

BACK COVER PAGE OF  
HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES  
OFFICIAL REPORT (HANSARD)  
VOL. 144, NUMBER 084  
18 SEPTEMBER 2009



PAGE DE DOS  
DÉBATS DE LA CHAMBRE DES  
COMMUNES  
COMPTE RENDU OFFICIEL (HANSARD)  
VOL. 144, NUMÉRO 084  
18 SEPTEMBRE 2009

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:  
Publishing and Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

En cas de non-livraison,  
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :  
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

Published under the authority of the Speaker of  
the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité  
du Président de la Chambre des communes

#### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

#### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5  
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943  
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757  
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca  
<http://publications.gc.ca>

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5  
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943  
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757  
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca  
<http://publications.gc.ca>

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

[Translation]

### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Science and Technology):** I ask, Madam Speaker, that all questions be allowed to stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Shall all questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

#### CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Tuesday, May 12, consideration of the motion of Mr. Lewis that Bill C-36, an act respecting corrections and the conditional release and detention of offenders and to establish the office of Correctional Investigator, be read the third time and passed.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I wish to inform the House that pursuant to Standing Order 33(2)(a), because of the ministerial statement, Government Orders will be extended by 34 minutes beginning at one o'clock p.m.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys):** Madam Speaker, I am privileged to be here today to speak on this very important piece of legislation, Bill C-36, an act respecting corrections and conditional release and detention of offenders and to establish the office of correctional investigator.

It is an important piece of legislation not only for what it does but largely for what it does not do. We have a chance, in looking at this piece of legislation, to determine where we are going as a society with respect to our corrections.

This act will replace the Penitentiary Act, the Parole Act and, in the 19 year use of the Inquiries Act, to authorize the office of the correctional investigator.

When I say that we look at this bill in conjunction with other legislation, I mean just that, that we are not really

#### Government Orders

making the strides we should be making with respect to corrections. This bill only gives us half of the package.

On saying that, I want to congratulate the member for Scarborough West, the member for Scarborough—Rouge River and the member for Moncton from our party who have done an excellent job on this bill and have brought this bill to the piece of legislation we see today. They worked hard, presented a great many amendments, quite a few of which were accepted by the government. I want to thank the government for its conciliatory attitude.

The reason I say that this is only one-half of a package is because we still do not have the sentencing reform. We were told that this was to be a complete overhaul of corrections, parole and sentencing. This is what the government told us we would be getting, yet we do not have the sentencing reform, which is really the first part of the whole question. When in court the first question dealt with is sentencing, then corrections is dealt with, then parole is dealt with. But we do not have the first part of the package. Therefore, we are dealing with the second and third parts without having the first part.

• (1100)

As the member for Scarborough West said in his excellent speech before the House, this bill was introduced on November 4. There has been plenty of time for the government to compile what it wants to bring forward on the sentencing reform and bring it before the House with the common sense understanding that we would be debating the whole question at the same time or at least within a close proximity of time. Instead of just dealing with corrections and parole, we would be dealing with sentencing as well.

I feel that is not too much to ask of the government, yet we do not have it and I feel that is extremely unfortunate.

What we are going to have, to do, of course, when we get the first part is then review the second and third parts again in light of what we have received with respect to sentencing reform.

However, at this point, because we are supportive of this bill, I do not want to dwell only on the questions that create problems, but I want to deal with a couple of areas, as well, where I think we have made some improvements. There are two areas with respect to corrections and parole where we really have to give a lot

*Government Orders*

of attention. I feel that some attention has been given in these areas.

The first relates to the victims. It is important not to forget the victim when we are talking about incarceration and parole. The victim may be very concerned about what the offender will do when he or she is released from incarceration, even on a day parole. We have to be able to allow the victim to state his or her concern when dealing with this question of day passes or even parole itself.

The bill gives some consideration to this question. In clause 26, the rights of the victim, including giving the victim the eligibility dates and the review dates applicable to the offender under the act with respect to temporary passes or parole, are dealt with. It is important so that the victim, knowing the horror which he or she may have with regard to somebody being released from incarceration, can make some presentation to the Parole Board or to other authorities which could have a bearing on this question of parole.

