

Administration of Justice

mention the study to which the hon. member for Egmont referred.

A considerable amount of work has already been done, though work still remains to be done. There is a reasonable expectation, in line with the contemplated expenditure of close to \$1 million in the next two years, of doing something along the lines proposed by the hon. member in terms of working out a new and refreshing way of dealing with the whole question of crime and punishment. The government and the department of the Solicitor General are well aware of the type of thinking which has been expressed in the House today. I certainly share with the hon. member for Egmont the hope that it will begin to change the almost Middle Ages mentality which exists today when it comes to the whole question of crime and punishment, particularly as it relates to young people who seem to be placed in the position of having virtually no hope of returning to a normal life once they have been convicted; at least, their chances of doing so are increasingly becoming very slim.

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I can see that time is passing but I sincerely want to congratulate the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) for his motion.

I am not in favour of establishing a new committee. In my opinion, as stated by the hon. member, we are well enough documented to be able to reach a political decision with regard to penal reform.

Because of the lack of time, I will simply call the House's attention on a point which I consider most important. I have practised criminal law for seven years and I have always been irritated by all that time spent at determining conviction, determining whether someone was guilty or not while the sentence aspect was neglected, that is what to do with the accused once convicted.

I think that much time was devoted to conviction by opposition to sentencing because the lawyer could see the inadequacy of the penal system and of the means available to the criminals and found it advisable to tell his client not to plead guilty and be rehabilitated in those institutions but to plead not guilty so as to avoid the harmful experiences which are the current results of those institutions.

The Prévost report which was submitted to the Quebec legislature pointed out that we should have a distinction between the sentencing system and the convicting system and I am in perfect agreement. In closing my remarks, I think we should adopt the principle of two judges, one to determine conviction and a second specialized in sentencing.

Mr. Speaker, that was my contribution to this debate.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It being six o'clock, the hour for private members' business has expired and I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

[Mr. Blaker.]

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA PENSION PLAN (No. 2)**AMENDMENTS RESPECTING ANNUAL INCREASES AND LEVEL OF INCOME ON WHICH CONTRIBUTIONS WILL BE PAID**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde that Bill C-224, to amend the Canada Pension Plan, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the applause you heard has very little to do with the present bill. None the less, I think we should go back to our business and carry on with consideration of Bill C-224 which I had begun to talk about shortly before five o'clock.

[*Translation*]

When debate was adjourned at five o'clock, I was saying that, if enacted by the Parliament of Canada and the Quebec legislature, the agreements reached at the last federal-provincial conference would have a profound effect on both pension plans. Among other things, they mean that maximum CPP retirement, which now run at about \$90 a month, could reach a level of \$250 a month by the end of this decade. They also mean that the bonds of national unity as they affect Canadians in their daily lives, now and in the future, will be strengthened in that differences which had developed early this year between the Canada Pension Plan and the Quebec Pension Plan with respect to contributions, retirement pensions, and the escalation of benefits will be removed for 1974 and future years. In other words, employers and employees in all provinces will, once again, be subject to identical CPP-QPP contributions, and citizens in Quebec and the rest of Canada will receive virtually the same retirement pensions, which in turn will be escalated in a common manner to take account of changes in the cost of living.

Clearly, this will contribute to the mobility of workers between all parts of Canada. Important differences between the two plans will still exist, notably with respect to the so-called flat-rate component of survivor and disability benefits, but these will be reviewed on a priority basis with my provincial colleagues.

The changes to the Canada Pension Plan which the federal government has developed in conjunction with the provinces, and which I am committed to place before