

Government Orders

I suggest that the possible third hearing will be minimal in light of the fact that the Supreme Court has already made the decision for the time being on the matter of the death sentence.

I also would like to lend support to the governments in the United States that helped in bringing to the attention of Canadian people the concern about justice being applied to Americans who were serving lengthy times in prison here and wanting them to go back.

We had the governors of Ohio and California, and a host of people in the United States trying for six years to get Ng back to face trial. The fact that when the ruling was made and the minister moved in and, to answer another one of our concerns, the quick flight back to the United States before the United Nations heard the case.

If the United Nations is going to listen to extradition cases here in Canada, before we send them back after nine courts of appeal have been listened to and heard, then I think that the United Nations is running out of work to do. I do not think that would have happened and I am so pleased that we did not waste any time in extraditing Ng and Kindler back to the United States.

I think all members in this House would like to support this bill. I hope it is passed without objections, without any negative votes so that we can represent about 95 per cent of the Canadian people who have been looking for this for seven years.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member who just spoke a question. How does this government bill differ from his private member's bill? Could he tell the House that?

Mr. Domm: Mr. Speaker, I had two private member's bills. One was approved in this House on division at second reading just prior to prorogation. It allowed the extradition hearing to be held in conjunction with the habeas corpus, but no appeal.

My bill stated that when they wanted to appeal that, they would go to the federal courts, and we would take it right through the Federal Court process, the trials division and so on. It meant that my bill reduced it from nine to six. I still had all of the federal side to deal with and the opportunities there were to the minister, perhaps, to move it directly to the Supreme Court, if she so wished, if the challenge was on the charter.

I went through the extradition hearing, the one provincial hearing, over to the Federal Court for the federal court hearing, the Federal Court appeal which led to an appeal at the Supreme Court. My bill had three in the provincial courts and two in the federal courts. I had five. Bill C-31 has two, plus one possible, making a total of three. It cuts down the process further than my bill did. That is why I am supporting this bill. I did not feel when I was writing my bills that I wanted to take it out of the federal arena and put it in the provincial one. I wanted to take it through the federal side as quickly as possible after the extradition hearings.

Mr. Waddell: Is the hon. member saying that he feels this government bill is better than his bill or does he feel his bill was better than the government bill?

Mr. Domm: That is an easy question to answer. I think this bill is better. If I could reduce it to one hearing, it would be even better. If anyone can come up with a bill where one hearing is held, I will support that too.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to stand in the House to debate third reading of Bill C-31. I am very pleased that the member for Peterborough is here today. I enjoyed listening to his speech, as I enjoyed working with him on his private member's bill.

Like the member for Peterborough, I felt very strongly about the extradition bill that is in effect now and will be changed as a result of Bill C-31. I want to congratulate him on the work he did. As he has said, he presented two private member's bills on this subject. I was not the critic for my party on the first, but I was fortunately on the second and immediately joined with him in support of what he did. He acknowledged the support of our party and I thank him for that. That is a very non-partisan statement. It shows the sincerity of the member and I appreciate it.

He says too that Bill C-31 is better than his bill in the regard that it is down to two, possibly three, steps where his was five. I agree with him on that. I think this is a better bill.

I also say in his defence and in support of him that his was the only bill we had. Had it not been for his private member's bill, quite frankly, I am convinced that we would not be here today in this House discussing Bill C-31, an act to amend the Extradition Act. As he said,