Perhaps there is something which the victim will want the Parole Board or the officials to consider. That is not to say that if there is an alarmed victim that it is going to stop a parole or even temporary passes. It is important that this perspective be taken into consideration.

Also there are people who are victims, not in the legal sense, but in the actual physical or mental sense whereby the person who is incarcerated has caused some physical or mental damage to a person who either was not able to or decided not to or for whatever reason did not have that offence heard before a court of law, but may wish to bring before the Parole Board or other agency his or her concerns relating to the offender's passes or parole. I think that is important and this bill does take that into consideration.

It is also important to note the second area which has to do with native and aboriginal justice. There is a very important consideration here. Under clause 81, the minister:

—may enter into an agreement with an aboriginal community for the provision of correctional services to aboriginal offenders and for

payment by the Minister or by a person authorized by the Minister in respect of the provision of those services.

That is important and I cannot stress this too much because we have not been successful in dealing with our aboriginal people with respect to corrections. Our correctional incarceration has not worked with respect to aboriginal people and we have to review that in total in conjunction with other aspects of native justice.

In particular we are finding the aboriginal people are more resentful as a result of their incarceration and the fact that any treatment or rehabilitation factor is not being utilized or not having any effect.

For the ability to be able to say to the aboriginal people we are going to put them in a facility in an aboriginal community and allow the aboriginal community to work with this offender I think is a major step forward.

Clause 82 of the bill states:

The Service will establish a National Aboriginal Advisory Committee, and may establish regional and local aboriginal advisory committees, which shall provide advice to the Service on the provision of correctional services to aboriginal offenders.

I feel that is a major step forward because it is absolutely vital that we not bury our heads in the sand and say that by locking away offenders we have solved the problem. If there is anything that has become evident in our society, it is that we need changes to our correctional system and this bill does provide some of these changes.

I listened very carefully to the petition presented by the member for Halton—Peel and the concern that people in his riding have with respect to violence in our society. I understand the point he is making and I sympathize with the concerns of the people in his riding because there is a very great fear out there.

In my constituency of Cape Breton—The Sydneys, we always took pride in the fact we were a non-violent society, a close society, a close community and cared for one another. We have had 10 murders in the last 22 months and that was before the horrendous shooting of four people in a McDonald's restaurant in Sydney River. This is just cold-blooded murder and we cannot ignore it exists in our communities. No community is exempt. If it

can happen on Cape Breton Island it can happen anywhere in this country and we have to realize that.

Frankly I do not think we are meeting the needs of the community. As much as this legislation is an improvement it does not go nearly far enough. Perhaps the changes need not be made in this legislation itself but other pieces of legislation should be brought forward. I do not want to restrict the mobility and the thought processes of the government such as they are in dealing with the needs of our society at the present time.

I was listening last night to the *MacNeil-Lehrer Report* and they were discussing the recent riots in Los Angeles and actual racism in the cities in the United States. It was frightening, not because of what took place during the riots but that the needs and the questions in our society go unanswered. We seem to be going headlong into more urban problems, more violence, more misunderstanding, and more ignorance of the needs of our visible minorities.

• (1110)

One of the members of the panel that was discussing this question—and I say this just having heard the minister's statement on South Africa and the responses presented by the two opposition parties—one of the black Americans in discussing this whole subject said that in the United States a larger percentage of blacks are incarcerated than is the case in South Africa.

That is a very distressing statistic because we know what the situation is in South Africa. Maybe that country is not dealing with as much in corrections or what have you and there are various ways of ignoring that statistic and saying that it is not of vital importance.

Whatever excuse or explanation a person may want to give it is a vital statistic. It is important to realize that that is the case.

Also they talked about the fact that in the Los Angeles riots there were 8,000 people arrested. How is the judicial system going to deal with 8,000 people arrested if they are going to try each of these people?

And what if they do not try them? What if they say there were too many people arrested and they cannot possibly try them all? They are going to be given suspended sentences or whatever you want to do. What

### *Government Orders*

is that going to do for the shopkeepers or the victims of the violence in Los Angeles?

