

*Government Orders*

There have certainly been enough questions raised lately about just how Canada's criminal justice system is supposed to work. There have been many instances. There are cases out in B.C. recently where a band of militant natives held the RCMP at bay for a number of days. The people in B.C. were saying: "My God, what is going on when people can draw arms against our country and hold a whole province and the national police force at ransom with seeming impunity?" We saw the same thing at Ipperwash.

We see serious criminals who have committed violent acts being let out on parole and day passes and for what reason? For reasons that just boggle the mind of the average Canadian, only to have criminals go out and kill, rape and maim again.

These are the concerns on the minds of the Canadian people, not some airy-fairy ideas that come from the minister's friends in Toronto. These concerns come from average Canadians. These concerns are not going to be addressed by the people he appoints to the law commission. They will be there only to do his bidding and not the bidding of the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, you can probably imagine that I do not support this bill either. In confusion, in conclusion—

**An hon. member:** It is a confusing bill.

**Mr. Harris:** Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that I stumble on my words. The word confusion comes up right now because I am so confused about the motives of this bill. The minister is not telling the people what he is planning on doing.

I am confused about how this bill has come into the House to be debated and will come to a vote when we found an announcement that the minister is going to create this law commission. What does this debate count for? Anything? Is this a waste of time? Surely the government must have some other business to put forward.

We are going to waste time debating something that is already a done deal. If this deal is already a done deal as we saw by the announcement the other day, that means I have wasted my time in the House. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra has wasted his time in this House. The member for Calgary North has wasted her time in this House. The Bloc member who spoke on this has wasted her time. Could we not be doing something more constructive than debating a bill that apparently already is a done deal?

• (1125)

I join with my Reform colleagues and the hon. members from the Bloc in opposing this bill in the strongest possible terms. It is inconsequential. It will not achieve any realistic reform to the criminal justice system. It cannot in the form it is proposed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The Chair never engages in debate but certainly if I can be of any assistance to any member of any party at any time, let there be no confusion that on the government's Bill C-106, the member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley does not support the government's bill.

**Mr. Harris:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I want to make it clear that I do not support Bill C-106.

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member in his remarks questions why we would be debating this bill today when as he suggests it is some kind of a done deal. He knows full well that the bill is not passed until it is passed.

I am sure the hon. member would not for the world miss an opportunity nor would his colleagues have missed the opportunity to take the time of the House and tell Canadians how undeserving and unworthy this bill was of support. Having taken all his time to do this, something he figures was not worth his time in the first place nor worth the time of this House, maybe he will not find it worth his time to reply to my question. We will see.

This bill which sets up this renewed law commission states very clearly in clause 6 that the commission is accountable through the minister to Parliament for the conduct of its affairs. That is a fairly clear statement, that this commission is accountable to Parliament. It is Parliament that will make decisions about changes in law.

I am wondering what his comment is, what he thinks about the very clear statement that this commission is accountable to Parliament and not anybody else. It is accountable to Parliament. Does he believe what is written in the law on which he will have a chance to vote?

**Mr. Harris:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question. Clause 6 does say that, but let us examine what accountable through the minister to Parliament really means. In other words, Parliament will have no opportunity to question members of the law commission, only the minister. That is sort of a misleading explanation of accountability.

We all know that unfortunately the Liberal Party has a majority in this House. Quite frankly, on very few occasions do I see the Liberal Party or any of the ministers really paying any attention to what the opposition members say. Every amendment that we ever put through to the Minister of Justice has been defeated by the government. This indicates that the Liberals have a clear agenda that they are going to follow regardless of what arguments the opposition members bring up in the House.

The idea of the law commission being accountable to Parliament through the minister really is just a smoke and mirrors thing. The only way that could work would be if we had a