think that there is a sizeable consensus that this list is just part of the reforms still out there for us to accomplish.

The first item is the denial of statutory release for serious, repeat offenders. A serious repeat offender in this case is a person who while on any form of early release, has been convicted of an offence for which that person has been sentenced to five years or more. The subsequent second offence which would result in the denial of early release is certainly a serious offence. It would have drawn a sentence of five years or more.

I am not being particularly aggressive in this. In April 1993 the standing committee on justice reported through its 14th report and recommended that the sentence for the subsequent offence be set at two years. It is the same recommendation of denial of parole and early release but the threshold was two years. In my bill I have selected five years.

I hope I will not be accused by anyone of wimping out. The Liberal Party of Canada in May and August of the same year adopted the report of the justice committee as part of its criminal justice policy package. The House of Commons justice committee unanimously endorsed the provision and referred it to the House. The Liberal Party of Canada adopted the entire justice committee report. At the moment that recommended reform has not yet been adopted.

• (1340)

One of the most glaring examples of why reform is necessary is the case of the conviction of Albert Foulston in Edmonton for the murder of a police officer in 1990. This person has had 48 separate convictions so it is fair to call him a convict. This convict was in prison serving a sentence of approximately 10 years. I do not know whether anybody really knew exactly how the 10 years was composed because the sentencing mathematics contained in the Criminal Code and in the CCRA are very complex. In any event, he was released.

On several occasions while he was on early release he committed other offences. I will not go through the list. It is part of the public record elsewhere. While on early release for the umpteenth time he participated in the killing of an Edmonton police officer for which he was fairly promptly sentenced to 20 years.

The sentence calculation resulted in his total sentence looking like 30 years because it was consecutive. However, because of the way we calculate sentences, he was eligible for parole one year and five months after he was convicted of the murder. With his life sentence he was eligible for parole one year and five months after he was convicted of murder. That is absurd. The absurdity has been recorded in public journals.

One is moved to say that the system is obviously in some disarray. I will leave that as an example of why the existing provision must be changed.

My bill says that if a person is on early release and is convicted of a crime and sentenced to two years or more that person loses the right to early release.

I accept that there must be at the end of the consecutive sentences a period when the offender will be integrated. That has to be in the statutory release portion because I do not want that guy being released at the end of 30 years and sitting on the Bay Street bus the next day beside my kids. I want a period of integration.

The bill would close a loophole which allows offenders to avoid serving time for new offences if those new offences occur while they are on early release or even while they are in prison. If a person is sentenced to seven years for a particularly bad crime and during the fifth year that person gets out, beats somebody up and steals his money, that would normally draw a sentence of a couple of years. The way the law is currently written it requires that person to start the two years back at the beginning of the seven year sentence.

I am not going to take time to read that section of the Criminal Code. It is a public statute and anybody can read it. They can read the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and the appropriate section of the Criminal Code.

• (1345)

Basically the second offence is what I call a freebie. There is no sanction. You can steal a car, steal a purse, commit an assault, and provided of course that the sentence for the second offence does not exceed the length of the sentence you were first on, you do not have to serve any additional time. This needs to be corrected.

We tried in the House in the last Parliament, I know we tried in this one, and we are getting closer. We have made amendments, but officials seem to be reluctant to alter the system too much, because every time you change a sentence calculation it costs money, and they do not have the money in their budgets. They are very cautious about making changes to the way we sentence people and keep people in our correctional institutions. I accept that.

In any event, I am still on the case and many of our colleagues in this House are still on the case and we are slowly getting to those reforms.

The third area is the lowering of the age of criminal responsibility from age 12, where it is now, to age 10. That has been misinterpreted in a lot of quarters. People ask how you can throw the Criminal Code at a little 11–year old. That is not the objective, any more than it is the objective to throw the book at the 13–year old or the 14–year old. What we have done in this country is arrange for intervention into the life of a young offender when they are under 18 years of age. What this does is allows the appropriate intervention for a 10–year old or 11–year old. At present there is no intervention.