I will tell you what it is going to do. It is going to cause a further breakdown of respect for law and order and for our justice systems in North America. We have to be able to deal with violence when it occurs. We cannot have laws which say that those who are white can get certain treatment and those who are black do not get the same treatment because they are members of a visible minority. We cannot say that because someone's store was damaged and looted during the riot, that because there was so much lawlessness, the injustice that was done to them cannot be dealt with.

If we start saying that, if we start saying because it is group violence we cannot deal with it, but if it is one individual who is committing the crimes one at a time that is okay, our system can deal with it.

If we do that we are going to cause animosity toward the victim, naturally, and we are going to cause a complete misunderstanding and a tension in our various multicultural communities.

It is absolutely ludicrous to deal with these situations the way we are dealing with them and to say that because we are in Canada this cannot happen, that is in the United States.

We saw the situation in Toronto. It may not have been as extensive as it was in Los Angeles but it was no less important to consider. It was no less serious.

We have to deal with this question. We have to deal with the question that if we are going to have urban unrest we have to be prepared to have the law support it, and we have to understand why that lawlessness occurred. We have got to not wait until the lawlessness takes place, until the violence takes place. We have to deal with it beforehand.

The Minister of Justice in response to the situation in Toronto said that it is difficult to organize a meeting that would co-ordinate the services of the federal, provincial, and municipal officials.

It takes time. We do not want to do something before we are really ready to make sure it is done properly. It will probably be a year before we can have a conference dealing with these urban problems, but do not worry. I have talked to the mayors of the major cities and asked them to come back to us concerning their problems.

*Government Orders*

Whoopie. What kind of a response is that to the needs that exist in our urban centres in this country. It is absolute neglect. It is absolutely burying their heads in the sand to the situation and to what needs to be done to correct the situation. To say that there is no racism in our cities is wrong. There is racism in our cities. The fact is we have to face that.

The first thing to do is to face it, and then to deal with it. First, government has got to face it. We have to deal with this very, very serious problem which seems to be getting worse. We seem to be having more drug related crimes.

The Minister of National Revenue, and I congratulate him, has been able to stop a lot of the narcotics from coming across the border. That is important, but the fact is in Nova Scotia there is very little being done to stop drugs from being landed. In our cities, there does not seem to be any shortage of drugs.

Either they are making it here in Canada or there is more coming across the border. I would suggest that illegal importation of drugs into this country is becoming more and more of a serious problem all the time. With the drug related problems comes violence, violence against women, violence against the family in general which feeds industries like pornography, particularly child pornography.

Where is the legislation that is needed in this question? We do not even have the first part of the problem with which we are dealing today. We do not have sentencing reform. The Minister of Justice, whose job it is to bring this legislation before the House, has not brought this legislation forward.

I suggest that we are not dealing with the question. In fact, we are not even keeping the same distance behind the problem. We are falling farther and farther behind the problem. We are saying in this country that we will wait until we have unanimous consent on something. It is obvious that we cannot wait any longer, but we are not anticipating. We are not dealing with the symptoms. We are not looking at the problem and saying: "What is the situation going to be in the future?"

I can say what the situation is going to be in the future if the government does not do something. If the government does not try to understand and deal with the problems of visible minorities in the cities, if the government is not going to support laws and to have reasonable

laws so that the police will know what they have to do and to act in a measured and responsible way so that the police morale is not absolutely downtrodden and we have the worst of both worlds, as seems to be the case in our society today, we are going to have a problem of incarceration that we never had before because we are not going to be able to incarcerate everybody who is going to be breaking the law in this country.

They would be breaking the law because they do not have suitable housing, they do not have jobs and feel that this is the only outlet. Nothing excuses breaking the law, but the fact of the matter is it is going to become an increasing regularity if this government does not do more to deal with the problem.

**Mr. Iain Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Madam Speaker, I have a question and a comment. I will tell the hon. member my question right away.

My question is: Why is the Liberal Party supporting this bill?

The comment I have is this: The hon. member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys must know that when this government talks about law and order, it is full of lawn ornaments. It tinkers with things. It is not doing anything substantial to make our communities safer for Canadians.

