

Government Orders

I want to thank the member for Parkdale—High Park for bringing this point forward. It is a very important point. It does recognize the bond between the mother and the children and the fact that the children cannot be excluded from the agony of this situation.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bills without amendment: Bill C-132, an act to establish a territory to be known as Nunavut and provide for its government and to amend certain acts in consequence thereof; Bill C-133, an act respecting an agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut settlement area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada; and Bill C-134, an act for granting Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1994.

* * *

• (1545)

THE ROYAL ASSENT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order. I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Mr. Speaker,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Beverly McLachlin, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in her capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 10th day of June, 1993, at 3.45 p.m., for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.

Yours sincerely,

Judith LaRocque,
Secretary to the Governor General

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE**MEASURE TO AMEND**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Blais, that Bill C-126, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, I have just a follow up on the matter raised by the member for Parkdale—High Park.

The hon. member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys pointed out the new provisions which concerns usually a woman taking her children when she believes they face imminent harm. I should also point out that in the stalking section itself one of the ways that criminal harassment can take place is if the threatening conduct is not directed just at the individual in question but any other member of their family. That would bring the children within the scope of the bill. I just thought I would make that comment.

Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I may not take the 10 minutes because what I have to say is fairly simple.

First I want to commend members on all sides of this House who have done a very large amount of work on this bill. As has been agreed on all sides, it could be better but it is best for it to go through now and it can be improved in further years.

There is a great weight of evidence that has been brought forward in the committee and sampled in the House about the need for Bill C-126 to defend against stalking. I admit that I was surprised at first at the expressed need for this bill although it is clear enough even from the daily newspapers and from phone calls to my office that something like this is needed. I asked myself if this was a change or if this something that was not needed before. I would say that it is not entirely so.

In the past, domestic violence, as it was often classified, was very rarely a subject of a court action and very rarely punished. The attitude was that it would be handled within the family. Many women in the past