

Adjournment Debate

The letter goes on to say:

In parliament the flag dropped to half mast in respect for Italy's Aldo Moro, a politician. How much more appropriate would it be for such respect to be shown for our own Mounties when they give their lives in the service of Canadian citizens, including those stupid politicians who refuse to give them the protection of the law.

I would like to refer to the murder of the young shoeshine boy in Toronto last year, and in particular to an article which appeared in the Toronto *Sun* under the heading "Police say film shows sex attack on Emanuel". The article states:

● (2207)

Police investigating the slaying of Emanuel Jaques yesterday revealed they had seized colour film showing the boy being repeatedly sexually assaulted before his death.

These are the types of people Canadians want punished and that is why the government must consider the implementation of capital punishment once again.

Mr. Roger Young (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, it has been stated before that the ministry is not prepared to accede to the request for reinstatement of capital punishment in this country. The ministry does not feel compelled to depart from that principle presently enshrined in the law of this country in relation to offences committed by national or international terrorists.

This, notwithstanding the comments made by the hon. member this evening and the press clipping he quoted from a Winnipeg paper referring to "stupid politicians". I take it that must refer to all members of this House who voted for abolition in a free vote, including a number of members of his own party, among them his own leader.

Criminal Code amendments passed by parliament in 1977 which have now been proclaimed as the law of the land should be ample notice to would-be national or international terrorists that Canadians are prepared to deal rigorously with those who would commit violent criminal acts. This trend has been continued in the current legislation presently tabled before the House.

These present and proposed provisions are ample testimony to the fact that Canada will not be a haven for incidents of national or international terrorism.

The impact of the increased lengths of parole eligibility for persons convicted of first and second degree murder is becoming increasingly apparent in the community. Individuals who are convicted of first degree murder will be sentenced to imprisonment for life without eligibility for parole for 25 years. Persons found guilty of second degree murder run the risk of having their parole eligibility extended from ten to a maximum of 25 years.

Radical changes to the penalties for the criminal misuse of firearms are a mark of the new gun control legislation. Use of a firearm while committing an indictable offence will now be punished by mandatory imprisonment for one to 14 years for the first offence. Subsequent offences may attract sentences of three to 14 years. The sentence for use of a firearm in the

[Mr. McKenzie.]

commission of a violent indictable offence will be served consecutively to any other offence imposed for the crime. Carrying a concealed weapon, possessing prohibited weapons or unregistered restricted weapons, is punishable by up to five years imprisonment. Any offence under the Criminal Code authorizing imprisonment for five years or more now comes within the expanded definition of "offence" for which an authorization may be permitted under the wiretap provisions of the Code.

Proposed amendments presently before the House to the Fugitive Offenders and Extradition Acts are an attempt to modernize this legislation in the face of the increasing international scope of criminal activities, including terrorism. The—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST—EFFECT OF GUIDELINES ON FORMER
MINISTERS AND DEPUTY MINISTERS

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in the hope of getting a better answer to the question I raised with respect to the conflict of interest rules set out by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), particularly as they related to the appointment of the former minister of finance, the Hon. Donald Macdonald, to the board of directors of the MacDonnell-Douglas Corporation.

I suppose one of the advantages of flying back and forth between Saskatoon and Ottawa is that one has the chance of reading the papers. But on the weekend, before I asked my question, I noted on the financial pages of various newspapers, including the *Globe and Mail*, an announcement by the MacDonnell-Douglas Corporation of the appointment of Mr. Macdonald to the board of directors. In reading the announcement over, what struck me were the rather Freudian references to the qualifications of Mr. Macdonald, including the fact that he is a former minister of national defence and minister of finance. There was no reference to any other portfolios Mr. Macdonald held, so I suppose MacDonnell-Douglas felt those other portfolios brought no significant advantage to the company and were not the basis upon which Mr. Macdonald was made a member of the board.

● (2212)

The company went on to point out that it has commercial and military aircraft and automation services amongst its products. As we all know, the Government of Canada is now in process of considering a number of tenders for a massive \$2.3 billion contract relating to military aircraft for the Department of National Defence and the government generally.

Mr. Macdonald resigned as minister of finance less than a year ago. He was minister of finance up until September, 1977, so there are a couple of considerations in this situation. As has been pointed out by many people, no one is suggesting that Mr. Macdonald is going to use some devious methods to obtain a particular preference for Macdonnell-Douglas. That is not the issue.