• (1120)

The problem is that we have to deal with this. This government says it is for law and order. What this government has failed to do is to give an emphasis to crime prevention. That is the key. That is what will make our cities and our country safer.

Together with that failure to deal with crime prevention on behalf of the Mulroney Conservative government and its economic policies, the trade deal with the United States, which I see the Liberals now support, and the social policies which have made so many people unemployed in our country, we are going to Americanize Canada. We are already seeing it. Toronto was a little bit of a mini Los Angeles.

We are seeing a government that in fact is doing nothing for law and order. It is simply tinkering. Surely, this parole act is another example of a bill that is doing exactly that, tinkering and purporting to say to the Canadian people: "We are for law and order, we are going to make things tougher".

*Government Orders*

We all know that what we have to do in the prison system is isolate violent offenders. We have to get some resources and some treatment in there. Then we have to get outside that system and prevent people from going into prison because it is often too late to do much when they go into prison.

I know my colleague, the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, is going to speak later on this morning about the prison system. I just want to come back to that question. I want to tell the hon. member before I sit down that yesterday in Montreal there was a meeting of people from all over the world to talk about crime prevention. I had a chance on Monday to meet with some of these people.

I got the manifesto of the Conservative Party in Britain on crime and law and order. I got the manifesto of the Labour Party in Britain. I got the policy in France and I will show the hon. member some writings that came from some very thoughtful Americans who want to change their country's policy. The key element of the policy people in those three countries where it is implemented in Britain and in France is to get local, to get into crime prevention, to get away from just providing more cops and more jails, to provide some real resources for people and real local control and talk about community safety. That is where it is at. That is crime prevention.

I ask the hon. member: Does he agree with me that this government has done nothing on that approach, not one thing? There is not one bill that deals with crime prevention.

We dealt with the estimates the other day. Was there anybody in the department that dealt with crime prevention? No. There is a heck of a lot of money for rich lawyers to prosecute in Vancouver especially and in Montreal and Toronto, the government's friends. Those budgets went up. However, the budget for crime prevention went down.

Does the hon. member agree with me that this Conservative government has done nothing for crime prevention? Will the hon. member tell me succinctly in plain language why his party is supporting this bill which I just think continues with a whitewash.

**Mr. MacLellan:** Madam Speaker, I want to deal with the hon. member's question first because I think that is my fault. I think I misled him on that.

I was speaking about there being some consideration for victims now, the needs of victims and the feelings of victims and there is now a beginning in dealing with incarceration of aboriginals and the treatment of aboriginals and incarceration perhaps in aboriginal communities. I said that that was a step forward and we supported it.

I meant to go on and say that this bill does not go far enough and that the Liberal Party will not be supporting the bill.

The hon. member is right, I left that out. I thank him for bringing it to my attention because this bill is not sufficient. As I went on to say, I felt it was very insufficient. The hon. member is correct. As we heard yesterday in committee when the minister was there, not only is nothing being done for crime prevention but what is being said is misleading. The government is saying that there is money going forward for crime prevention but most of it, of course, is in the area of drug and family violence. The money is not for prevention. The money is for dealing with crimes after they have occurred. However, the government is calling it crime prevention. I think that is misleading. I agree with the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam that there is nothing being done, literally nothing, on crime prevention and that is a travesty.

In fact, in the budget for the Department of Justice, in the estimates, I think it is on pages 10 and 11, we see that they actually come in under what they estimated. There is a 10 per cent decrease in justice spending for 1992-93 over what was predicted would be the budget in 1991-92. Two of the areas where it has reduced expenditures are on family violence and on drug trafficking and drug related problems.

It is a tragedy. It is an absolute tragedy that the government is just burying its head. It has no idea what is going on in our urban communities and has no idea on how to deal with it. I feel that the sense of frustration that exists has been manifested in the petitions presented by the hon. member for Halton—Peel and their concern about violence in our communities. It reflects the fact that the situation is out of control and the government does not know how to deal with it.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Madam Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to participate in this debate today because the bill, of course, is a very important one for my riding of Kingston and the Islands where there are so many federal penitentiaries. When a bill is introduced that provides significant changes to the Penitentiary Act, it is very important that I try to make some comment on the substance of the legislation that is before the House.

