Mr. Rossi: A former Liberal candidate, a former Liberal candidate.

Mr. Prud'homme: But let us be elegant, I congratulate him—

Mr. Rossi: A former Liberal candidate.

Mr. Prud'homme: Let us be elegant, I wanted to congratulate him.

Mr. Rossi: A former Liberal candidate, they did not want you.

Mr. Prud'homme: Please. I was about to—

Mr. Rossi: They did not want you, you were not good enough for us.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please.

[*English*]

Order, please. The Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) has the floor. He has another three or four minutes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I was about to congratulate him. I am forced to conclude. What brought us back here this summer? So I thought about it, I thought about it. I said: It could have been done before. We scared the people, we showed we were tough—I am talking about the Government, I would not want to make a mistake. So I said: Well, now, there must be another reason. Quite obviously, Mr. Speaker, with a man as nice and charming as the new House leader, when we compare him—because you know everything is relative—to the one who was there before, he has to display not only a new face but also a new Government, a new mentality, something elegant, something soothing, so they said we will be back on September 8. But it does not make sense, we should not return with such a Bill which is awkward and embarrassing, because maybe my colleague from York North—Weston will decide—

An Hon. Member: York South—Weston.

Mr. Prud'homme: York South—Weston.

[*English*]

My colleague for York South—Weston—Mr. Nunziata—the time will come when we humanize this institution and refer to each other by name. It is ridiculous to call each other by the names of our constituencies. However, that is the rule. They knew that in September they would convince even me as well as the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria). They are lucky that today the Hon. Member for Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin), the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall) and the Hon. Member for Gander—Twillingate (Mr. Baker) did not participate in the debate. They expected that to take place in early September. Since they want a new order of the day, they had to get rid of that this summer. I believe that is the reason we are here.

The House would have been better ordained under the ex-leader of the House of Commons. We all know who he is. We hope he will relax now. He no longer has to do a hatchet job on everybody. If he would have ordered the House differently, that Bill would have been dealt with a long time ago. If this Bill is as important as the Government say it is, it would have been sent to the Senate. The Senate would have returned the Bill here with the amendment. We would have said that it is unacceptable to a majority of this House. The Bill would have been returned to the Senate, as it will be done today, with the message "Sorry, you are not elected, we are, we want that Bill".

This is useless. I have tried to put forwad the true reason. Let us not fall into the trap of saying that this Government cares more than we do about the protection of Canadians. We care just as much for the protection of Canadians.

An Hon. Member: We care more.

Mr. Prud'homme: I will not fall into the trap of saying we care more. We do care equally. We care for the protection of Canadians. We must not say to Canadians that people in the two Parties on the opposition side of the House care less than the Government. If the House business had been better ordered, we would have worked in a more orderly fashion and this would have been done a long time ago.

• (1750)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions or comments. The Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie.

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, like everybody else, I would have liked to take part in the debate, but considering that everyone says this is urgent... First of all, I would like to congratulate the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) on his *exposé*, and I think all my colleagues and my leader have clearly shown that we were called back today strictly in an attempt to save the face of the Prime Minister following a drop in the polls and to make public opinion forget all the scandals this Government is struggling with. However, I would appreciate some comments by the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis, in connection with his *exposé* on the former and the present Solicitor General, and his premise that they had tried to scare Canadians by alluding to the possibility that there were criminals that might be released without consent. So I would like to know what he thinks of the fact that at the very moment these two people were trying to scare Canadians, five recognized criminals in a Canadian penitentiary did not bother to wait for this legislation and escaped through the sewer mains, and that these two Solicitors General did nothing to try and reassure Canadians. So I would like to hear the Hon. Member's comments on the subject, namely whether what we have been doing today is just a whitewash, while the