Capital Punishment

where it does today. However, because this is a private Member's private Bill, I would submit that this might have been improperly done and might require unanimous consent of the House to have it where it presently finds itself in the order of precedence.

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, I just want to add to what the Hon. Member has said, that we on this side of the House would be ready to try to help the people of the North which we believe have been so often neglected by the Government. We are happy to see that someone on the Government side is putting something forward which will be constructive and, in that sense, we would be agreeable.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, in the same spirit, we too agree to this proposal.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the Hon. Member for Western Arctic would allow the Table Officers to consider the matter and then I will come back to the House with what resolution we can. However, I just want to put on the record that there is unanimous consent of the House to the suggestion of the Hon. Member.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON REINSTATEMENT

The House resumed from Thursday, June 18, consideration of the Motion of Mr. Mazankowski:

That this House supports, in principle, the reinstatement of capital punishment and directs that a special committee on reinstatement, composed of 15 members, be established, hold hearings and make its final report to the House no later than three (3) months following the adoption of this motion, such report to provide recommendations on:

(a) which offence or offences should carry the death penalty, and in what circumstances;

(b) which method or methods should be used to carry out the penalty of death, and in what circumstances;

That, pursuant to Standing Order 107(1), this special committee be hereby appointed as a committee to prepare and bring in a bill no later than three months following the adoption of this motion, founded on the committee's recommendations on (a) and (b) above; such a bill shall be the object of a separate and distinct report of the special committee, and such a report shall be its final report;

That such bill, when reported from such special committee to the House, be deemed pursuant to Standing Order 107(1) to have been introduced and stand on the Order Paper, in the name of the special committee chairman, for first reading at the next sitting of the House; and that subsequent House stages of the bill be considered under "Government Orders", with the bill standing under the heading "Government Business"; and that, when the said bill has been read a second time, it shall stand referred to a Legislative Committee;

That the Striking Committee be empowered to name the Members of the special committee, provided that once the Striking Committee report is laid upon the Table, it shall be deemed concurred in;

That the special committee have the power to sit while the House is sitting and during periods when the House stands adjourned; That the special committee be empowered to report from time to time and send for persons and papers, and to print such papers and evidence from time to time as may be ordered by the committee and to retain the services of expert, technical, professional and clerical staff;

That the special committee be empowered to adjourn from place to place inside Canada and that, when deemed necessary, the appropriate staff accompany the committee;

That a quorum of the special committee be eight (8) members for any vote, resolution or other decision; and that the chairman be authorized to hold meetings to receive evidence and authorize the printing thereof whenever six (6) members are present;

That any substitution of membership on the special committee be made pursuant to Standing Order 94(4); and

That, notwithstanding the usual practices of this House, if the House is not sitting when the special committee is ready to issue its final report and the said bill, the special committee shall present its report and the bill to the House by filing them with the Clerk of the House provided that the report shall then be deemed to have been laid upon the Table, and the bill shall then be deemed, pursuant to Standing Order 107(1), to have been introduced at the first sitting of the House thereafter and to stand on the Order Paper in the name of the special committee chairman, for first reading at the next sitting of the House; and that subsequent House stages of the bill be considered under "Government Orders", with the bill standing under the heading "Government Business".

And on the amendment of Mr. Nystrom, (P.7307).

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I enter into this debate with a concern my colleague has just expressed, why it is there seems to be such an inordinate and unacceptable ambition on the part of so many Members of the Government to limit debate on this issue. One of the most crucial decisions every one of us will be taking in this House at some time is on the matter of the restoration of capital punishment. It has been initiated by Members of the Government Party. The onus is on them to prove their case.

All we can assume is that those Hon. Members believe they are losing their case and, therefore, want the debate to come to an end. Therefore, this House, in part, is debating this motion under a cloud. There is a gun being put to our head. If we do not behave ourselves and limit our remarks, the Government at some point will bring in closure.

We certainly appreciate the decision you have made this morning, Mr. Speaker, that at the point in time at which there is an intention on the part of the Government to bring in closure, we will be able to resume our argument and be able to once again show that any attempt to limit the rights and freedoms of Members of Parliament to speak on behalf of their constituents on this crucial issue should not be permitted. If it gets in the way of the Government's timetable or its agenda or its fear of public reaction, then at least we can show that Parliament itself will not be victimized by those crass kinds of motivations.

It is interesting to note that this attempt to limit, restrain and circumscribe debate takes place at a time when I think Canadians want more debate. Over the last two months, I have been invited to countless numbers of schools, churches and organizations at which people wanted to hear the arguments for and against.