

Criminal Code

If Parliament is to take action on this important issue which gave rise to the Bill presented by the Member opposite, it should not take this particular action.

• (1610)

Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could get an indication from you of how much time I have.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Until 4.13 p.m.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief. I want to say at the outset that I support wholeheartedly what the Hon. Member is trying to do with this Bill. Like my colleague from Etobicoke North (Mr. MacLaren), I believe this Bill is too broad in scope because there are situations where I do not think the penalty suggested by this Bill should apply. For instance, let us take the case of the convicted felon who spends ten years in prison and when he comes out he writes a book about his experiences, including an account of how the crime was committed. Do we then preclude him from making a profit from that work, if in fact he has been rehabilitated and is doing something positive for society?

I would, however, suggest that the Bill covers an important issue today. The Olson case made it an important issue because of the odious nature of that case and because of the odious nature of that individual. I think we should have a law in Canada that would make it impossible for that type of criminal to profit from his crimes.

An Hon. Member: Let us send the Bill to committee then.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Therefore, if the Hon. Member would just be patient, I would like to suggest that the subject matter only of this Bill be sent to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for consideration and recommendation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I think procedurally I have to put before the House a motion. I believe the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) wanted to propose an amendment which I presume was to be seconded.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): No, I did not make a motion, Mr. Speaker, but I would if I still had the floor.

Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to indicate my support for the objective behind the Bill which the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) has put forward. However, due to the shortcomings of the Bill itself I must speak against it.

The subject matter of today's discussion is one of keen public interest, as a result of some notorious criminal acts that have taken place in Canada in the recent past.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I hear some comments on my right. I am not exactly certain what happens but the Chair is obligated, pursuant to Standing Order (24(2)), to interrupt the proceedings at this point because the time allotted for Private Members' Public Bills has now past.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe there is a disposition in the House to at least accept the content of Bill C-664. Since the House is an institution that can rule itself by unanimous consent, and since the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) has made the suggestion, may we seek unanimous consent of the House that the subject matter of the Bill go to the relevant standing committee for further study and whatever amendments that that committee so deems necessary? In this way the intent of the Bill will be put in its proper perspective, irrespective of the specific writings therein.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): On the face of the matter, I should indicate to the House that the time allotted for the Private Member's Public Bill has expired. In the ordinary course, I think the House would want to be observant of the clock and not permit motions pertaining to the Bill to come in after the time allowed.

There was, however, some comment from the Hon. Member to my right, and I do not know what his intention was. Because I think it is important to ensure that the rights of Hon. Members are respected, if necessary I will hear the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne). If I understood him correctly, he may wish to propose a motion, the effect of which would be that the subject matter of the Bill would be sent to committee.

I must say that from the point of view of the Chair, the time has expired. The only way I can go past that is to seek unanimous consent to determine whether or not the House is prepared to not observe the clock long enough to permit the motion that I described.

I would assume that the Hon. Member for Crowfoot would be pleased to ask the unanimous consent of the House to not see the clock for a couple of moments, for the purpose I have described, but I would have to have unanimous consent in order to proceed in that fashion. Is there unanimous consent to not see the clock?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): There is not.

Shall all items listed under Private Members' Notices of Motions preceding No. 58 be allowed to stand by unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.