any event and which I undertake to look into from our point of view. That being the case, we are quite prepared now to allow the motion standing in his name to proceed without further debate.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) has pointed out, the government House leader has given a correct summary of the understanding that we had at our meeting in his office at 6.15 this evening. I should like to say that once again it has been proven that discussion does have value and that compromise here and there sometimes brings results.

It had been our hope that the government would agree not to proceed before the adjournment with either Bill C-87 or Bill C-68. For a while the government House leader seemed to hope that he might have to postpone only part of Bill C-87, the restraint package, but in the end he agreed to postpone the whole of Bill C-87. But as he has already said, he could not meet me with respect to Bill C-68, which relates to medicare. Well, Mr. Speaker, in the process of give and take, we concurred in the agreement, though I point out to him that when Bill C-68 is called for third reading we shall debate the bill in the hope that we may yet be able to persuade the government that it is a bad piece of legislation to proceed with at this time.

With that understanding I concur with what was said by the two previous speakers, and we are now prepared for the motion respecting extra hours to be passed without further debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, the comments of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) and the two previous speakers prove that when we have discussions with the leaders of all parties in the House, an agreement is reached without resorting to closure and without warming our ears too much, as we say in Quebec. I think it is quite fair to co-operate with the government and adjourn at a reasonable date for the summer holidays. We agree with the comments of the President of the Privy Council.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question on the motion put earlier this day by the President of the Privy Council?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion (Mr. Sharp) agreed to.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

• (2110)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, before the interruption at nine o'clock I was speaking at length about the philosophical side of the question before the House, and the neglect of members on the government side to represent and serve their constituents as they said they would in the 1972 and 1974 election campaigns, and that should encompass most of the backbenchers on that side of the House.

Let me now deal with a matter that may be difficult to prove, and that is the deterrent effect of capital punishment. Many members, including the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), have said they do not believe there is any deterrent value in the retention of capital punishment. I would be the first to admit there is no deterrent value in retention of capital punishment in respect of those crimes committed in a fit of passion or in the heat of an argument. There can be a deterrent value where a crime is deliberately planned by a person against another person or persons. It is really that simple.

The minister said the deterrent value had never been proven. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) made a speech in which he recalled a number of murder cases where there was some question about the actual justness of sentencing individuals to the death penalty. He mentioned the Coffin case, the Raymond Cook case, and a number of others. Many of the people who have mentioned those cases and have put forward that argument did not take into consideration the changes in the legislation in September 1961. Those changes in essence established non-capital and capital murder.

Before the non-capital and capital murder trial period we are now embarked upon, murder was defined as being premeditated, proven beyond a shadow of a doubt. Murder was a premeditated and deliberate taking of somebody's life. The government came along in 1967 and changed the essence of capital murder to being that of killing a policeman or a prison guard. Murder then did not have to be premeditated, preconceived, or deliberate. As the law now exists, a frightened 17-year old youth with a heavy flashlight in his hand who hits a policeman over the head and kills him accidentally would be committing murder. Perhaps the cabinet would commute the sentence in such a case, and I would agree with that commutation.

The path we are embarking upon through this legislation is one that will lay down the penalty for murder, namely, ten years for non-capital and 25 years for capital murder. I assume that will be under the 1961 definition and not murder in respect of policemen and prison guards. That