

I submit that it would be very difficult for me to vote for this particular bill if I do not see some real attempt on the part of the government to show that it does in fact care about the families of these victims. There is no such indication. I should like to quote the figures which the Solicitor General supplied. In the year 1974-75 I believe there were approximately 1,000 instances in which compensation was paid out in respect of some type of crime. The amount of the compensation paid by both levels of government amounted to approximately \$2,300,000 in respect of approximately 1,000 cases. That represents about \$2,300 per case. The Solicitor General was unable to provide us with more specific figures. Although I am subject to correction, I suspect that in fact we do not compensate the families of the victims of murder adequately. These figures seem to suggest that.

Surely the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) should be in a position, if he hopes to get some of the abolitionists in this House to support his bill, to give us some assurance that in actual fact the government does care about the families of the victims of murder. It would seem to me that the government has shown little concern for these families.

I shall summarize by saying that I am an abolitionist. I voted for this bill on second reading because as a new member of this House I was under the impression that second reading meant approval of the bill in principle. I am the first to agree that I do approve of this bill in principle. I approve of the abolition of capital punishment. I also approve, however, of the complete protection of society against repeaters of murder, people who would be intent on piracy and people who would be intent, if it should happen, on high treason. I submit that the government by way of Bill C-84 has made no effort to assure the people of Canada that it is concerned about this and does not want people to go on committing murder after murder after murder. I acknowledge that this does not happen often. I know there have been only two or three cases in a period of several years.

I refuse to accept the fact that a person who is unable to learn from having committed a heinous crime should be allowed, because of the very generous terms of the law, to be paroled after 15 years. If such a person is unwilling or unable to learn after committing a second crime, then there is a problem in respect of protecting society. I believe the government must give some assurance that it does care about the people in Canada who deserve protection against the worst offenders, those who go on committing murder after murder. As I say, I admit that there are only a few such cases. All of our constituents are upset about such cases. They keep bringing these cases to our attention and suggest that we are not concerned about protecting the average citizen of Canada when we let such people out again.

Although it might seem inappropriate, I should like to commend the government on the principle of the bill. However, I have grave doubt about the way I will vote on third reading because now we are in a different ball game. It is not a vote on principle. I am concerned about the provisions in this bill. I must reconsider my first vote because I do not believe the government is concerned about these two crucial matters; first, the protection of society against repeaters of murder and, second, the ques-

### *Capital Punishment*

tion concerning when the government will tell the Canadian people that it does care about the families of those who have suffered because of unwarranted murder in this land.

I would close by saying I hope we can hear from either or both the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice. I notice both ministers are here tonight. I hope we can hear from one or both of them that they do care about Canadians, that they do care about these two issues, and are willing to close the loopholes which presently exist. I think this bill is a disgrace to this parliament if it should pass as it is. Thank you.

**Mr. Beatty:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member would accept a question?

**Mr. Halliday:** Yes, indeed.

**Mr. Beatty:** I appreciate having the opportunity to ask a question of the hon. member. I share many of the concerns he has expressed. I appreciate that this is a very difficult decision for him to make. One of the bases on which the hon. member defended his proposal tonight in respect of in essence giving convicted murderers an option to commit suicide or receive a death sentence was that this would act as a deterrent against a second offence. Could the hon. member tell the House how in his mind he feels this would provide an additional deterrent because a person who is convicted for the first time of a murder and sentenced to life imprisonment, and in fact preferred to be killed, could only get that option by committing a second offence?

The other question is in respect of the euthanasia aspect of what he proposes. I think it is correct to paraphrase what he meant by referring to it as mercy killing. Would the hon. member indicate whether he would also propose in the case of the chronically ill and people in great pain that this be extended to them as well?

**Mr. Halliday:** I appreciate these questions from the hon. member. I think perhaps he has misunderstood me a little, or perhaps I have misunderstood his question. Obviously my amendment in no way would preclude, or is unlikely to preclude, a person committing a second murder. Being an abolitionist I am prepared to go along with the government in respect of first degree murder or second degree murder, but what happens then if someone at some stage, whether on parole or after release, commits another murder? To me there is no protection for society. What we must do then is see that they are in jail for the remainder of their lives.

The hon. member asked about euthanasia. According to my understanding this is not euthanasia. What I am proposing could be referred to as legalized suicide, but it is not euthanasia. Euthanasia is where society decides that another person should be put to death, for whatever reason. In other words the primary move is by society. It may be by a physician, but the physician represents society.

● (2150)

In this instance this is not euthanasia, it is more like legalized suicide when the state countenances suicide. But normally the state does not countenance any kind of suicide. As I explained in my earlier remarks, there are indeed a few instances of people trying suicide on repeated occa-