

Our state of penology is not contemporary. We have made no efforts at the national level to compensate the victims of crime. Our rehabilitation procedures are backward. The Juvenile Delinquents Act needs to be updated. A commission has inquired into this and made a report. The Solicitor General has told us that he has submitted a draft bill to all the provincial attorneys general. The Juvenile Delinquents Act should provide for uniformity of treatment on a national basis because it is a subject of common concern to all Canadians.

I think we need a sweeping review of the entire question of law enforcement. We must attack the causes as well as the effects of crime, the war on poverty, housing, the environmental causes such as broken homes, the whole question of marriage and divorce, the problem of drugs. I believe we need to stimulate research and establish in universities across this country institutes of criminology, assigning to each university some specialized branch of the subject. I believe we have to review questions of sentencing, bail, detention before trial, indefinite detention, uniformity of treatment and educating judges after their appointment. If judges with only civil experience are to sit in criminal courts, there is nothing wrong with educating them in this regard.

**Mr. Woolliams:** We do it for years when we are practising law.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Turner:** All this is a national responsibility. I believe we must be humane as a government but we must also respect our responsibility to protect citizens from the threat and injury arising from breaches of the criminal law. I hope this debate will do more than determine merely the question of abolition, however important that is. I hope it will stimulate a new Canadian concern and a new concern within the bounds of this house for the larger questions of rooting out and minimizing criminal acts in the future. I want to thank the house for its attention, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister a question. I listened with

*Amendments Respecting Death Sentence*  
great attention to his speech. With regard to the reasons he gave for accepting this compromise would he be fair enough to say—I am sure he would—that the reason for the compromise is that we have actually had abolition *de facto*, if not *de jure*, since 1963 or even before?

**Mr. Turner:** I am being absolutely sincere in my reply, Mr. Speaker. I said that I believe this bill to be drafted in a form that will carry the house. I believe also that if a similar procedure had been attempted on an earlier occasion it might well have achieved the same result. I cannot accept the premise in the hon. member's question. This is my sincere view.

● (4:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Choquette:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the minister as he has had some experience as cabinet member.

Does he not agree that there should be a commutation court, or some other court of last resort, to whose discretion commutations could be referred instead of to the cabinet? The latter really does not have time to study thoroughly the files submitted to it.

**Mr. Turner:** Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Lotbinière, I would say that, eventually the whole question of commutation must be entrusted either to a court or to the National Parole Board; but, as I said in my speech, in order to impress the public with the seriousness of the situation, I feel that for a five-year trial period it might be preferable to leave commutations to the discretion of the cabinet.

**Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières):** Mr. Speaker, at the outset I simply wish to renew a kind of act of faith. Since I came to this house, I have tried, as far as possible, to support the government and to refrain from causing trouble with regard to its administrative responsibilities. Besides, that is what I had promised my constituents when they elected me as their representative in the House of Commons. I have disagreed with the government on a few occasions, and I shall disagree again on this bill.