

*Private Members' Business*

bring in other amendments that would streamline the procedure and make it that much fairer.

I would hope that prior to six p.m. today, a vote could be called at second reading stage and that the matter can be referred to the standing committee on justice. The standing committee on justice could then expedite consideration of this bill.

• (1720)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** On a point of order, the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.

**Mr. Waddell:** Mr. Speaker, having spoken in this debate, I am not entitled to speak again, but I wonder if I could seek the unanimous consent of the House to pose a short question to the member.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** I wonder if the member would answer this. I am concerned that because the member for Peterborough's bill really drastically reduces the process, the extra number of extradition hearings, including removing the process of habeas corpus, which is an ancient part of British and Canadian law, does the hon. member not think that this would probably make the bill unconstitutional?

**Mr. Nunziata:** I do not believe that the bill is unconstitutional. The hon. member is a lawyer. He has his own legal opinion as to the constitutional validity of Bill C-210. He will have the opportunity, as will the Department of Justice and all other interested individuals, to make submissions before the justice committee as to the constitutionality of this particular bill.

The bill does streamline the procedure. It only makes common sense to allow an individual one hearing and several appeals, to the court of appeal in the province where the extradition hearing is held and ultimately an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. Under the present procedure there are a number of different avenues of appeal open to an individual that is subjected to the extradition procedure.

Surely any reasonable person, including the nine justices on the Supreme Court of Canada would agree that an individual should have one avenue of appeal. If a person is convicted of murder in Canada today they have an appeal to the court of appeal in the province in which they were convicted and a further appeal to the Supreme

Court of Canada. No one is suggesting that the person should have a further avenue of appeal either to another country or to the Federal Court of Appeal. There should be one streamlined procedure. That is all we are suggesting.

If the member has an opportunity to speak again, we would like to know whether the New Democratic Party will allow this bill to get to committee, so we can more fully answer the question he put.

**Mr. Lee Richardson (Calgary Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians were shocked by revelations of the Charles Ng case as referred to by the member for York South—Weston and by my colleague, the member for Erie.

Charles Ng was captured in Calgary in July 1985 by a friend and constituent of mine, Sean Doyle. Mr. Doyle had little idea at the time of just who he was capturing when he apprehended Charles Ng.

Canadians have been frustrated by the extraordinary and extended delays in the extradition of Mr. Ng. The U.S. requested extradition of Charles Ng in February 1987. Still Ng remains, at the expense of Canadian taxpayers', harbouring this fugitive in Canada.

The case raised a lot of attention in Canada and a lot of people were upset by this ongoing process. Many of us followed the cause taken up by the member for Peterborough in championing this cause to expedite the extradition process in cases such as the Charles Ng case. Like many members here, I circulated petitions in my constituency to encourage revision and repeal of some of these extradition matters.

The hon. member for Peterborough proposed Bill C-210 which is before us in the House today. The intention of the Domm bill is to streamline Canada's extradition process which currently provides a multi-tiered system of appeals. Specifically, this bill attempts to limit one of the number of appeals available to a fugitive in an extradition case before the Minister of Justice renders a decision.

The objective of the bill, to avoid delays in handling requests for extradition, is clearly commendable, just what all those who signed petitions were demanding. No one wants to allow excessive delays in the extradition process which could turn Canada into a haven for fugitives who have been accused of serious crimes in other countries. On that matter I expect we will agree, having heard the media attention that the well-publicized extradition cases have received during the last year.