I agree with the comments that have been made by my colleague from Cape Breton—The Sydneys that really what is going on here is, in large measure, window dressing and the government is failing to address some of the major issues of crime and punishment in Canada. Those particularly relate to the question of alternative measures and programs within federal penitentiaries, which in my view are not affected significantly by the passage of this legislation.

Part of the problem is the lack of funding for these programs and the cutbacks I learn about on a regular basis during the course of my visits to federal institutions. Those cutbacks, I submit, are at the root of the problem in dealing with corrections in this country.

As I listened to the Solicitor General make his opening speech in the debate the other day and to his parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Niagara Falls, I could not help but recall lines from *The Mikado*. The parliamentary secretary said, for example, and I quote from page 10576 of *Hansard*:

All I can say is that unless you give a sentence that is commensurate in people's minds with the seriousness of the crime people will lose that confidence.

He was referring to confidence in the system. Of course we all know the jingle from *The Mikado*: "My object all sublime, I shall achieve in time to let the punishment fit the crime—the punishment fit the crime". The parliamentary secretary reminded me very much of that line as he spoke in glowing terms about how this bill was designed to correct the problem of sentencing and punishment in Canada.

Unfortunately, it fails to do that because as my hon. colleague has indicated and as the hon. member for Scarborough West has indicated in his very able speech in this debate, the government has failed to bring

forward its sentencing legislation which is an integral part of the corrections proceedings in Canada and which should have been dealt with at the same time as the penitentiary amendments that are brought forward in this Bill C-36.

• (1130)

I could quote from an editorial in the *Calgary Herald*. No one in the House would maintain that the *Calgary Herald* is anything but a supporter of the government. After all, it is in a city that elects more Tories per capita than I think any other in the country. I do not think there is anything but a Tory member from Calgary. Of course the government House leader is one of them. This is what they wrote in his paper. I would have thought he might have prevailed on his colleague, the Solicitor General, to do something more substantive.

Let me read from this editorial that appeared on October 10:

Keeping dangerous criminals in jail longer, as federal Solicitor General Doug Lewis proposes to do, will undoubtedly make Canadians feel safer.

So will the lengthy roster of parole related housekeeping measures the Solicitor General intends to implement.

But Lewis's changes won't necessarily make Canada a safer place.

Without concentrated efforts aimed at rehabilitating criminals already in jail and preventing potential offenders from falling into the vicious cycle of violent behaviour, Lewis's well meaning but short-sighted efforts can have little real impact.

I agree with the sentiment expressed in that editorial. I could go on reading it, but I think I have made the point.

What we are doing here is missing an opportunity when we are revising the Penitentiary Act to do something significant, to help with the rehabilitation of offenders in Canada. I am repeatedly faced with the argument, as are many members, if we just lock these people up we will solve the problem. With great respect we will not.

Sentences come to an end. Offenders are released. Without some meaningful programs to try to reintegrate offenders into the community and provide them with opportunities to obtain gainful employment, to lead something approaching a normal lifestyle on release, we will simply postpone the continuing problems with the offender and leave society at the mercy of these people upon their release.

This bill may answer the criticisms that some people are not held in jail long enough, but it does not do anything to address the serious problem of rehabilitation which I think is so significant and so important in the area of corrections.

For example, to be quite specific about some of the provisions in the bill, there is no distinction made in conditional release between first-time offenders and repeat offenders. In other words, one can be released from prison on terms whether or not one is a first-time or repeat offender. There might have been a distinction so that the person who has re-offended has a much more significant hurdle to overcome in being released. Unfortunately none is provided for in the legislation.

What is far more serious is the change in the law that will allow—and it is in the bill—non-violent offenders to be released on early parole even where the Parole Board believes they are likely to re-offend. That to me is a serious mistake.

What we seem to be saying in this bill is if it is a violent offence you will be held in. If it is a non-violent offence for which you are serving time, but a serious one like break and enter into a house, theft on a massive scale from a store, or a break-in of a bank which was not actually a robbery with violence, release will be automatic even if it is expected re-offending will take place.

