



Ottawa stoned over grass

by Peter Birt
National Affairs Reporter
Canadian University Press

OTTAWA (CUP). — It was two years ago, Tuesday that discussion in committee began on the government's bill to amend the marijuana laws in Canada.

In that time the bill has gone through the Senate's legal and constitutional affairs committee, suffered amendments, was returned to the Senate and passed. It went to the House of Commons on June 18, 1975. It hasn't been heard of since.

That bill, S-19, was "an act to amend the food and drugs act, the narcotic control act, and the criminal code."

"The intent of this legislation," according to Marc Lalonde, minister of health and welfare in his testimony before the committee "is to provide Canadian courts with needed flexibility in dealing with offences involving cannabis so that the penalties levied will be suited to the circumstances and significance of the offences."

A spokesperson for the minister said Jan. 19 there had been "recent discussion of the whole matter" but Loraine Andrews said she could not say what was going to happen to the bill. She also said there was a possibility of some action on the matter at the end of January.

Interest in the legislation hasn't declined. According to Bennett Ross of the Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario,

studies show increased use of cannabis, especially among 18-29 year-old men with university education and earning \$15,000.

The Canadian Medical Association continues to "nag away" too, according to the CMA's director of scientific councils. Dr. J.S. Bennett blames "political expediency" on the lack of government action.

Even the chairperson of the original Senate committee that studied the bill, Senator Carl Goldenberg, doesn't know why no action has been taken by the government.

He said that he knew the bill was "very controversial" but he said, "I thought I would have been told" if the amendments the Senate committee made were unacceptable to the government. He said he has heard "nothing whatsoever" about the bill since it passed the Senate two years ago.

The government has now at least three options.

It can put the amended Senate version of its bill on the House of Commons order paper and see that it soon comes up for debate. It can introduce a new version of the bill and take it to the House of Commons for discussion.

Or it can simply drop the whole matter.

Debate on Bill S-19 began in Senate Dec. 5, 1974. In those debates the purpose and limits of the bill were made clear.

Senator Neiman: "Honourable senators, on Tuesday of last week the government introduced Bill S-19 in this chamber, by which it proposes to transfer the legislative provisions relating to cannabis from the

narcotic control act to the food and drugs act and, in order to regulate those provisions more appropriately, to make amendments to the Criminal Code. I cannot stress too strongly that this bill does not make possession of the substance cannabis sativa legal, nor will it, I am sure, when the implications of these proposals are studied and fully understood, tend to encourage in any way the use of the substance in any of its forms."

In that speech the government makes its plans clear. During the course of witness testimony before the committee and in the debates in the Senate, proponents of the bill repeatedly stated what the government had been saying all along. This bill will change the category of offence that smoking marijuana is but it will not make an act which is illegal now, legal.

As Dr. Bennet of the CMA said during the hearing, "Surely in this day and age it is practical to make something an offence without necessarily making it a criminal offence."

One of the key amendments made by the Senators to the original bill referred to importation of marijuana for personal use. The RCMP had objected to this clause and before the bill went back to the Commons the section was simply removed.

That section stated, "50 (1) excepted as authorized by this part of the regulations, no person shall import into Canada or export from Canada any cannabis," and later "except that sub-paragraph (b) (UV) (regarding penalties) does not apply were that person, after having

been found guilty of the offence, establishes that he imported or exported the cannabis for his own consumption only."

The committee also recommended that first offenders would be given an absolute or conditional discharge after conviction for possession of marijuana.

Maximum penalties for importing or exporting would be reduced to 14 years less a day from the existing 14 years. The law now states that absolute or conditional discharges can only be granted in offences that carry a penalty of less than 14 years.

Not all the discussion in Senate was serious however. One senator, Sullivan, made his position on the whole matter very clear. "The use of soft drugs leads almost inevitably to the use of hard drugs. There is no such thing as 'simple possession of marijuana', I would remind Senator Neiman. They are all passing it on, or proselytizing. Furthermore, I am in favour of the death penalty for heroin traffickers. You now know exactly where I stand," he said.

Another, Senator Lorne Bonnell said "Marijuana has no medical use, and its effect on our young people between 14 and 20 cost our society dearly. These youngsters lose their initiative, drive, sense of purpose and their ambition to succeed." It was in this atmosphere that the Senate passed the amended Bill S-19.

U.S. president Jimmy Carter said he favored decriminalizing marijuana smoking — reducing the offence to a misdemeanor from a felony — but not its legalization.