

*Private Members' Business***PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—BILLS***[English]***CRIMINAL CODE AND SUPREME COURT ACT**

MEASURE TO AMEND

That is why all of the traditions of the House, all of the rules of the House, have an intermediary. People sometimes ask why we are always talking to the Speaker when we are speaking in the House. Why do we not talk to the minister? Why do we not talk to the people? Why are we always talking to the Speaker?

Mr. Epp: He's the only one who listens.

Mr. Baker: The hon. member said that perhaps he is the only one listening.

That is one suggestion I would make. That is to make the use of the word "you" completely unparliamentary, and if a member stands up and says "you", he should be told to sit down.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief question for the member for Gander—Grand Falls.

The number of members required to refuse consent, and this was put to you two or three times today in this House, to extend the hours past the normal adjournment is 15 under our present rules. It is proposed to increase that to 25.

When we were in opposition from 1984 to 1988, it was 25. There were 40 of us in opposition. The member for Gander—Grand Falls was there with me and he knows that it was difficult for us sometimes to get 25 members in the House. We are going back to that 25. Is that not what I would call an anti-democratic way of handling the smaller parties of this House? Is that not what I would call an anti-democratic way of handling the smaller parties of this House? Is that not the tyranny of the majority by asking those of us who have less to do more?

• (1700)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): It being five o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

The House resumed from Thursday, December 6, 1990, consideration of the motion of Mr. Domm that Bill C-210, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Supreme Court Act (habeas corpus) be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to Bill C-210 on the subject of Canada's extradition process as I was the seconder of the motion.

Extradition defined is the "handing over by one government to another government, upon the latter's request, of a person accused of or convicted of a crime in the requesting country."

Canada has entered into an extradition treaty or arrangement with 40 countries, including the United States. Our proximity to the U.S. underscores the importance of having an extradition agreement wherein fugitives fleeing from the U.S. into Canada and vice versa can be returned to the country where the alleged crimes took place and justice served. A fugitive must not be allowed to assume that by crossing a border into a foreign country that he has found a safe haven, free from prosecution.

Recently, Canadians were reminded of the alleged heinous crimes of Charles Ng, charged with the sex slayings of 11 people in California. We were reminded of these crimes because the families of the slain victims, the whereabouts of the remains of some of them are still unknown, came to Ottawa to request that the federal government extradite Ng to the U.S. so that he could be tried. I, along with others members of Parliament, met with these distressed families, at the invitation of the hon. member for Peterborough, the sponsor of the bill.

We are reminded as well, because on February 21, 1991 arguments were being presented before the Supreme Court of Canada as to whether or not Charles Ng and convicted killer Joseph Kindler should be extradited to the United States.