be saying no, no, no to capital punishment as well.

I want to conclude by asking a few more questions. Can I ever vote for a Bill on capital punishment? Obviously, my answer is no, for the nine or ten reasons I have already given. If I cannot vote for capital punishment, then how can I pass a law which will state that another Canadian must make the decision to kill? If I cannot kill myself, if I cannot be the hangman myself or the executioner, how can I pass a law that will make it mandatory for another Canadian to do that job? How can I pass a law that states that a jury must make a decision on life or death? I cannot pass such a law.