

The Governor in Council may establish a list of countries, to be called an Automatic Firearms Country Control List, including therein—

And I emphasize the word “including,” not restricted to, but including therein—

—any country with which Canada has an intergovernmental defence, research, development and production arrangement and to which the Governor in Council deems it appropriate to permit the export of a prohibited weapon described in the paragraph (c) or (e) of the definition “prohibited weapon” in subsection 84(1) of the Criminal Code, or components or parts thereof, that is included in an Export Control List.

As the member knows the bill goes on to say that the minister may issue an export permit provided the country of destination is one of the countries listed on the Automatic Firearms Country Control List.

There is no constraint whatever on cabinet as to what countries can be countries of destination. Any country on the globe, any dictator, any violator of human rights, any country that is a market for these weapons of destruction can be on this Automatic Firearms Country Control List. Parliament is imposing, through this bill, no constraint whatever on the cabinet. The country that this year makes a case a year ago could not have made a case. It 10 years ago could not have made a case on the basis of human rights violations, on the basis of being in the middle of the Middle East, an area of intense tension. Those countries could not then have made a case, but today can.

Next year, 10 years from now, even less savory dictatorships will be able to make that list. This bill provides no stringent controls. Not a scintilla of control is imposed by this bill.

The member is simply completely wrong. Why does the member not just come out clearly and say that this bill now permits the complete, unrestricted export of these weapons of destruction, weapons which have killed more human beings in this century than any other weapon ever invented. How does the member answer that?

Mr. Reimer: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why the member opposite is saying that. The member opposite is saying that there is an absence of any control whatsoever, if I understand him correctly.

That is not what I said. I went through four specific criteria.

Government Orders

Mr. Brewin: That is just a matter of policy.

Mr. Reimer: These four specific criteria are very clear. They are very clear.

Mr. Brewin: That policy can be changed overnight.

Mr. Reimer: Any country that poses a threat to Canada or to its allies cannot be on the list. That is number one.

Mr. Barrett: That is not in the legislation.

Mr. Reimer: The member keeps talking from his seat, Mr. Speaker. He will have his opportunity, I am sure.

Mr. Barrett: That is not in the legislation.

Mr. Reimer: Second, with respect to these criteria which must be met before any country can get on that list, they are there for the Government of Canada to follow. It is openly publishing them here right now. It is saying that these are the criteria we will be following before a country can be on that list. I think, therefore, they are criteria that are very significant. However, the member is not listening.

Mr. Brewin: I was listening very carefully. On a point of order, the member—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would hope that the hon. member for Kitchener has the floor. I would like him to reply to the questions and comments and get on with the debate because I have another great speaker coming up. The hon. member for Kitchener.

On a point of order, the hon. member for Victoria.

Mr. Brewin: Just as it is not fair for a member to suggest another member is not in the House, it is not fair for the member to suggest that another member was not listening when I was listening to him and listening very—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member for Kitchener will complete his remarks, please.

Mr. Reimer: Permit me to try again, Mr. Speaker, if I may. There are stringent controls and the criteria are very clear. Before any country can get on that list through an Order in Council, it must meet these four criteria: that country cannot pose a threat to Canada or its allies; it cannot be involved in or under imminent threat of hostilities; it cannot be under United Nations Security Council sanctions; and it cannot be a country which has a persistent record of serious violations of human rights. How much clearer do we have to be? The