

*Private Members' Business*

With the kind of history we have to look back on and with the kind of support we have as members of Parliament to consider legislation that would speed up this process, think of the good side to the victims in the United States who are trying to bring people such as those whom I have mentioned to court to face justice in the United States.

I read from *The Toronto Star* of Thursday, May 18. It states:

—families of at least 12 slain American men, women and children—torture victims who were beaten, raped, shot, their bodies later incinerated and buried. Some bones and body parts were uncovered by investigators at a remote farmsite in Calaveros County, outside San Francisco. The bodies of other victims have never been found.

No funerals, no spiritual farewells for their families, the final resting place for their loved ones unknown—

Trying unsuccessfully to hold back the tears—

—one of the 12 victims family members that visited Ottawa back in May of 1989—

—told how her family has agonized over their inability to give her son a proper burial—

Her 20-year-old-daughter, Brenda, year-old grandson, Lonnie, and son-in-law Lonnie Bond, were also among the murder victims. Film even exists that shows her daughter, handcuffed and bound in chains, begging for her baby. The child's body has never been found, and O'Connor hangs on to the slim hope he is still alive somewhere.

Justice denied is a very unfair analysis to put on this case, but it is a real one. Witnesses to these kinds of murders, or suspected murders, go unanswered while we hold these people in our prison system waiting for extradition.

I hope that the House will see fit to put this to committee for a quick decision on technical amendments, or whatever other amendments are permissive under our system of private members' legislation, to return it with due haste to the House of Commons for a report and third reading vote.

I do not think these concerns will be able to go unanswered by Canadians across the country.

I have one closing comment. I think the governors of California and of Ohio have spoken very key words in trying to find a solution to this problem.

I would like to read from their comments as they pertain to justice being denied. This is a letter from the Office of the Governor, state of Ohio, dated May 5, 1989. It reads:

As you know, Charles Ng is wanted by the State of California for nineteen criminal charges that include burglary, kidnapping, and twelve counts of murder. At present, his extradition case is in Canada's judicial system, at the provincial level.

I fully support the extradition of Charles Ng to the State of California, to face prosecution for his alleged acts of violence—Mr. Ng should be returned to California not only to stand trial, but also so that the victims' families may be able to learn the fate of their loved ones.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys):**  
Mr. Speaker, I was listening very intently to the presentation of the member for Peterborough on Bill C-210.

I agree with the member that there need to be some changes in this law. In fact we have waited an undue length of time for changes in the laws of extradition in this country.

He referred to some cases. I do not think there is any one case which really emphasizes this more than the Ng case, but I think that there are a lot of incidents where we have seen that the extradition process in Canada really is antiquated and needs to be changed.

That is not to say that in routine proceedings a lot of the extradition cases are dealt with expeditiously. Sometimes they can be sometimes quite routine, but in cases where there is an allegation of murder or a capital offence then the extradition will most certainly be challenged by the person whom the government is proposing to extradite. Of course this process can take quite a length of time.

The Minister of Justice said on January 24 of this year, as the member for Peterborough mentioned, that he was very concerned about this law and that he would be giving it a great deal of attention in the months and weeks ahead. That was in January. Now we are in October and we do not have any presentation by the government. I think that is wrong. The government just seems to be stalled on this. For that reason I would like to give the hon. member's bill a lot more attention in a legislative committee.

It is the position of my party that we should allow this bill to go to a legislative committee where we can look at it. We are not saying that the bill is perfect, that it supplies all the needs or has everything that we would want; but it is the only basis we have at the present for discussing this matter and bringing forth more modern concepts or more modern law to deal with this increasingly important question.