

## Order Paper Questions

## ANNEX A

	1980/81	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984 (Apr 1 to Nov 13)
2. Inmates convicted of the following offences and released or paroled:					
capital murder	3	4	2	2	5
non-capital murder	33	39	44	44	28
first degree murder	—	—	1*	—	—
second degree murder	—	—	—	1	—
Of the above, those who were released or paroled and subsequently convicted of a further indictable offence:					
capital murder	2	—	—	—	—
non-capital murder	3	2	1	—	—
first degree murder	—	—	—	—	—
second degree murder	—	—	—	—	—

\* Inmate was sentenced in the United States to 9,131 days for first degree murder. He was brought to Canada under the Canada/USA transfer treaty and was therefore eligible for parole.

## EXPENDITURE OF PROVINCIAL CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

## Question No. 78—Mr. Nunziata:

What is the per capita and total budgetary expenditures on provincial correctional services in each province, and what are the amounts?

**Mr. Bud Bradley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Supply and Services):** Statistics Canada reports:

The attached table shows the provincial operating expenditures for fiscal year 1982-83 on adult correctional services and the per capita operating cost by province.

Capital cost figures are not available, nor are juvenile correctional operating expenditures.

Provincial Correctional Operating Expenditures  
for Fiscal Year 1982/83  
(Adult Correctional Services)

Province/Territory	Total (\$000's)	Per Capita (\$)	Population Estimate June 1/82
Newfoundland and Labrador	9,741	17.11	569.2
Prince Edward Island	2,388	19.45	122.8
Nova Scotia	13,173	15.46	852.3
New Brunswick	11,180	15.99	699.1
Quebec	106,518	16.43	6482.5
Ontario	207,557	23.81	8715.7
Manitoba	19,758	19.09	1035.2
Saskatchewan	31,952	32.62	979.4
Alberta	66,014	28.49	2317.0
British Columbia	62,265	22.31	2790.1
Yukon	2,421	101.72	23.8
Northwest Territories	6,315	133.79	47.2
<b>All provinces/Territories</b>	<b>539,282</b>	<b>21.89</b>	<b>24634.3</b>

Notes: 1. The per capita figures are calculated using the total population of each province on June 1, 1982 from the 1982 population estimates of Canada and the provinces.

2. Costs of federal correctional services are not included.

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** The questions as enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered.

**Mr. Speyer:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1984

## MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Crosbie that Bill C-18, an Act to amend the Criminal Code, to amend an Act to amend the Criminal Code and to amend the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Act, the Excise Act, the Food and Drugs Act, the Narcotic Control Act, the Parole Act and the Weights and Measures Act, to repeal certain other Acts and to make other consequential amendments, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

**Mr. Chris Speyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, before lunch I was trying to demonstrate to the House the tremendous change that has evolved over time in our criminal law. It has been an evolution that is very, very important. At that time I said that property rights received far more emphasis than rights that related to the person. I gave as an illustration the fact that one could go to jail for one year for stealing a car with absolutely no discretion. I traced the fact that stealing from the post office carried an automatic six-month jail term.

We then moved into the 1960s. As I said, when I was a young prosecutor I remember that when a person was caught smoking a marijuana cigarette, there was absolutely no alternative but to send him to jail for a period of six months. Then in 1968 and 1969 we saw further matters that relate to this Bill evolve that dealt with drinking and driving. Until that particular point in time there was no compulsory breathalyser test. There was a very substantial debate as to whether or not a person should be compelled to take a breathalyser test for the purpose of determining the amount of alcohol in his system. There was substantial debate and certain safeguards were implemented with respect to it.

As I pointed out, in the City of Toronto in the 1960s, unless a person who blew less than 1.5 on the breathalyser was a falling-down drunk, the charges against him were withdrawn. That was less than 15 years ago. The law has evolved so that it is an offence not only for a person to be an impaired driver,