

Government Orders

not convinced that it is there. I think, from the submission of the Canadian Bar Association, it is not convinced that the right is there.

There are still some outstanding issues, as has been said. The committee was concerned, as was stated here this morning, as to whether Canada would become a safe haven for criminals. That has been addressed. I do not think that is going to be a concern as a result of the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada and as a result of this legislation.

The committee heard about the problems of the evidence of the hearings, as has been stated by other speakers, and this is important. We do tend to get a lot of fictitious information. The evidentiary rules are something that are going to have to be looked at very, very carefully.

There is the potential conflict of the Department of Justice as the lawyer for the country seeking the extradition on the one hand and the minister having the rights that she has with respect to being able to deal with this question. I think an important step has been made here and our party supports this legislation. We are pleased that the government brought it forward so quickly after report stage yesterday so that it can be put into place.

I hope that the parliamentary secretary will convey to the minister the concern of this party that so much is not coming forward, that there is almost a retardation of activity from the Department of Justice.

The parliamentary secretary mentioned the Law Reform Commission and the fact that it had dealt with the contraventions issue in 1976 and why the former government did not bring it forward. That is certainly a point, but that is not the point that I was trying to make obviously, as the parliamentary secretary will I am sure understand. The point was that this idea germinated with the Law Reform Commission as another example of the importance of the Law Reform Commission in this country. We hope that the Law Reform Commission will be reinstated after this government has had a chance to reconsider this very frivolous action of doing away with it

and that it will be allowed in the future to continue the good work it has done in the past. I want to say this is going to do a lot. We are awaiting the next step from the government on other changes.

I want to thank the member for Peterborough and all members of the House, frankly, for the interest that they have had because it has been important. It has been the feeling of the members of Parliament in general that changes needed to be made that, in a large sense, prompted this bill that we have before us today.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

**FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL FISCAL ARRANGEMENTS
AND FEDERAL POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION
AND HEALTH CONTRIBUTIONS ACT**

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Frank Oberle (for the Minister of Finance) moved that Bill C-60, an act to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mrs. Suzanne Duplessis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for External Relations and Minister of State (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to open the third reading debate on Bill C-60, an act to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act.

This bill extends the fiscal equalization program that previous speakers from both sides of this House have described, and rightly so, as the cornerstone of fiscal federalism in Canada. Equalization is one of the links that bind this country together.

It is the result of more than 20 months of consultations with the provinces, both at the ministerial and departmental levels. Mr. Speaker, because of these extensive and intensive consultations, the provinces are very satis-