

tration of justice is very strong in this country, and I do not have blinkers on my eyes when I say that. I know about some of the things which go on in the law courts; there is no doubt that you do have to have money from time to time to get a top criminal lawyer. However, regardless of all that, the administration of justice has really bent over backwards, and I think that is something which must be redressed. It is because of the killings which have been committed by those who have killed before that I have come back to the position where philosophically I believe that the potential of the ultimate penalty should be there for the perpetrator of the ultimate crime, with of course all the powers of commutation and royal prerogative of mercy.

● (2150)

The right hon. member for Prince Albert is concerned about this bill. He has always been concerned about the question, but he is concerned about this bill because of the lack of a clause about treason. He was the last prime minister to sign a final order, in 1962. I think if this bill were defeated and we go back to what is on the statute books now and the trial period that will last for another two or three years with the qualified retention for prison guards and policemen, that any prime minister, on a single killing, is going to take a long time to sign the final order.

Proponents of this bill cannot show me anything more convincing than that things are going to be better—the humanists will say it is to make life better because you do not have an organized killing, but I do not see it that way. In terms of crime, justice, the fears and aspirations of Canadians from coast to coast, the proponents of the bill cannot adduce any positive evidence or even positive logic that things are going to be better.

That is where we come back to the individual conscience. I suggest that the 70 per cent or 80 per cent of Canadians who have an individual conscience want that conscience represented. I am prepared to stand here with my conscience as I have done before. My conscience tells me now, for the reasons that I have tried to give, that the proof is not there that things are going to be better. It cannot be proven statistically. But there is the symbolism for Canadians that with the death penalty things may tighten up and some of the licence and licentiousness and lawlessness may not be on the streets of the land.

Thus I come back to the potential of the ultimate penalty for the ultimate crime. I should end right there, Mr. Speaker, and I think I will because it is a very individual thing. I hope we can come to grips with this in view of the motion made earlier today to extend the hours, which the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) has urged in order to try to get several bills through. I compliment him for getting us on extended hours to meet this question. Let the thing come; let us get it over with and let us leave it alone for some years so that we do not have to go through this agony and purgatory and soul-searching again.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth time I have spoken on the subject of capital punishment and I am a comparative newcomer to parliament, having arrived in 1972. Like the

Adjournment Debate

hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) I hope it is the last time I have to speak on capital punishment.

It was interesting to hear the comments of the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) tonight when he asked how many people have committed murder a second time. In Winnipeg, the city that I represent, we have had people commit murders twice. Ten years ago a man took a young lady into a hotel room and murdered her. He was convicted, put away for a short period as they are these days, and came out after eight years. Then we went through the same thing again. He took another young girl to the very same hotel and murdered her. As well, I have read recent statements from California about 12 convicted murderers who were out on parole or because their short term had expired, and they murdered another 22 people. I hope we do not have to see a similar situation where we have a large number of murderers committing murder the second time before we get across to the Liberals that we should have the ultimate penalty.

The *Globe and Mail* of May 26 ran the following story:

Donald Kelly, convicted of the 1969 murder of two North Bay residents, has quickened heart beats in Ontario again. Armed with what was thought to be a snub-nosed .38 calibre revolver, Kelly isolated himself in a cellblock in the North Bay jail on Monday night and held police at bay for nine tense hours. In the end, Kelly surrendered peacefully. His gun, fished from a toilet tank, was discovered to be only a toy pistol.

Just imagine if it had been a real gun. Kelly would have killed every guard in sight to get out of that jail. If you remember his escapade in North Bay last winter you will know it almost bankrupted the municipality paying for the police to track him down. All that was destroyed in the manhunt was a valuable dog. I should like to see the abolitionists go into the penitentiaries and guard this man Kelly, spend 15 years guarding him, or this man Lucas from Manitoba, the axe murderer. I have spoken to prison guards who look after Lucas and they say you cannot even turn your back on him for a second or you take your life in your hands. The abolitionists who want to protect these savages should go to the penitentiaries and guard them. In the case of Kelly it was a toy pistol.

The *Globe and Mail* argument continues:

A toy pistol. We can hear the sighs of relief—a chuckle here and there—as Ontario's law-abiding citizens recover their cool. A toy: it wasn't very serious after all. The whole adventure no doubt will lend a certain lustre to the legend Kelly acquired last summer while spending 31 days eluding police in the bush land of Northern Ontario. And, after all, it was only a toy gun.

Wrong. It was not only a toy gun; it was a gun, plain and simple.

If it had been a real gun Kelly would have killed. May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.