This kind of distinction may be very nice for members of the Solicitor General's department to think as important, but I suggest in the eyes of Canadians there is very little difference between a person who robs a bank at gunpoint even if it is a toy pistol and somebody who breaks into the bank in the middle of the night and makes off with much more cash or breaks into a person's home when he is away and steals everything the person has.

There is a problem here in recognition of the seriousness of offences, the rigid classification that has been adopted and the apparent *carte blanche* that is given to the authorities to release persons. In fact the direction to release persons early is in my view inappropriate.

The Parole Board has the ability to make judgments in these matters. The Parole Board has for years been making these kind of decisions. I suggest it is appropriate that it continue to do so. The change in the law is not a beneficial one.

#### *Government Orders*

With one exception under this bill all inmates must be released after two-thirds of their sentence regardless of their behaviour and irrespective of whether the Parole Board considers they may re-offend. The exception is an important one, I agree, but the fact is that is now the rule.

I suggest it is inappropriate when we do not have before us sentencing legislation which affects the length of sentences. It is inappropriate when good behaviour is not one of the factors to be considered, because it takes away any incentive on the part of a person sentenced to an offence to attempt to respond to the treatment that he or she is receiving in the institution.

I am disappointed that the government has ignored advice on this issue, particularly advice that came from the Elizabeth Fry Society of Kingston that submitted a brief to the committee stating its opposition to lengthening periods of incarceration rather than looking at other measures that might assist in the rehabilitation of offenders and to providing for these automatic releases instead of incentives and inducements either to behave, to get out earlier or to minimize the length of the sentence in other ways.

These are not provided for in the bill. It is a disappointment that the government has moved in that way.

Finally there is no effective supervision of offenders who are released at the two-thirds point in their sentence. There is only the usual term that they be of good behaviour and keep the peace.

Mandatory supervision was an important part of corrections. I realize in some cases there was an inability because of staffing shortages to provide any effective supervision. That is regrettable. It was helpful in many cases. It provided offenders who were perhaps new to the community in which they were living, and certainly new to living outside prison after a period of time spent in incarceration, with someone to whom they could turn for advice and assistance. Parole officers and persons supervising the offender on mandatory supervision were those kinds of people. They were available. They were helpful. They could provide advice, assistance and direction.



*Government Orders*

That is being removed in many cases, in part because of funding cuts and in part because of this legislation. I am disappointed the government has failed to provide the support services which are necessary for those newly released, particularly those who find themselves in a different community from which they came or who are released after an extended period in prison.

Sentencing and parole are tied together. If inmates are going to be released after two-thirds of their sentence, surely it is worth while looking at the length of the sentence. Here the government was urged to do exactly that and introduce the two bills at the same time. Instead we have one and there is no sign of the other. There is no indication, no promise from the minister that the other will be forthcoming in a reasonable time.

We are left in a situation where the National Parole Board will become powerless to deal with various offences. Judges will now know that whatever sentence they give, however inadequate they may feel it is or however heavy they may feel it is, it is going to be brought to an end at the end of two-thirds of the sentence regardless of the behaviour of the inmate. This must be a little disappointing from the point of view of the judiciary as well.

Finally the government dealt with the office of the correctional investigator and went through some kind of further indication of its obsession with secrecy. Surely the correctional investigator's report should have come to this House instead of to the Solicitor General.

What we have done here is that if the correctional investigator gets into a prison and uncovers an unholy mess, the report will go to the Solicitor General and not to Parliament. There will never be any public exposure of anything that goes wrong in a federal prison if it is investigated by the correctional investigator.

Why would the report not be made public? Why would the information not be available to members of Parliament directly, instead of to the Solicitor General? It is an obsession with secrecy and it is reflected in the government's rejection of certain amendments.

I want to turn to the amendment I obtained leave of the House to propose last week when we were debating the report stage of this bill. From 1834 until 1961 members of Parliament had the right to enter any federal prison. For the last 30 years of that period it was during

business hours, but for the first 100 years or so it was at any time. That right is not being given back in this bill.

