

Government Orders

equated taking a human life with the heinous crime of refusing to file the proper paperwork with the bureaucracy is ridiculous.

This minister made fine grandstanding speeches on how violent, killing youth would be held accountable for their actions. This same minister and his government told heart wrenching stories of poverty, dysfunctional families and their effect on juvenile crime. Whatever the reason, there is no excuse for coldly and cruelly taking another life.

Let me remind those opposite that not all youth raised in poverty turn to crime, deciding a human life is a worthless commodity that can be snuffed out at a whim. Let me remind those opposite that many youth are not raised in ideal conditions but go on to work hard day after day, save their money, meet someone, marry, have children and do all the normal things. Yet this bill makes folly of those hard working youth who do understand they have a role in society and that they can achieve a better life by following the minimum expectations of society.

What does this tell the people of Canada who have day in and day out raised their voices in loud cries that they have had enough of 16 and 17-year old butchers being treated like victims of some social order—

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but I would like some clarification from the Chair. It is my understanding that at this stage we are debating report stage Motions Nos. 3 and 4. I have been listening with care to the remarks of the member for Wild Rose and have yet to understand what relationship they bear to Motions Nos. 3 and 4. It may be that there is some confusion as to the stage of the debate. I wonder if the Speaker might provide some guidance.

The Speaker: Yes, the hon. member is correct. We are debating Motions Nos. 3 and 4. Many times members use a few minutes to set up their argument. I would presume that is what the hon. member for Wild Rose is doing.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I hope that I sum this all up at the end.

There are several things I know this government would like to do in regard to alternative measures, even with the violent people it is talking about and it certainly applies to the youth just as much as anyone else. I am talking about those alternative measures that may be applied to youth where we were going to get tough in Bill C-37. We were going to take 16 and 17-year olds to adult court, yet the sentencing and alternative measures the government is trying to propose in this bill do not seem to fall into line with what was proposed in Bill C-37.

• (2000)

Why should 16 and 17 year olds be excused for the most serious of crimes? If they are only one or two years older, what difference does it make when it gets that serious? Canadians are saying this is enough of this namby-pamby justice spouted by a bleeding heart government. Canadians say that the quality of mercy must be chosen when the right circumstances prevail, and murder is not one of those circumstances.

How dare we suggest alternative measures for a killer? How dare we even think that might be a good solution? Canadians are saying that if a 16 or 17 year old chooses to kill, he or she must also know that society will choose not to show mercy, that society will demand a grievous penalty to match the heinous crime.

Canadians are growing weary of a government that says one thing to a majority but follows the directions dictated by a small minority of ivory tower individuals who barricade themselves behind security systems and isolate themselves from the real world and reality and then say that young murderers cannot be blamed for their crimes and should be put on alternative measures.

I have had enough of this say everything but do nothing government. This has been going on for far too long. We see other clauses that come up in this particular bill and we have been trying to figure out exactly what we are trying to prove in our society. Consider 718.2. We would like to get rid of this section. We have made a list of people who are going to be treated differently than others because of their race, colour, creed, and now we want to add sexual orientation.

Mr. Speaker, while we are at it let us add fat people. I will tell you what happened in this House just a month ago. Someone sitting right over there said "Come on, fatso, let's go outside and fight". Rather than speaking to you, Mr. Speaker, about that kind of language, I decided I would meet him face to face and see if I could tell him not to do that. I am sure he will not do it again. It is a shame that I as a fat person would be left off this list. If we check, there are lawsuits throughout the country of people who did not get jobs because they were not built right or maybe because their IQ was a little too low. Why would that affect anything? Maybe some do not look right.

So let us take the section and get rid of it. For heaven's sake, do not add sexual orientation. That is the last thing we need in this country.

[Translation]

The Speaker: We are still debating Motions Nos. 3 and 4, and I give the floor to the hon. member for Bellechasse.

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief and will probably succeed in this endeavour.