

Canada is a signatory of that convention, and surely having signed it we should approve it and bring forward a bill to protect not only the pilots and personnel of the commercial airlines of Canada but all the passengers who use those airlines. That is the reason I brought forward this matter in the first place and prepared a bill in respect of hijacking. I drew up that bill along the lines of the terms and conditions contained in the convention.

If the Minister of Justice does not intend to introduce a bill himself, perhaps he would allow my bill to receive second reading and be referred to the committee for study. Then we would be able to come to grips with the problem. I make the prediction that if something is not done now, we may have a situation similar to the one we were discussing this afternoon and this evening. Something will happen in Canada, not only to the personnel of the commercial airlines but to the public using those airlines. Why does Canada not take the lead?

**Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, since Canada signed the Hague convention on December 16, 1970, the text of this new instrument as adopted at the Hague conference has been under study by the Department of Justice, the Department of Transport and the Department of External Affairs with a view to ascertaining what steps, including the enactment of domestic legislation, will be required to enable Canadian ratification. Because Canada will be accepting certain international responsibilities with respect to the treatment of aircraft hijackers when we become a party to the convention, it has been necessary to consider a number of legal implications which will affect Canadian criminal law once the convention comes into force for Canada.

The examination of this matter has shown that we would be in a better position to implement the convention if a specific offence of "unlawful seizure of aircraft"—hijacking—were to be created under the Canadian Criminal Code. This offence would conform to the definition set out in article 1 of the treaty as follows:

Any person who on board an aircraft in flight:

a) unlawfully, by force or threat thereof, or by any other form of intimidation, seizes, or exercises control of, that aircraft, or attempts to perform any such act, or

b) is an accomplice of a person who performs or attempts to perform any such act, commits an offence (hereinafter referred to as "the offence").

One of the most far-reaching provisions of the convention deals with the question of jurisdiction over hijackers. Section 5A of the Criminal Code gives Canada jurisdiction only over alleged offenders or offenders when the offence concerns a Canadian aircraft or a foreign aircraft which subsequently lands in Canada.

Article 4, paragraph 1(c) and article 4, paragraph 2 of the Hague convention require a contracting state to establish jurisdiction when the offence is committed on board leased aircraft and where the alleged offender is present in its territory—at any time—and it does not extradite him pursuant to other provisions of the convention. In order for Canada to undertake this obligation we must amend section 5(a) to extend the jurisdiction of Canadian courts.

#### *Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

The Department of Justice has under preparation, and shortly expects to introduce into Parliament, a number of amendments to the Criminal Code. At that time the amendments relating to the Hague convention will also be dealt with. When the relevant legislation has been passed, the major step which will enable Canadian ratification of the Hague convention will have been taken. Immediately following the enactment of such legislation, it is expected that the Secretary of State for External Affairs—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the parliamentary secretary, but his time has expired.

**Mr. Woolliams:** If other members would consent—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** There is no provision in the rules to extend the time. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Stewart).

**Mr. Béchard:** Mr. Speaker, I thought we had ten minutes altogether.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The parliamentary secretary's time has expired. The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has been gracious in suggesting that it should be extended, but there is no discretion in the Chair to extend it. The hon. member for Marquette.

#### NATIONAL PARKS—RIDING MOUNTAIN—CLOSURE OF CHURCH CAMPS

**Mr. Craig Stewart (Marquette):** Mr. Speaker, on May 11 I questioned the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) on the government's decision to force the closure of six church camps in Riding Mountain National Park. I do not understand the government's policy that the leases to these six church camps will not be renewed after 1975. It is as confusing as most of the policies they have established for our national parks, particularly as they affect our parks in western Canada where space is no problem.

The member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) and myself during the Easter recess met with representatives of the six denominations involved in the operation of these church camps. I can assure the minister that they are not happy with his decision after the time and effort that has been put forth in the last 30 years in developing these camps. In choosing a church camp it is extremely important that a location is chosen for urban children to receive the special gift of the revelations of nature; it is necessary for them to be in an unspoiled, undeveloped, isolated area. The present church campsites in Riding Mountain National Park fill this need.

The government will say that they have offered to relocate the church camps in one large, group camp. In view of the fact that the proposed relocation site offered the six denominations is a former prisoner of war camp, surely the government will alter its decision. By giving these six churches one unacceptable alternative the minister knows that he will force the eviction of these