

after serving two-thirds. That is called mandatory supervision.

Even though a judge says that this person is to serve nine years for an armed robbery or a violent offence, the law says that this person should be released after serving only six years, unless the government can show that a detention order should be issued to keep the person detained longer.

When we deal with those who are considered for mandatory supervision, we are dealing with the worst offenders. We are dealing with the bad apples in the system. It is these individuals who cannot convince the Parole Board that they should be released any earlier.

In fact, they are automatically released by operation of law. It does not make any sense at all. Again, is it any wonder that people do not have confidence in the criminal justice system. You have to ask yourself, Mr. Speaker, when you consider these time periods—one-sixth, one-third, one-half—what is the scientific rationale or the reasons why these time periods have been pulled out of a hat to say: "Someone should become eligible for full parole after serving one-third of their sentence".

The government now is saying: "For certain offenders, they should serve at least a half". Why?

An hon. member: There is no real supervision.

Mr. Nunziata: As my colleague says, there is no real supervision once inmates are released on mandatory supervision.

The whole concept of mandatory supervision is an experiment that has failed. It was introduced by a Liberal government over 10 years ago. It just does not work. People confuse it with parole when in fact it is not parole.

This government should have read the writing on the wall and abolished it altogether. That will be one of the amendments that the Liberal Party proposes at committee.

With regard to parole itself, the Law Reform Commission in Canada, a number of very prominent criminal lawyers in Canada, a number of groups and organizations in the criminal justice system have recommended the abolition of parole. It is a far-reaching proposal, but it is a proposal that makes a lot of sense because right now the whole system is warped.

Government Orders

Judges sentence individuals not because of the crime they committed. They sentence individuals trying to take into consideration when the individual might be released on parole and for that reason, the sentencing system in Canada has gone haywire. There is no rhyme or reason to it.

What has been recommended in the proposal that I support is the abolition of parole with some release period, say six months before release that the person be released into the community in order to reintegrate, that that be part of the sentence, that sentencing be reformed so that rather than handing out a nine-year sentence and people only serve five years, let us make the sentence more realistic and bring sentencing in line with reality and inject some certainty.

I note that I have just a few more minutes to talk about the particulars of this legislation. I would like to start talking about some of the specific provisions of this bill.

We will support this bill going to a legislative committee or the justice committee. We support that proposal because a body of expertise has developed. There are a number of members of the justice committee who have been there for a number of years.

We do not support a full blown cross-country tour in order to acquaint ourselves with the problem. We know what the problems are. We already spent over a year putting this report together. A lot of good work went into this piece of work, and we believe this should form the basis of the committee's consideration.

We look forward to this bill going to committee. This party, the Official Opposition, will be moving a significant number of amendments. We will be asking the more general questions about parole, for example, and whether or not we should continue to hang on to the parole system in Canada. We will listen attentively to groups that appear before the committee. We will also consider some of the specific provisions in Bill C-36, first with regard to the first item that is listened on the government's propaganda here. It says: "Protection of the public will now be the paramount consideration in all decisions relating to the treatment and release of inmates".

• (1300)

What is new, as my colleague asks? Protection of the public will now be the paramount consideration. Has it not always been the paramount consideration? If it has