

### Capital Punishment

and kidnapping cases. I would like to hear his views on this matter. I have suggested that many persons convicted of rape or kidnapping are mentally or physically ill. This has been my experience. Your Honour has experience in criminal law and may have drawn the same conclusion. I would like to hear a former Crown counsel speak with regard to this particular amendment and give us the benefit of his experience on the question of rape and kidnapping. He knows that in many rape cases there is a great deal of invitation and provocation. These are surrounding circumstances. But in most cases the persons who commit these offences have disordered minds. I would like to hear the views of the hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

The hon. member for York East spoke of the good and evil concept in society. I suppose most of us are an amalgamation of both good and evil. Surely the pursuit of man should be the attainment of good. The principles we follow should be toward attaining good. Perhaps this is the reason why the members of the New Democratic Party are so progressive with regard to this subject. We want the type of society which is based on man's goodness, enlightenment and achievement toward goodness. I cannot see any way of controlling evil by wreaking vengeance on a fellow human being, swelling within the human mind and soul hatred, passion and prejudice of one man toward another. I cannot picture that type of society.

I notice there are only two minutes left before private members' hour. I will summarize briefly what I feel with regard to this amendment. I am sure it was brought forward with good intentions, but the mover has the mistaken conception that it will in some way act as a deterrent. I respectfully submit that the whole basis of the amendment is fear. You cannot develop with any success a society which is based on fear. I ask the mover of this amendment to look at the experience in the United States and England to see whether their thinking and experience is the type we should have in this country. In the final analysis, what we want is a better Canada and a protected Canada. This amendment will not produce that result.

**Mr. Stevens:** Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member entertain a question?

**Mr. Gilbert:** Certainly.

**Mr. Stevens:** Does the hon. member disagree that the bill before us today, which has been sponsored by the Solicitor General, is an entirely different measure from the bill referred to at Westminster, which was simply a Conservative backbencher's bill to attempt to restore capital punishment and was handled simply as a private member's bill?

**Mr. Gilbert:** Mr. Speaker, in all honesty I am not familiar with the content of the motion that was dealt with at Westminster. I am familiar with the previous bill that was the law of England. The law of England said that capital punishment was abolished. The motion by the backbencher was to reinstate capital punishment. That motion was defeated.

[Mr. Gilbert.]

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker)—National Capital Commission—Alleged notification to municipalities that dumping on its lands will be prohibited in 1974; the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Nesdoly)—Housing—Alleged poor construction of Bal-Mon Homes, Meadow Lake, Saskatchewan—Request for investigation; the hon. member for Rocky Mountain (Mr. Clark)—Information Canada—Suggested disbandment—Government position.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions.

• (1700)

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[English]

#### UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

SUGGESTION THAT CANADIAN CONTRIBUTORS RECEIVE BENEFITS WHEN UNEMPLOYED OUTSIDE OF CANADA

**Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of amending the Unemployment Insurance Act to remove the inequity whereby a contributor under the act, who is not resident in Canada, cannot receive benefits upon becoming unemployed outside of Canada and, in fact, receives no benefit from those contributions upon returning to Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my notice of motion asks the government to remove the inequity whereby a contributor under the Unemployment Insurance Act, who is not resident in Canada, cannot receive benefits upon becoming unemployed outside Canada and, in fact, receives no benefit from those contributions upon returning to Canada.

It seems to me that by regulation the government should simply not deduct unemployment insurance contributions from persons outside Canada who cannot, under the act, receive benefits. As far as I am concerned, this is a very straightforward matter, but I am sure from conversations I have had with some of my colleagues opposite they will confuse the matter and it will not be as simple as I see it.

This whole matter came to my attention early this year, in January in fact, when a constituent normally residing in my riding of Halton-Wentworth received orders to proceed overseas with our Canadian armed forces to Europe. As my constituent is a member of the armed forces and his wife moved with him to Europe, upon receiving his notice to move, my constituent's wife applied for unemployment insurance on the assumption that having contributed to the UIC for 12 years she would be entitled to receive benefits for the prescribed period of weeks. She then