

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member. Perhaps we should all remind ourselves that there are certain words that are unparliamentary. We all know which ones they are. There is a fairly short list now.

The first test is that the language does not cause an uproar. I did hear the expression the member referred to and I noticed that there was no uproar caused by the expression. Frankly, I was surprised by that. I would ask all members that since we are starting afresh this fall to please, if they hear something offensive, get up and put the objection on the floor immediately rather than waiting.

I am sure the hon. member will take note of what has been said. I would ask then if we are ready for the question.

The member is entitled to reply.

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to know what I said that was offensive.

The Deputy Speaker: It is a phrase we have all heard many times involving a word that begins with *h* and ends with *l*. I do not think the Chair should string this thing out.

Is the parliamentary secretary to the solicitor general rising on a point of order or on debate?

Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, it is on a point of order and it could very well lead to a debate.

The Deputy Speaker: I am afraid the hon. parliamentary secretary has to choose. If it is on debate, it is the turn of the Liberal Party and the hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are discussing the last motion raised by the opposition, Motion No. 19.

We heard a number of things here this morning and indeed most of yesterday afternoon about Canadians having a constant worry about the apparent rise in criminality in the country. I think we should keep in mind that criminality in Canada has been somewhat stable for the past 20 years. The statistics are there. A number of cases were brought to the attention of the public and many of those were in heinous crimes and very disturbing. That is why the government and we on this side of the House have done considerable work to try to reduce criminality and make Canada a safer place.

I found it interesting when I heard a number of members claim that the federal government was not putting any money whatsoever into trying to protect Canadians and especially our youth. I would like to point out that the Ministry of the Solicitor

General of Canada is one of the few departments that has seen a slight increase in its expenditures.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, a while ago we were talking about finances. Now we are on Motion No. 19 dealing with parole. I would like the member to stick to the subject.

The Deputy Speaker: All hon. members will understand the relevance rule. It is even more important since we are discussing motions and perhaps second reading. I am sure the hon. parliamentary secretary will make his remarks relevant very quickly.

• (1240)

Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, we have heard from the opposition on Motion No. 19, on Motion No. 16 and on all the other motions. I think we have been patient enough on this side of the House by giving these people the chance to express themselves. What we have heard all day is a well founded concern about the safety of Canadians. However, after hearing a number of those debates it is my opinion and that of most members of the House that often the information that was introduced by the opposition was not entirely correct.

We have the obligation to explain to these people, as it concerns Motion No. 19, that we have done a number of things to make Canada a safer place. I will make this point very briefly. I think that members sitting on the opposition benches should know that money has been put into the system. We are out there protecting Canadians. We are now spending considerable amounts of money building new facilities. That was a concern raised by the opposition. Five new facilities are going to open in the short term in Canada in order to accommodate the incarcerated members of our society.

There was also talk about CPIC, the screening mechanism we now have in place. We should also inform hon. members of the opposition that they have the right through various service and volunteer associations, for instance the brownies, the scouts, minor hockey and what not, to screen volunteers in these organizations for a previous criminal record to avoid endangering the lives of many young innocent Canadians. We have instituted that. It is a tangible benefit from the Liberal government. We are concerned about the safety of the younger members of our society.

We also spoke about gun control. If opposition members are concerned about the rise in criminality, why did they oppose gun control? That is a fundamental issue. Most crimes committed in Canada are committed with guns and rifles. Often these weapons are acquired illegally. We are trying to make Canada a safer place, and this is all we have heard all day. The opposition benches are supposed to be the law and order side of government, but we have done the tangible thing. We have done the