

Government Orders

I myself will only deal with Motions Nos. 22 and 23, which I had the honour of submitting and which were seconded by the hon. member for Saint-Hubert.

Motion No. 22 seeks to clarify clause 68 of the bill. The beginning of the current English version of that clause reads as follows:

[English]

The following provisions are amended by replacing the expression "sans surveillance" with the expression "sans escorte".

[Translation]

The idea is to replace the expression "sans surveillance" with the expression "sans escorte", which is deemed more appropriate in French.

It would be more logical to say that, in the French version, the expression "sans escorte" replaces the expression "sans surveillance", so that the introduction to clause 68 would read as follows, should the amendment be passed. The new merged version would read:

[English]

The French version of the following provisions are amended by replacing the expression "sans surveillance" with the expression "sans escorte".

[Translation]

The same logic is applied as in the case of the two preceding clauses, where it is said, in regard to the English version, that:

[English]

The English version of the act is amended.

[Translation]

The same goes for clause 66. The logic is the same as that which prevails throughout the bill.

The other amendment which I tabled, namely Motion No. 23 dealing with clause 69, is for the same purpose. I will spare you the reading of the merged text which, albeit short, could nevertheless be boring. However, the objective of that amendment is the same, that is to say the French version.

I respectfully submit these amendments to the House. As for the other amendments, I do hope that they will be accepted without a long debate.

• (1015)

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, regarding the motion tabled by the hon. member for Bellechasse, I wish to underline his active involvement in the committee. I think it is

in everyone's interest to know how much the hon. member cares about his work. He is always striving for perfection. The government and especially the members of this House would do well to recognize what an excellent job the opposition member did, in my opinion, in this committee.

But I must stick to this text. We in this government support the motion as tabled by the hon. member for Bellechasse.

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, I was not here but I imagine we are still debating Group No. 2.

I wish to repeat that the Bloc Québécois understands and shares the solicitor general's goal of reassuring the public about conditional release, given the enduring climate of public scepticism toward the federal parole system.

In particular, Motion No. 6 tabled by the government is aimed at correcting a drafting error. This provision deals with the calculation of the automatic release date of an offender sentenced to a jail term in a provincial correctional facility who is then transferred to a federal penitentiary.

As it now reads, clause 40 of the bill excludes those offenders who were serving prison sentences on or before November 1, 1992. The government's motion is aimed at correcting this oversight and we support this motion.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on Motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion No. 2 agreed to.)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The next question is on Motion No. 3. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion No. 3 agreed to.)

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on Motion No. 6. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion No. 6 agreed to.)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The next question is on Motion No. 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?