

*Supply*

Fischer had just applied for early release under the Liberal government's faint hope clause, section 745 of the Criminal Code. Mrs. Marie King-Forest, the wife of RCMP Constable Brian King, had to fight hard for her right to be heard at these hearings. She had the support and sympathy of many friends, the police, the public, the media and many MPs in the House.

How did the Liberal government respond to this one victim's lonely struggle? What was her family's reward for reliving the nightmare of her husband's mindless murder by two cold-blooded killers? The Liberal government rewarded Mrs. King-Forest with a small change to Bill C-41, giving victims the right to introduce a victim impact statement in the judicial hearings that decide to release these killers early. The court rewarded Mrs. King-Forest's efforts by cutting two years off Gregory Fischer's sentence. That is Liberal justice.

The Liberals are poised once again to drag Mrs. King-Forest through the same ordeal because now Darrel Crook, her husband's other murderer, is applying for early release under the same Liberal loophole in the Criminal Code.

• (1515)

If the Liberals had accepted our amendment during the debate on Bill C-41, section 745 of the Criminal Code would have been repealed and Mr. Crooks and the hundreds of other killers who were serving life sentences with no chance of parole would have served their full sentences. If our amendment had been accepted, Mrs. King-Forest and her family would not have to endure another senseless judicial hearing.

Under a Reform government, when the court says no chance of parole for 25 years, that is exactly what the heartless criminal will get. If do-gooders are concerned about killers' rehabilitation, let them play their games after the full sentence has been served. Certainty in sentencing, protecting society and giving the relatives of the victims some peace and closure are more important than letting a killer back on the streets a couple of years early.

Everything our party has done with respect to the criminal justice issue has been governed by our fundamental principle that the rights of the victim should supersede the rights of the criminal.

During the debate on Bill C-37, the Young Offenders Act, we proposed changes that would better protect victims rights. We proposed changes that would place more emphasis on victim compensation as part of the sentencing. We proposed that the parents of young offenders be held legally responsible for the crimes committed by their children, if it could be demonstrated that the parents failed to exercise reasonable parental control. Under these proposals parents would be required to compensate victims for property crimes committed by their children.

Unfortunately, the Liberals ignored our advice and recommendations. They voted against our amendments and against giving victims more rights than the criminals.

During the debate on Bill C-41, the sentencing bill, Reformers proposed changes that would ensure victims were protected. We proposed that victims be given the right to express their views on whether the use of alternate measures were appropriate for the crime against them. We proposed measures which would ensure sentencing would be proportionate to the gravity of the criminal conduct and to the actual harm done to the victim. We proposed changes which would give victims the right to give verbal victim impact statements.

As stated previously, we proposed the repeal of section 745 of the Criminal Code, which would ensure killers stayed in jail for the full term of their sentence. For Reformers, life means life. Unfortunately, the Liberals ignored our advice and recommendations and voted against our amendments and against giving victims more rights than criminals.

During debate on Bill C-45, the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, Reformers proposed changes that would give victims more rights. We proposed amendments that would ensure victims received direct financial compensation from the offender's income while incarcerated. We also proposed that violent criminals be denied parole and statutory release thereby protecting the rights of victims to life, liberty and security of the person.

We proposed that criminals who commit criminal acts while on parole or conditional release be sent back to serve the full sentence of their crime and then the full term of the sentence of their second offence. Two plus two is four consecutive sentences, not concurrent.

To protect victims of child sexual abuse, we proposed a child sex offender registry and that this registry be made available to police investigating a child sexual offence. We proposed that all persons convicted of sexual assault would serve the full term of their sentence. Once again, the Liberal Party ignored our advice and recommendations and voted against our amendments and against giving victims more rights than the criminals.

Reformers have gone to great lengths to introduce and enhance victims rights every chance we get, but the Liberals simply ignore them. They do not seem to get it. They seem locked in the Liberal thinking of the 1970s. Liberal ideas are socialist concepts that have failed and failed miserably. Reformers give their ideas freely because they have come from the common sense of the common people.

The Liberals across the aisle seem to ignore these ideas at their own peril. In the next election common sense will prevail and common people will only re-elect members who best represent their views in the House. That means voting the constituents' wishes and not the Liberal cabinet's wishes.