

lives. We do not have to house them and we did not have to feed them, but I think it is a sad day when a program is failing for almost half of those to whom it is applied.

Honourable senators, we never seem to direct our attention to another matter, why a sentence could not be a sentence, since we already concede that the only people who are helped by this kind of program are those who need and want help and who will take advantage of the system that is provided for them. Why is there never a program for those who serve a full term? There is not, other than that of the John Howard Society and some of the helpful groups in the community.

Having said that, I think we have to cut out the excesses contained in the current Penitentiary Act and Parole Act that allow this revolving-door system that Senator Hastings talked about. If, as and when the committee examines this bill, it ought to examine the entire early release program and hear from groups such as the Citizens United for Safety and Justice, the John Howard Society of Ontario, who have written to the members of my party and, I am certain, to the members of the other parties, opposing the bill but asking that it be referred to committee quickly, and the Attorneys General for the provinces.

Honourable senators, I have nothing further to add. I see that Senator Hastings is not present, but I am reasonably satisfied that no one else on this side wishes to participate in the debate. Consequently, I have no objection to the bill being referred to committee.

Hon. Richard A. Donahoe: Honourable senators, I rise on a matter of privilege. Bill C-31 was introduced for first reading in this chamber, and was subsequently passed. This evening there arose a discussion between myself and the deputy leader as to what undertakings had been given with respect to that bill. I was unable to get any statement from him as to the undertaking, or what he understood the undertaking was, given by Mr. Joyal before the committee.

I refer to the report of the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, Issue No. 26, proceedings held on October 13, 1982, and I ask permission to quote one brief paragraph from page 83. The minister said:

● (2140)

It is a great privilege, honourable senators, to be able to meet your expectations and inform you, on behalf of the Government of Canada, that the government intends to introduce, when the next session of the House of Commons of Canada begins, a bill to supplement the bill you are now studying—

That is in accordance with my recollection.

When I asked my questions previously, I had intended to follow by asking the question: What transpired between the date on which Mr. Joyal spoke and the date on which the bill was introduced not in the House of Commons but in the Senate?

Hon. C. William Doody: Another Liberal government commitment.

[Senator Nurgitz.]

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, we are in the midst of a debate on another bill, but, of course, a question of privilege can be raised at any time. I have no comment to make on this question at this stage except to say that I am glad that Senator Donahoe's recollection and strong impression are supported by the transcript of the proceedings before the committee.

Honourable senators, I have Senator Hastings' authority to say that he has nothing to add to what he has already said on second reading.

It is clear from the excellent intervention by Senator Nurgitz that the issue has been joined and it is, accordingly, appropriate that this bill be referred to committee.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

Senator Frith moved that the bill be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs.

Motion agreed to.

INDIAN-INUIT WEEK BILL

SECOND READING—ORDER DISCHARGED AND BILL WITHDRAWN

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Williams, seconded by the Honourable Senator Adams, for the second reading of the Bill S-28, intituled: "An Act establishing Indian-Inuit Week and Inuit-Indian Day".—(*Honourable Senator Frith*).

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, at the last sitting of the Senate, Senator Flynn suggested that, since this bill was sponsored by Senator Williams, who is no longer a member of the Senate, having reached the mandatory retirement age, it would be best if this order were discharged if no other senator wishes to speak to it or sponsor it.

Over the weekend I found a precedent regarding a similar, although not exactly the same, situation. Without going into any detail, it is quite obvious that Senator Flynn's original suggestion seems to be the preferred procedure in this situation—that is, that the order be discharged, it being perfectly clear that another senator is, without any impediment, free to introduce this or a similar bill again.

It appears that there would be no problem with the so-called "question of anticipation" since the bill has not been debated, it having received, in effect, only first reading and been stood over since.

Honourable senators, with that background, I ask, with leave, that this order be discharged.

Hon. Senators: Agreed.