

on page 5 should not be there. Therefore we would give unanimous consent to making that amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I gather I am now permitted to move the amendment. I move:

That Bill C-2 be amended by striking out lines 24 to 29 on page 5 thereof.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Arthur Laing (for the Minister of Justice) moved that Bill C-2, to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendment Act, the Criminal Records Act, the National Defence Act, the Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, be concurred in.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask one question on this point? Again, I have obtained legal advice. He is an NDP lawyer and will not send me a bill.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If we strike out lines 24 to 29 which are now identified as subclause (2) of clause 9, would it not then follow that the "(1)" that is in line 16 should also come out? Do we not end up with only one clause as clause 9? Does the minister see what I am driving at?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Unless there is someone here to tell us we are wrong, I suggest that the minister's amendment should include the elimination of "(1)" where it appears after "9" in line 16.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, that makes sense to me. There does not seem any necessity for the "(1)" when there is only one. If we made an egregious error, the Senate can probably correct it.

Motion (for concurrence) agreed to.

Mr. Laing moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, would the parliamentary secretary be kind enough to enlighten the House as to the amendments? I do not know whether it is his intention to speak. We will be very brief and as far as we are concerned the bill will receive third reading. Does the parliamentary secretary intend to indicate the thrust of the amendments made in committee, for those members of the House who were not privileged to be there and participate in its flexible wisdom?

• (2140)

[Translation]

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I was quickly called a while

Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1972

ago—considering the good intentions shown by the members lately.

An hon. Member: It is because it is a serious matter.

Mr. Béchard: I know and I thank the hon. members, if it is in order to pass this bill tonight, by having it go through the report stage and the third reading.

All the members who sat on the committee—distinguished members from both parties—certainly explained at their respective caucus recently the amendments that were brought forward, in some cases important amendments and in other cases minor ones.

The amendment moved by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) deals with clause 4 page 5 which was changed, as we have seen, as regards contempt of court in and outside the court. Here is what is mentioned in the bill as to punishment:

9. (1) Where a court, judge, justice or magistrate summarily convicts a person for contempt of court, whether committed in the face of the court or otherwise, and punishment is imposed in respect thereof, that person may appeal

(a) from the conviction, or

(b) against the punishment imposed.

Now in the existing legislation, as the bill has not gone through all stages yet, section 1 reads as follows:

9. (1) Where a court, judge, justice or magistrate summarily convicts—

(2) Where a court or judge summarily convicts a person for a contempt of court—

An amendment was moved following the submission of a very important brief by the Canadian Airline Pilots Association.

If my memory serves me right, because I did not have any time to refer to all my notes before coming to the House, the Airline Pilots Association was worried about the fact that the bill applied in particular to aircraft hijacking. However, we were told that there could be cases of hijacking on the ground by people who are not on board, but who, by telephone, may cause a lot of trouble, to an aircraft or to the pilot's family, who would be thus threatened by a person not on board.

A few other amendments were introduced. Of course, I should read the bill through, but I know that members of the official opposition, of the New Democratic Party, but none from the Social Credit Party because the latter never attended any meeting, agreed to these amendments wholeheartedly and unanimously.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to all committee members whatever party they belong to for their contribution and cooperation and for the positive manner in which they approached the matter and handled the procedures during the debate on this bill.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we shall be able, I hope, to proceed with the third reading of the bill, which will enable the government, particularly with regard to air piracy, to ratify the Conventions of the Hague and Montreal, for we were told by the official from the Canadian Airline Pilots Association that nowadays the worst danger for pilots who have very heavy responsibilities is hijacking, which has become very common, not only in this