other embarrassing situations with which it happens to be faced at the present time? Does he think that it used the guise of this Bill to reconvene the House for this very short session and in that way is attempting to divert the focus of public opinion from very serious problems at the present time?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. I know all Hon. Members are very happy to see each other back in the Chamber. It is nice to hear that camaraderie in the House. However, I would appreciate it if they would take their conversations behind the curtains so that we can hear the Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata).

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin by thanking my good friend and colleague, the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria), for his very generous comments.

It is obvious why we are here today, for only the twelfth time in Canadian parliamentary history that the House of Commons has been recalled. We are here because of the reckless negligence of the former Solicitor General, the reckless negligence of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), as well as the reckless rhetoric of the former Solicitor General. It is pure and simple politics. That is the reason we are back here dealing with this legislation.

We agree that the legislation is important. We agreed a year ago with the former Solicitor General that the legislation was important. Notwithstanding the fact that the legislation was of crucial interest to Canadians, as the Government has indicated, the Conservative Government of Canada had this legislation hanging around for a year before it called it back to the House for third reading. It is not the responsibility of the Senate to call the Bill back for third reading. It is not the responsibility of the Opposition. It is the responsibility of the Government, which failed miserably in its obligation and responsibility to call back this Bill at an early stage. If anyone is responsible for the year of living dangerously, it is the former Solicitor General.

Mr. Shields: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member took great pains in his earlier remarks before lunch to explain that mandatory supervision really did not matter, that we were better off bringing them out in society where they could be watched, where they could be counselled, and where they could be under supervision, and that they would be let out in two years anyway. What would that Hon. Member say to the family of the 19 year old girl who was mutilated, raped, and strangled to death by someone who was released on mandatory supervision? How would he respond to that?

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, that is one of the more irresponsible questions which has been asked in the House. It is indicative of the attitude of the Government.

It was the former Solicitor General, the current Minister of National Defence (Mr. Beatty), who needlessly alarmed Canadians by indicating that there were 54 time bombs which were waiting to be released into society. He knew darn well that mandatory supervision had been with us for the last 16 years, and that over the course of the last two years since his Government came to office some 3,000 inmates in federal institutions had been released on mandatory supervision.

If the Conservative Government of Canada had been true to its word—and many Canadians would question that—it would have taken action two years ago rather than recalling Parliament. It is quite obvious that the Government of Canada and specifically the former Solicitor General have mastered the art of hypocrisy.

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the debate this afternoon to add my thoughts to the events which returned us to Ottawa on this very hot day. I have been taken away from my constituents and Lake Superior with its cool breezes and returned to Ottawa and its warm weather.

We are here because of two principles. The first principle is that it is up to the House and its Members, as newly elected representatives of Canadians, to decide what shall be the laws of the land. In this case we are here as an opposition Party reviewing government legislation to determine whether it is the most appropriate mechanism for the aims of the Bill. Ironically, I am not happy about the second principle, the one which allows the Senate, that unelected group in the other Chamber whose ranks will be swelled by one this afternoon, to make changes. I do not agree with the principle that the Senate should be making changes to a Bill. However, the amendment it proposed and sent back to us for consideration makes a lot of sense.

Our society believes in the right of appeal and in justice prevailing. We do not arbitrarily pick someone up off the street and throw him or her in jail. If we have duly tried and convicted individuals of certain crimes and have incarcerated them in one of our penitentiaries, they should have the same rights in terms of early release as they would have in the process of being found guilty. Even within our court system we have a series of appeals. The Supreme Court of Ontario can be overruled by the Supreme Court of Canada. We allow for benefit of the doubt. We allow an appeal for people who feel they have been wronged by the judiciary. In civil law we provide the right of appeal. We in the House have passed many pieces of legislation which give the right of appeal to Cabinet of decisions by Minister, of decisions by tribunals. This amendment by the other place would provide opportunity for those persons whose early release had been rejected by the National Parole Board. If they have just cause, if they have actually lived up to the rules of good behaviour, and if they have indicated quite clearly that they have learned from their experience behind bars, they can go to the next phase.

• (1510)

The next phase is the transition. If you are placed in confinement for a number of months or years you are no longer in touch with the real world. You are in a very artificial situation where you are told when to eat, when to sleep and