

*Government Orders*

more on what we are putting through the House. I am very concerned with what is happening here.

We are giving the impression to people out there that Bill C-45 will fix what is broken in the criminal justice system. It will not. It is one small step in the right direction. Why do we not have the courage to do it right, right now? That is the problem we have.

Let us look at the things we are doing here. I look at a motion we just put through. It was tinkering and playing with words. People may look at this and say that the words life sentence are being changed to imprisonment for life. It may seem innocuous at first; it may seem like no big deal. However there is a difference. Imprisonment for life is always 25 years and a life sentence can be as low as 10 years. The Liberals are going soft with the amendments they are making, which is not right. People ought to know it is not just playing with words. We are dealing with people's lives. As the hon. member for Fraser Valley West just pointed out, these criminals are being released when they should not be released.

● (1050)

I support Motion No. 4 which the hon. member for Wild Rose put forward because it will prevent an offender convicted of a violent offence from getting statutory release. We must enforce full term sentences for violent offenders. That has to be the bottom line. The message must go out that we will not tolerate this kind of thing.

The Liberals believe in harsher sentences. They gave that impression with Bill C-41 in which they made hate crimes more punishable than other crimes. They give the impression that they believe in harsher sentences and then they come up with this stuff. It is inconsistent. Why should violent criminals not get harsh, full term sentences?

What is the most basic function of government? What is the primary function government should be performing? It is to provide for the safety of its citizens. It is simply that. We are not here to create huge programs, tax people to death, and do all this wonderful stuff that gives the impression government is taking care of its people. The basic function of government is to provide for the safety of its citizens. That is why it is so important for us to debate the bill.

We were here yesterday for the entire afternoon and I only heard Reformers dealing with the substance of the bill. Are we the only ones who care about the safety of people? Surely to goodness there must be enough compassion in this place that we would begin to seriously debate what should be the direction of our criminal justice system.

Like I said before, it is not our job to create and run big social programs and all kinds of other wonderful things. That may be something people will ask us to do from time to time, but the big

picture is that government should first and foremost provide for the safety of the citizens within its borders. We need to pay more attention to crime, not just big crime but all crime.

On Motion No. 5 which the hon. member for Wild Rose put forward, we do not support statutory release in general but some may consider it for non-violent offences to be all right. The amendment still allows some form of non-violent statutory release but forces the offender to serve the full sentence if the statutory release is revoked or suspended.

The hon. member for Fraser Valley West has made the point, and I will make again. If a person receives a sentence for a crime and then commits another crime when on parole, not only should that person complete the first sentence but the next sentence the person gets should be tacked on. It should be consecutive.

Too often our courts do not add two and two to make four. For them two and two equals two. What is that? Is it Liberal mathematics? I am not sure. In my books two and two should equal four and that is what such people should be serving. For every single crime they commit they should be punished. They should not be able to commit five crimes and be punished for only one.

I strongly oppose the motion previously put forth in which offenders serving time at a provincial institution are transferred to a federal institution and can be released from the federal institution on the day they would have been released from the provincial institution. Why should they get out early just because the federal government is now paying the bill? That should not happen. They should not be able to play within the system. It is not right.

We oppose Motion No. 10. The amendment will not allow full term sentences for sexual offences against an adult female. The point has been made previously that there should not be a great distinction about whom someone commits the crime against. A crime is a crime and it is serious no matter whom it is committed against. We do not want statutory release.

● (1055)

I have made the point already that sentences need to be consecutive. If criminals recommit crimes they should serve those sentences plus the full sentences for the crimes committed previously.

We are moving in the right direction but we need to take more seriously what is happening in the House. We need to deal with these things and make sure we get them right. We need to provide for the safety of our citizens so they can feel safer in this great country of ours.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.