

*Private Members' Business*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I have the honour to inform the House that when the House went up to the Senate Chamber, the Deputy Governor General was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following bills:

Bill C-31, An Act to amend the Extradition Act—Chapter 13.

Bill C-68, An Act to amend the Competition Act (multi-level marketing plans and pyramid selling)—Chapter 14.

Bill C-328, An Act respecting National Public Service Week: Serving Canadians Better—Chapter 15.

Bill C-77, An Act to amend the National Defence Act—Chapter 16.

Bill C-53, An Act to provide for the imposition of special economic measures—Chapter 17.

\* \* \*

[English]

### CRIMINAL CODE

#### MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Thorkelson that Bill C-311, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Parole Act, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee in the Departmental envelope.

**Mr. Thorkelson:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could seek the unanimous consent of the House to extend Private Members' Hour by the time it has taken to do the Royal Assent and the vote. If we could extend it by that amount of time or until the debate collapses, I would appreciate it.

May I ask for unanimous consent for that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Members have heard the terms of the motion. Is there unanimous consent to extend the period of Private Members' Hour for five to 10 minutes, the time it took to go to the Senate? I suggest that the hour be extended to 6.10 p.m.

Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton):** Mr. Speaker, I will continue on with what I was saying before we had a message from the other place.

My colleague opposite has introduced a measure which in some respects is redundant now with what has

transpired by the government by a very hard-working and dedicated committee of this House dealing with Bill C-36.

That piece of legislation to my mind was an attempt to correct some of the problems. We on this side were supportive in the sense of trying to make the bill better. I believe that in some areas we did make it better and we did have some improvements. I am thinking particularly in the area of victims and their involvement in the parole process, the ability to be there and to have some input, and also to be notified should an inmate in the institution be out on a day parole or on a pass of any sort. You can think of the obvious upset that would occur if you were walking down the street and saw the perpetrator of an offence on you personally walking down the same side of the street.

• (1750)

We tried to get this government to strengthen those areas that would help victims. I have to say, in all candour, the member opposite being part of the government team, that as you peruse the committee records you will see that he and others in his party voted against strengthening the legislation which would help victims. We were really surprised because we thought, given this bill being introduced and the legion of co-sponsors of the bill, and the high regard that those co-sponsors have within his party, that he would have seen to it that his party was supportive of the amendments which were brought forward by this party in order to make the laws that relate to victims and as it relates to those inmates who are out on temporary absences of either escorted or unescorted nature. Instead, he and his colleagues voted nay to those positive amendments. Now he stands in his place and says to all: "Here is a bill that is going to remedy all of the problems" and of which we in this House should be supportive.

I say sure, we should be supportive of some of the recommendations that are here. But where was that support when it counted? Where was that support when it would have made a difference? We all know the process here. We know what is going to happen with this particular bill. When it could have had an effect, when it could have made an impact for victims across this country, his party was not there. In fact, not only was it