

Capital Punishment

Mr. Lawrence: I must admit that motion No. 35, standing in my name, which I first submitted to the parliamentary draftsmen for submission to this House as an amendment at report stage, somehow or other got lost in the shuffle. At a very late hour yesterday morning, before the 12 noon deadline, I realized it had not been reprinted in the Order Paper. I therefore got after the parliamentary counsel who very hurriedly got to work and redrafted the matter, and it appears now as motion No. 35 standing in my name. On sober second thought the parliamentary draftsmen contacted me. As a result I find that the amendment is a bit long. There are parts of it which are quite redundant and unnecessary and should not be included, in the draftsmen's point of view. As well, there should be three small lines at the very beginning in relation to the heading. In no way does this change the operative words. With your permission, Sir, and with the unanimous consent of the House, I would seek to amend my motion No. 35 so that it would read:

That Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended by (a) adding immediately after line 17 at page 8 the following new clause 21:

"21. The heading preceding section 669 and section 669 of the said Act are repealed and the following substituted therefor:

'Sentence of Death

669. The sentence to be pronounced against a person who is sentenced to death shall be that he shall be executed by drug or gas for euthanasia.'

As you will see, that deletes three paragraphs in respect of the matter and adds three inconsequential lines at the very beginning.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. members have heard the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence). In looking at the suggested change it appears it is not a change in the substance of the amendment, but is merely putting things into order, and making the amendment much easier to fit into the bill. Is it agreed that the correction be made?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not object to the hon. member's request to

reword his motion. After all, he did file it originally in time. However, I wonder if he does not mean "after line 18" instead of "after line 17"? But I rise mainly to re-assert the caveat I entered earlier today, namely that I should like to raise a point of order about Motion No. 35 as a whole. As for changing its wording in the Order Paper, I certainly give consent.

● (1700)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This means it would be after line 17 which comprises the words "in a probation order".

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It should be after line 18.

Mr. Lawrence: It should be added immediately after line 18 on page 8. The hon. member is perfectly correct. I cannot count and the draftsman cannot count. That is the problem.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is so agreed that the changes will be made accordingly.

The House will now proceed to the consideration of Motion No. 7.

Mr. Sharp: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding that some of the members who would want to participate in the debate on this item and any others that might be called today would like to leave this afternoon. I feel members of the House would be very happy to accommodate them. We hope this is an example of the co-operation we will have in the future. Therefore, may I call it six o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. members have heard the suggestion of the President of the Privy Council that we should call it six o'clock with unanimous consent at this time. I do so call it six o'clock and wish everyone in this House a very long, restful, and enjoyable weekend on the occasion of our national holiday.

This House stands adjourned until next Monday at 2 p.m.

At 5.03 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.