appropriate words I will be prepared to give consent to finishing this bill today. However, I do not want to do that beforehand.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, there were no formal undertakings with regard to completing Bill C-70. However, I think there is a clear disposition on this side of the House that we would like to proceed with both the report stage and third reading.

I find it rather objectionable that preconditions would be established by members of this House before continuing on with debate on a particular piece of legislation. I would hope that my colleague who has raised an amendment with regard to Bill C-70 will have an opportunity to debate it. Of course the government and the Official Opposition would have an opportunity to intervene. Then perhaps an adjudication could take place and we could then proceed with the completion, if necessary, of the bill.

I want to make it perfectly clear to the parliamentary secretary that we are not trying to obstruct in any way. We wish to facilitate the debate. I find it somewhat objectionable that preconditions—in other words, a form of blackmail—would be placed on the floor of the House of Commons before we proceed. That is totally unacceptable.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would hope that these agreements would take place behind the curtain. I do not consider this the place to debate this.

Motion No. 1 is now in front of the House and the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam has the floor on debate.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, the Official Opposition House leader can call it whatever he likes but I hope he will listen to my remarks. He will see that it is no such thing. I think, and hope, that he will agree with me when I finish.

I introduced the amendment to alleviate some of the concerns that many of us have about Bill C-70 and the jury selection process. Allow me to explain to the House what the bill is and what we are trying to do.

The bill before us today is a result of the decision in the case of Regina *v.* Bain. It is a major decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. The judgment was rendered January 23, 1992. In that decision the Supreme Court ruled that sections 634(1) and (2) are inconsistent with section 11(d) of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in so far as they provide the Crown with a combination of peremptory challenges and stand-bys four times the number permitted the accused.

As the court noted:

> The observer of the process is bound to conclude that, absent some control, the Crown possesses a substantial advantage and can effectively influence the make-up of that jury under partisan considerations.

Let me translate that into plain English. We have a system in which the Crown prosecutor has a different level of challenges. The Crown can follow a different process. It has a better crack at excluding people from a jury than does the defence. The Supreme Court basically said: "Make it a level playing field".

The court gave Parliament six months to bring forward a remedy. That was on January 23, 1992. I know that the parliamentary secretary has acted and the government has acted. It has introduced a bill and we have expedited it in committee.

However, the government's legislation deals specifically with the narrow and very limited recommendations that come from the Supreme Court decision, which was limited to the very specific questions that were asked in the case. I believe that it was a case concerning sexual assault and the lower court's ruling that the Crown could not use stand-asides to influence the make-up of the jury.

My concern, and I know I am not alone in this, is that we have gone through the process of drafting and debating amendments to the Criminal Code without making full use of this opportunity to really effect meaningful and innovative change that will bring the code into the modern age and into the future.

Instead, we have done the least that could be expected of us and left the real work for another day. What kind of real work am I talking about? There have been numerous studies and inquiries that have shown that the justice system is not always fair. Justice is not always equally available to Canadians as a result of procedural flaws, including the jury selection process. This is not only because of the use of stand-asides by the Crown—even back in 1980 the Law Reform Commission drew this to