

*Government Orders*

I talked about parole eligibility. If the law reform commission was so good, why has it not closed the loopholes in parole eligibility? What about violent criminals being let out of prison early? If the law reform commission was so good, why do we have violent criminals walking the streets because some parole board has screwed up its decisions? Who is charged with fixing those mistakes?

• (1210)

Let us talk about what upsets Canadians most of all, the grand idea of condoning plea bargaining in our justice system. Canadians are fed up with seeing people accused of crimes plea bargaining away the more violent sections of the crime in order for the courts to give a lesser sentence and get a sure conviction.

If the law reform commission is so good, why do we have so many things wrong with the criminal justice system? The fact remains that the laws of the country are made by lawyers for lawyers with little regard for the opinions, concerns and wishes of Canadians. If it were not that way we would not have so many problems with the justice system.

Canadians have had enough with law commissions and a Liberal government that treat criminals as if they have special rights. In 1982 the Liberal government brought in a Constitution and in the section on rights granted more rights to people who break the law than to people who keep the law. That is an absolute disgrace and the legislation will not change a thing.

**Ms. Clancy:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the hon. member because what I hear in them is a real *cri du coeur*. I understand his being upset about certain situations that he perceives to be developing in the country. There are several things to consider but let me deal with a number of comments he made.

With regard to the problem of there being a Liberal government, I would only say to the hon. member that the government was duly elected in a very democratic process. A majority of Canadians elected a majority of Liberals. We are here to represent the wishes of our constituents, just as the hon. member is here to represent the wishes of his. It so happens that a majority of Canadians picked this Liberal government. I understand he does not like it. I understand he does not agree with it, but there it is. It is a *fait accompli* and unfortunately he will have to deal with it. I suspect he will have to deal with it after the next election as well, but we will wait and see.

There is a real misconception in the land with regard to criminal activity. This is not to minimize the criminal activity that takes place but unfortunately some of our hon. colleagues in the third party are overly influenced by American television and American newspapers. The crime rate is not rising in this country over all. It is rising in the United States; it is not rising

here. As a matter of fact in certain sectors it is dropping, but good news unfortunately is not something the third party deals in.

I will certainly not deal with the member's meanderings on the issue of capital punishment. As my constituents well know I have been against capital punishment from the first time I ever heard of it. I will continue to be against capital punishment for the rest of my life. The people of Halifax know well what my feelings are on this and other issues, never having been one to hide my opinions.

I go back to what the hon. member said about the law commission. With the greatest of respect it shows he does not understand it. The law reform commission is not the House of Commons and the House of Commons is not the law reform commission. They are two separate entities with two separate jobs. The law reform commission is there to research and recommend. Then the government and the House of Commons can accept or reject its recommendations. In many cases those recommendations are accepted; in other cases they are rejected.

They talk about it being hand and glove with the Liberal government. I merely ask the member to take any list of the previous members of the Law Reform Commission of Canada, or of those provinces that have law reform commissions, and he will see people who have served their country, served their province and served their community in ways the third party would like very much to be able to emulate.

• (1215)

We are talking about people who are eminent members of their communities, holders of the Order of Canada, people who have been honoured by non-partisan members of their community. I for one find this disappointing, tragic, and I would go so far as to say despicable, that they would cast aspersions on the characters of such a large group of public servants, of people who serve Canada.

Why would these people cast aspersions on people who wish to serve their country? Why is membership on a federal board or committee, a provincial board or committee, or a municipal board or committee something that should taint you? I am appalled that anyone would suggest this. I am appalled that there is such a narrow and angry and sad view of public service in this country by the hon. members of the third party, that they do not rejoice in the opportunity to serve Canada, in the opportunity to stand up and say how lucky we are to be in the House of Commons or how lucky our constituents are to be able to serve their country.

If they do not feel that way, I can only say we feel on this side of the House a great sorrow for them at the loss in their public participation.