

the cabinet represent him on government issues and he need not speak out at all, they would not have sent him to Ottawa. He is a member in a position to lend some wisdom to this debate.

Mr. Railton: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Welland (Mr. Railton) on a point of order. I would suggest we all get back to the subject of debate.

Mr. Railton: Mr. Speaker, I think we will have to correct some misstatements. It is too bad. I have spoken on this subject twice before, but I have not spoken this time because I thought we were trying to save time. Nobody has brought forward any new ideas on this subject. I hope the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) will, but even if he does not I think it is regrettable that we have so much misstatement and talking around the subject. I hope he will give us some new ideas.

● (2040)

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. member. The last thing I wanted him to do was rise, bare his soul, and tell the House he had no new ideas to offer. But he interrupted me. I shall forever let it be known that he has no new ideas to offer this House, and his constituents can judge him accordingly. So long as he represents his constituency I will not mention his name again in the House. I know he has nothing new to offer.

I have been interrupted several times. I do not mind interruptions.

Mr. Railton: Good going, Jack!

Mr. Horner: But it is difficult to maintain one's continuity of thought. As I was saying before the interruption, we are concerned about preventing the incidence of violent crime in this country and we must exercise our responsibilities to the full, to eliminate the difficulty confronting Canada.

This has been an interesting debate, and I have read most of the speeches. There have been worth-while contributions on the side of abolition and on the side of retention. To me, it is glaringly obvious that all members of the socialist party believe in abolition, that most Progressive Conservatives believe in retention—

An hon. Member: What about your leader?

Mr. Horner: I said most—and that most members of the Liberal party believe in retaining power and in doing what is necessary to retain power. Therefore we must approach this question philosophically. Why do socialists, the NDP group included, believe in abolition?

An hon. Member: Ask Joe Clark.

An hon. Member: Ask Trudeau.

Mr. Horner: It is apparent that socialists support ever-more controls over the individual.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Capital Punishment

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, if any hon. members interrupting me have something new to suggest, perhaps they can speak after I have finished. I am trying to put forward new thoughts which may invigorate the minds of some hon. members for the first time since their election.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Let's hear them.

Mr. Horner: The socialists believe in more state control over the individual. That may be oversimplifying the position but that, I believe, is a broad statement which socialists find acceptable. They think private enterprise cannot do the job, that the state knows best, that the state should control the people, and that it should therefore have absolute control. In exercising absolute control it must restrict the individual in every nook and cranny of activity. But this restraint of the individual makes the individual rebellious.

Far be it from me to suggest that the spirit of rebelliousness is more prevalent today than it was ten or 20 years ago; the fact remains that the spirit of rebelliousness is ever more evident. Therefore it is not surprising to note that crime rates are higher than they were ten years or 20 years ago. As I said, the more controls the state imposes on the individual, the more rebellious will the individual become. He rebels against the state. The rebellious action might take the form of crime committed against our wives or loved ones.

The fundamental question we must answer is: how are we to curb this rebelliousness? Are we, as legislators, doing everything we can to give the individual freedom to do what he wants to do in society, freedom to better his community and country; or are we imposing so many restrictions on the individual that he tends to rebel? If we are to cure the ever-increasing incidence of violent crime, we, as legislators, must answer that question. Of course the socialists think the state knows best. Their position is almost religious: the state knows best, does everything best, and we should all be controlled by the state. This experiment has been tried in Russia, with not too much success. I doubt if it will succeed in the end, just as I doubt if it will succeed in any other relatively affluent country. It succeeded in mainland China for a number of years, a country suffering from great poverty and distress. There the state managed the economy more efficiently than the individual could have managed it; but I do not expect that experiment to last for many years in the future. I think in the years ahead the present system of authority in mainland China will decay.

Putting it simply, when the state imposes its external discipline on the individual, the individual tends to rebel. As legislators we must encourage the individual to exercise self-discipline, self-restraint, for his own betterment and that of his community. In the long run state imposed discipline on the individual creates rebellion, upheaval, and an increase in violent crime. Therefore I am not surprised at what has happened in this country. The government is imposing ever more external pressure on the individual and fostering the spirit of rebellion.

Let us examine certain statistics relating to Canada. In 1954, when our population was some 15 million, there were