

Criminal Code

was so common in Europe that arsenic powder was known as inheritance powder. It was only after this development, and after a few murderers had been convicted, that the practice of murder by arsenic poisoning dropped to almost zero in Europe.

I do not know what the deterrent effect of life imprisonment is, but I am told that in criminal society in some cases there is a kind of inverted status, where the bigger the crime one is convicted of, then the more of a big shot one is. Indeed it frequently happens that criminals convicted for minor crimes, after serving their time return to society and commit more serious ones, and are then returned to prison for longer periods. I do not know how valid this is, but if there is any validity to it, then the person who is put away for his entire natural life is going to become the dean of the house in a very short time. I doubt if this would have the deterrent effect that so many anticipate.

Far more important than the question of capital punishment is the question of the root cause of crime. In the United States this is a matter which is receiving careful consideration. In today's *Christian Science Monitor* there is a report about a special United States Senate committee which has been set up to explore this problem, which states that Senator McClellan, in his opening remarks as committee chairman, pointed out that major crimes in the United States are increasing six times faster than the population growth.

This is the problem we should be considering in Canada. We should be doing research into the root cause of crime.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired, unless he has leave of the house to continue. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. MacLean: Have I unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I regret very much there is not unanimous consent.

[*Translation*]

During the debate, earlier tonight the member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme), seconded by the hon. member for Matapédia-Matane (Mr. Tremblay) moved the following amendment: I move, seconded by the hon. member for Matapédia-Matane, that para-

graphs (a), (b) and (c) be replaced by the following—I shall not read the amendment then moved by the member for Quebec-Montmorency.

But I shall now consider briefly whether this amendment is in order. The hon. member for Montréal-Saint-Jacques (Mr. Rinfret), who was then in the chair, expressed very grave doubts as to whether the amendment was in order. He indicated that the amendment would be considered by the Chair at the earliest opportunity.

Since then, I had the opportunity to examine the proposal of the member for Quebec-Montmorency.

I refer the hon. member to citation 203(1) of Beauchesne's fourth edition which reads as follows:

It is an imperative rule, that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed. Every amendment proposed to be made either to a question or to a proposed amendment should be so framed that if agreed to by the house the question or amendment as amended would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

It seems to me that the proposal of the member for Quebec-Montmorency is under the form of an amendment to the main motion rather than a subamendment.

That is why the Chair does not think the amendment can be accepted and suggests to the mover and the seconder that the proposal should rather form the subject of an amendment to the main motion.

• (9:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. B. S. Mackasey (Verdun): Mr. Speaker, most members who have participated in this debate have reflected their deep interest in this subject, and it has been obvious from the calibre of the debate that they have done a lot of research and a lot of soul-searching. I should like to think that I am not an exception in this regard.

My position in this house is unique in that I represent the city of Verdun which, in the provincial legislature, is represented by the Minister of Justice, Hon. Claude Wagner. That minister is a very close friend of mine. We share the same political views, or at least we belong to a certain degree to the same political party. We both claim to represent the thinking of the 90,000 people of the city of Verdun, but he is an avowed retentionist and I will vote for abolition.