

*Capital Punishment*

sions, and it becomes obvious to those involved in their care that the kindest thing for those people would be if they could only be successful. So my answer in short is that I am not talking about any kind of euthanasia but rather about legalized suicide.

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say a few brief words about these motions. The hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday) proposes that for high treason, piracy, and for second murders there should be either a life sentence or an opportunity to be executed, which would be the choice of the person convicted of these three offences. In his amendment No. 38 he sets out the way in which the death sentence would be carried out.

He said he did not draft the amendments himself, and perhaps that is the reason for some of the loopholes in them. He says he put forward these amendments for humane reasons, because he feels that for certain offences a person should have the choice of either being put to death or being imprisoned for life. But what I think has been overlooked is that in the present bill a person, for the crime of treason, shall be sentenced to imprisonment for life and would be eligible for parole in 25 years, and perhaps in 15 years if a jury agreed that his parole eligibility date should be shortened. So he would be sentenced to imprisonment for life subject to the minimum parole eligibility date.

With respect to piracy, when we discussed this in the committee last night the hon. member referred to the hijacking of aircraft. I made some comments with respect to people who are suicidal and had martyr complexes. A study was made with respect to aircraft hijackers in recent years—people who hijacked aircraft to Cuba, Algeria, and so on. The mistake he made was that his amendment was with respect to section 75 in the Criminal Code which deals with the piracy of ships. That section is a very old section in the Criminal Code and the death penalty still applied to piracy of ships. The sections relating to hijacking of aircraft provide a maximum life sentence, not a minimum life sentence. So in fact what he is doing is to say that for piracy we should have, instead of the death penalty, imprisonment for life, which, by the way, would be subject to parole in ten years, but the hon. member says that person should have the choice of being executed, if he wishes.

The third type of offence is a second murder. That is a difficult case. There are other amendments here also dealing with second murders. All I can say is that this is a very rare occurrence. In Canadian history we had only five examples of this. One of the five examples was of the second murder having been committed in the United States after the individual escaped from a Canadian prison.

The second one of these examples is of an inmate who killed another inmate who was his accomplice in the murder that brought them both to prison. In other words, these two individuals committed a murder and, when they were sentenced to prison for life, one of the individuals killed his accomplice.

The other three cases are of individuals who committed second murders, and in one of these cases an individual

[Mr. Halliday.]

was hanged in the early forties. So it is a rare occurrence. I am an abolitionist and I believe that the answer in case of second murders is a better security system in our prisons and a better parole system.

With respect to the principle in the hon. member's proposal, I do not question his sincerity but I feel that the very fact he says "execute these people" makes it a type of suicide. If you read his amendment No. 38, it is the state that must do the execution once the convicted person decides he wishes to be executed rather than serve his sentence. This means that the state must provide all the apparatus for the execution—have an executioner available, and so on, and deliberately execute the individual even though he has agreed to it. It seems to me to be a cold blooded ritual and I would prefer that we do not accept that type of procedure.

The hon. member has made some other points with which I agree. He says that we should show concern for the victim. I have stated repeatedly that my first concern is for victims, or to ensure lack of victims. My first goal as Solicitor General is to do everything possible to prevent crime and to reduce the number of victims.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Allmand:** Of course our programs for crime prevention and crime reduction are not in Bill C-84; they are found in many other bills. For example, Bill C-83 is directed to crime prevention. Bill C-71, passed by the House in January, was directed to crime prevention. When we submitted our estimates to the House for this department we provided an increase in the estimates for the RCMP, which is law enforcement and crime prevention. We were dealing with the protection of the public. There are many programs geared to crime prevention and public protection, but they are not in Bill C-84.

With respect to the compensation of victims of crime, we have a program now covering this. That program is under the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). Under the program he cost shares with the provinces in their provincial programs in that area. I believe that he has agreements with all provinces in Canada. Terms of those programs differ from province to province.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the minister but it is close to ten o'clock.

I said earlier that I would give to the House a precise compilation of amendments considered up to now. Three motions have been withdrawn: Motions Nos. 1, 16 and 20. The following motions have been ruled out of order: Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 39. Therefore remaining for consideration are the four that have been grouped for debate standing in the name of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday), namely, motions Nos. 4, 9, 18 and 38. In addition to those are motions Nos. 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 21 to 37 inclusive, and 40 to 46 inclusive.

● (2200)

In respect of the grouping of these motions perhaps House leaders might agree that the Chair should attempt to put forward suggested groupings of amendments tomorrow morning, which would only form the basis of discussion. The Chair would try to get these suggestions into