

Capital Punishment

gration. Is it the minister's intention to broaden the criteria for granting extensions to local initiatives projects?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to add to the statement I made the other day.

* * *

DRUGS**MEASURES TO INFORM PUBLIC OF DRUGS NOT THERAPEUTICALLY EQUIVALENT ACCORDING TO QUAD STANDARDS**

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the fact many patients are continuing to use drugs that are not therapeutically equivalent as determined by QUAD analytical standards, will the minister indicate to the House the measures being taken by the government to inform the public of these potentially ineffective drugs so that appropriate substitution can be made?

[Translation]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the QUAD program is in operation and the department will issue another publication next year, with an additional list of drugs.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I notice a number of members are seeking supplementaries to previous questions. Perhaps the Chair might be allowed to note the supplementaries of the hon. member for Lambton-Kent, the hon. member for Hamilton West and the hon. member for St. Paul's and give them some kind of priority tomorrow, although in fairness I think I should recognize the hon. member for Lambton-Kent now for one supplementary.

Mr. Holmes: Will the minister indicate if the government has plans to reimburse those patients who have found it necessary to discard a drug that has failed to pass one or more of the QUAD analytical standards? I refer in particular to those on fixed incomes such as our old age pensioners?

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the implication of the question, and the answer is no.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**CRIMINAL CODE****REINSTATEMENT OF LAW RELATING TO CAPITAL PUNISHMENT THAT EXISTED PRIOR TO DECEMBER 30, 1972**

The House resumed, from Tuesday, February 20, 1973, consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-2,

[Mr. Caccia.]

to amend the Criminal Code, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: When this debate was adjourned some weeks ago, the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) had the floor.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In view of the fact that a large number of members wish to participate in this debate, I wonder whether the House would agree to limiting the speeches to 20 minutes. If we impose this restraint, it will provide an additional amount of time for other members who wish to speak.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed and so ordered?

[Translation]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, our party will not agree with this suggestion as long as we shall not come to an understanding regarding the use of Thursday as an opposition day.

[English]

● (1510)

Mr. H. T. Herbert (Vaudreuil): Mr. Speaker, I began this speech on February 20 by indicating I would vote for second reading of Bill C-2 in the belief that detailed discussion of the subject in committee would probably result in the passing of amendments. I also indicated that I believed the vote should reflect the will of the majority of Canadians, just as my vote will reflect the majority opinion of my constituents.

I had been presenting different opinions, and today I should like to read two more. The first is an extract from an article which appeared in *Le Devoir* on February 6 by Fr. Guy Bourgeault. He said:

[Translation]

... I could quote various studies for the benefit of our bilingual members of Parliament... they all go to show that the abolition of the death penalty has no noticeable effect on crime.

Despite the progress made by the abolitionist movement, and despite all the studies that have been made into the subject, there are still many who wish to retain capital punishment. They see it as primarily a means of intimidation and dissuasion, and consequently, a means of protecting society against criminals. But the experience of many countries demonstrates that the death penalty does not have the intimidating effect that we tend to suppose it has, and that abolition does not bring about an increase in crime.

For society to protect itself, it will have to prevent crime by applying the necessary socio-economic adjustments.

... sub-human socio-economic conditions are an important factor in crime. In other words the criminal is often—perhaps always—both a victim of existing social disorder and the cause of a new social disorder. Or again, to quote the title of a once-famous film, we are all murderers. For collective responsibilities are not only sub- or super-personal ones; they are also personal responsibilities. All of us together are... responsible for the continuation of unjust social structures which prevent some individuals from fulfilling their possibilities. If these people end up committing murder, dare we judge them and punish them just like that?

However, those who seek to justify the death penalty invoke much more than society's need for protection by intimidating the potential killer. It becomes a requirement of justice; the murderer shall be put to death, the Bible said...; and St. Paul considered the prince raising the blade to the murderer as "a minister of God