

*Capital Punishment***GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON REINSTATEMENT

The House resumed 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).

Mr. Oostrom: Mr. Speaker, I would like to applaud the Member for Essex-Windsor (Mr. Langdon) for the eloquence

with which he presented his views and his argument. However, I do not think the Hon. Member is very consistent in his argument for preserving life at any cost. He used the very laudable words "life is sacred", and I commend him for that. However, although he pleads for the lives of the guilty, I have never heard him speak or vote in this House for the lives of the innocent. I speak not only of protecting the lives of innocent victims from serial and repeat murderers by advocating life imprisonment without parole, I am also speaking for the innocent babies about to be born. The Member, his Party, and his Leader, advocate their abortion on demand. There are over 60,000 innocent victims a year.

● (1620)

Will the Hon. Member at least say a few words on behalf of those babies who are innocent victims being murdered each year? Will he also say a few words in support of a life sentence without parole for those premeditated murderers?

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, I certainly take the issue of innocent victims very seriously. It is very difficult for a family member, whether a wife or child, to deal with someone's murder. It is very difficult for a parent to face the viciousness of a murder, perhaps even a sexual murder of a daughter. One recognizes the grimness which is involved. This is not an issue on which certain people in the House have a monopoly. It is something for which all of us share a very human feeling and, therefore, I believe we have to talk about serious punishment.

We cannot talk about parole after seven years in a case where innocent victims have been badly hurt and expect them to support our justice system.

I believe with the Hon. Member that some serious change in the sentencing structure and the parole system in this country is very much required. I have made these points in my own constituency and I do not disagree with the Hon. Member in that respect.

However, I disagree with respect to the description of the New Democratic Party position as one of supporting abortion on demand. I recognize that this is not a debate about this subject, but let me briefly say that our view is that this too is such a crucial issue of life that it is inappropriate to be in the Criminal Code.

Instead, it is an issue in which the choices they face should be decided upon between a woman and her physician. I am not certain how recently the Member has gone to his physician. However, if his physician is anything like the ones I visit, I suspect that if he demands certain treatment from his physician the situation will be discussed before any action is taken.

I believe the issue of abortion does not belong in the Criminal Code. It is clear that some of us are opposed to abortion and some of us are in favour of abortion, but as I look around the House, very few of us are forced to face that choice. The Hon. Member and myself will never have to face that choice, and I think it is a question that should not be in