

were punishable by death under the Criminal Code. Those three changes have a direct influence on the abolition of capital punishment. Clause 5 amends section 218, which included a provision describing an offence explicitly punishable by death. Clause 6 amends section 511 which dealt with capital punishment. Clause 7 amends section 534 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 8 amends section 535 of the Criminal Code concerning capital punishment. Clause 9 amends section 538 of the Criminal Code dealing with capital punishment. Clause 10 amends section 562 of the Criminal Code which deals with capital punishment. Clause 11 amends section 589 of the Criminal Code dealing with capital punishment. Clause 12 repeals section 597 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 13 simply amends the sentence in accordance with the new definition of second degree murder, an amendment which results from the abolition of capital punishment. Clause 14 repeals section 604 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 15 deals with the sentence for first degree murder, resulting from the abolition of capital punishment. Finally, clause 16 amends section 607 of the Criminal Code dealing with capital punishment. Clause 17 amends section 609 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 18 amends section 618 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 19 repeals section 619 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 20 amends section 662.1 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 21 amends sections 669 to 681 all dealing with capital punishment. Clause 22 amends section 682 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 23 repeals section 684 dealing with capital punishment. Finally, clauses 25 to 28 inclusive are transition; the principle of Bill C-84 does not lie there. Clause 29 deals with consequential amendments. The principle of the bill does not lie there. And the last one, clause 30, deals with the commencement of the act. The principle of the bill does not lie there either.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, my contention is that there is nothing like reading a bill to discover its principle. It is erratic from the start to rely on its title, as some hon. members did, or to take some clauses out of the bill, to read them out of context to interpret them subjectively and to claim before the House that the principle of Bill C-84 is to redefine treason under two categories, high treason or plain treason, or to redefine piracy or first and second degree murder. I have just ascertained, simply on reading Bill C-84, that each and all of the clauses of Bill C-84 have a direct impact on the abolition of the death penalty and I think there is nothing more obvious than facts which speak for themselves and make it possible to come to a reliable decision, namely to invalidate amendments to alter the principle of a bill which appears plainly following the reading of each clause in Bill C-84.

[English]

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to your attention a word of fundamental importance. We are told in the notice of motion presented to hon. members by the Clerks of this assembly pursuant to Standing Order 75(5) that we are to consider the report stage of Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences. I bring to Your Honour's attention the word punishment. Certainly, unless the House of Commons is not prepared to mete out certain forms of punish-

ment, we should recognize that the key word in the title is punishment, I think this was brought to Your Honour's attention earlier this afternoon by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) who said we are seeking the middle of the road approach.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I say, while we await the messenger from the other place, that arguments put forward on this point have been most interesting and helpful. In every case the arguments were well put up and touch on the important decision which must be made with respect to further debate on amendments at this stage.

I shall reserve on this matter. I may be able to bring down a decision after the eight o'clock vote and will try to do so if I can.

I see the messenger from the other place is here. I repeat that I will take arguments presented under consideration during the supper hour and endeavour to bring down a decision after eight o'clock this evening.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Bon appetit!

● (1750)

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[English]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker the Honourable the Deputy Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

● (1800)

[Translation]

And being returned:

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills.

Bill C-93, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1977—Chapter No. 102.

Bill C-94, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1977—Chapter No. 103.

Bill S-32, An Act to implement conventions for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to income tax between Canada and France, Canada and Belgium and Canada and Israel—Chapter No. 104.

Mr. Speaker: It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

At 6.05 the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.