

Measures Against Crime

from time to time non-Canadians serve in an operational capacity with Canadians within the NATO context? Would the Canadian government consider extending to that relatively rare handful of people—nevertheless they are there permanently on officer exchange programs, and so on—their inclusion in connection with the award of a service ribbon or medal?

● (1720)

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question of the hon. member but I am afraid I cannot give him a definitive answer. It seems to me that there would be a problem of protocol since this country would be making awards to citizens of other countries, and I suspect that there would have to be consultation between the governments involved. I think it is a matter which would have to be subject to negotiation with other countries before it could even be considered.

[Translation]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does it please the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

[English]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Six o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There seems to be a disposition to call it six o'clock. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

At 5.23 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT (NO. 1), 1976

MEASURES FOR BETTER PROTECTION OF CANADIAN SOCIETY AGAINST CRIME

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-83, for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violence and other crime, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It is my understanding that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) and the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Wool-

[Mr. Forrestall.]

liams) would like to offer certain comments as to the procedural acceptability of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Calgary North. I wonder if the House would agree to let this matter stand over until tomorrow, at three o'clock, at which time Mr. Speaker will hear arguments pro and con the acceptability of this amendment. Meanwhile the House could go on debating the motion for second reading of Bill C-83. Is this agreed?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, when intervening, I rose to reserve the rights of the government, and it may not be I who will speak to the amendment. I hope that is acceptable.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is so agreed.

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, before I was so politely interrupted at five o'clock I tried to make two points, namely that this bill lacks provisions concerning our native peoples and provisions concerning hard drugs in Canada.

When he began his remarks the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) elucidated some of the lofty ideals which he hoped this bill would meet in improving our criminal justice system. An ideal to which he and, I am sure, all hon. members subscribe is the ideal of the independence of the judiciary. I ask the minister to read again the answer of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury) as reported on page 11457 of *Hansard* for March 3. I know the minister has acted in good faith and is making a serious attempt to inquire into the matter.

I think every hon. member should examine carefully the answer made on March 3 by the Minister of Public Works in response to a question by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). I have read the record with care. That is the only incident to which I draw the attention of hon. members. I think the minister and hon. members ought to be concerned about it. I trust that despite any consultations in which the minister may engage he will give serious consideration to what the Minister of Public Works said on March 3 in answer to the hon. member for Calgary North. May I put on record once more the answer to the hon. member for Calgary North. The Minister of Public Works said:

I had a conversation, also, with the Associate Chief Justice of Quebec, along, as I discovered, with a great many other public spirited citizens who had taken part in trying to effect a solution to a rather difficult and, to some degree, unprecedented problem. The hon. Mr. Justice Mackay has suggested that my intervention, whatever it may have been—and he does not make any suggestion as to what it was—did not have the desired effect.

To be fair, the minister disclaimed any intention to influence the judge's decision. Nevertheless, any member reading that answer must question if such intervention is consistent with an independent judiciary, of which the Minister of Justice spoke so eloquently. Is it consistent with one of the objects of the legislation? Is it right and necessary for the Minister of Justice to question the actions of another minister?