

• (1110)

I could not agree with that. They are American citizens. They are up here and have committed crimes back home. I would not want to think that we were going to make available to them millions of dollars to pursue the *ad infinitum* appeals that might be available to them through that part in the budget in which we remove that money from the purpose of challenging. I hope we will continue to leave it out of that category for challenging.

I made a note of all members who supported changes to the extradition at the time when we first were dealing with it. From just after the 1984 election right up to the 1988 election we compiled petitions with more than 130,000 signatures wanting to expedite the extradition laws in this country. Not only did we receive that many petitions from all sides of the House but the government received over 90,000 personal letters, which were delivered in cartons to my office and later turned over to the then Minister of Justice, asking that we see some expediting of this matter. That was in 1989.

Since that time, the all-party justice committee has put forward a report strongly supporting expediting these cases through the courts and eliminating some of the appeals. In addition, there was another legislative opportunity between second and third reading. The discussion that took place showed a willingness—not to say that the NDP do not support it, the NDP is now prepared to support it as the Liberals always have been.

The only unfortunate thing that happened to me in the discussions and debates around this bill was that when my private member's bill was before the House, I could only get the support of the Liberals. I never did get the support of the NDP. Finally, on division, it went through on the eve of proroguing. The session ended and we lost that bill.

In one respect I am happy at having lost and not passing either of my bills or any of my resolutions. I at least have a bill now that deals with it and speeds it up even more than my bill did. I allowed them to move through one case in the provincial court to a case in the federal court and work their way through there. I felt that extradition should be in a federal court rather than just a provincial court. That is the only difference. It was rumoured that my bill did not include the matter of being able to go before the courts on habeas corpus. It

### *Government Orders*

did include that but not in the appeal stage only in the first set, when they were in the provincial court. When they are in the provincial court habeas corpus was permitted in my bill.

There are a lot of national groups in Canada that we all owe our support to for helping this come to fruition. We can never forget the hard work of Victims of Violence, whose headquarters are here in Ottawa, in giving us the opportunity to talk to some of the victims of Ng in the United States. Victims' families came up. We met with them. We gave the opportunity of a press conference to those people who lost children, adults and parents at the hands of Ng, according to the charges laid. They have not been heard yet in the United States.

They were concerned they were never going to be able to try Ng. The witnesses were dying and moving. It had gone on for so long that they were having trouble putting together witnesses for a trial.

We too appreciated the encouragement to send him back once that major hurdle was overcome and the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that we could send back from Canada to the United States someone who might be executed if found guilty in the United States. I return to the question of why that clause is in the treaty. The clause is in the treaty where it gives the opportunity to have that exclusion of the death penalty if requested. It was put there by the Americans, not by the Canadians. The Americans, when the treaty was first drawn up, had no death penalty in place. Canada did, we had it on our books. We could execute people for a certain number of things. We were going through periods of moratoriums and not doing it but we still had it on the books.

The Americans wanted that provision in our treaty, that they could take back to the United States someone or they could send someone to us to be tried for a crime, providing we did not apply the death penalty to those American citizens.

We have set an example through the Department of Justice, through the Minister of Justice, that when a Canadian goes down to the United States and is wanted for a homicide in the United States, we can ask that the Canadian not be executed. We have done that with one case in the last two or three months and we might do it in others. I think we owe that to Canadians. If we do not have capital punishment in Canada, then we should be able to go to our friends in the south and ask them not to