• (1140)

I moved an amendment to provide for that right to be returned to members of Parliament. I suggest it is a worth-while right. It is something that should be considered by the House. We received an extremely weak answer from the acting parliamentary secretary to the minister on this issue. The minister himself did not respond. The parliamentary secretary said nothing about it in his speech the other day.

Frankly, I was disappointed that we did not get some reasoned explanation as to why this was not done. I think I know what the reason is. I think the hon. member for Scarborough West knows what the reason is. The government is obsessed with secrecy. The government is very much afraid that if members of Parliament drop into a prison and see something is wrong—a guard has been beaten or an inmate has been beaten—maybe something would get out to the public that things were not just hunky-dory in a federal institution.

With its obsession about letting out that anything could possibly be wrong, the clamps will be put on. Regulations will be passed by Orders in Council that restrict access to members of Parliament, senators and judges so that they may visit prisons only under certain terms and conditions and frankly at times that are convenient or appropriate in the eyes of the head of the institution.

**An hon. member:** Sanitized conditions.

**Mr. Milliken:** As my hon. friend from Hamilton West says, sanitized conditions.

I want to say openly in this House that I have never had any difficulty in entering any of the prisons in Kingston. When I have sought to go, I have always been welcomed and what I have wanted to visit has been made open and available to me.

However I must say that I do not tend to exercise my privileges at night. I do not tend to go at the crack of dawn, at five o'clock in the morning or something like that. I do not go at eight, nine, ten or even one o'clock in the morning. It does not happen. I go during the day, during regular business hours for the most part. I was

*Government Orders*

there once in the evening. Always I have had no difficulty in entering the institution.

In fairness I normally call ahead and make an appointment. I do not think I have ever dropped in and said I would like to take a tour that day, walk around and see somebody. Often I have been told that someone is unavailable to come to the visiting area. I have said that was fine, that I would go to the cell and visit the inmate there.

I have done that frequently in various prisons in my area. I found the visits always easy to arrange. Possibly it causes a bit of annoyance to the staff that I am going to that particular location, but if that annoyance were there it was not expressed to me.

I do not see a problem with this but the government apparently does. It is not willing to allow members to use their judgment as to when to enter a prison. It is a matter that will be entirely at the discretion of the institutional head, as he is described in the legislation, and of course in accordance with the regulations issued by the cabinet.

It is a serious omission from this bill that this right is denied. Members of Parliament exercise the function of an ombudsman in our society in many instances. We deal with complaints from constituents on a host of issues. In my particular case the inmates in the institutions located in Kingston are clearly constituents for at least a certain purpose. They may well have a vote in the next election, although that is not entirely clear. They have it now under a court decision that is under appeal. Whether they are voters or not, they are still living there and they are still entitled to some representation from a member of Parliament.

That is true of persons living in institutions across this country. Many other members have institutions in their ridings where the men and women who live there and also the employees who work there, are entitled to representation.

Surely it is not an expectation that the only place a member of Parliament is going to see either a prison employee or an inmate will be at the member's office or at the employee's home. Surely there is an expectation that there could be a visit on site on property owned and operated by the Government of Canada which is represented in this House by cabinet and by all of us in a certain sense. Surely there is an expectation we might be able to visit on site and see people who are living there,

who are being cared for or who are working for the Government of Canada.

Every member of this House could go to another government office such as the income tax office and visit the employees there and talk to them. Why are we not able to go to a prison at will and talk to people there?

There are restrictions on this one. There are restrictions on prisons, and they are all in this bill. I submit that the minister was ill-advised in rejecting the amendment as cavalierly as he did. He chose not to speak to it, not to give any answer as to why it was inappropriate.

It is merely a matter of fear and trembling on the part of the government and its obsession with secrecy, its obsession to ensure that something embarrassing is not released. I am disappointed.

I can only express some optimism that when this bill gets to the other place, the hon. senators will move appropriate amendments to correct this glaring omission from the legislation in accordance with a bill introduced in the other place by Senator Hastings some time ago which would have corrected the previous Penitentiary Act that is now being repealed and replaced by this new corrections bill.

In summary, my final message on this bill is that what Canadians need today for their own protection and for the safety of us all are not necessarily longer prison sentences and the locking up of inmates. Those can provide some temporary relief. What we need is to provide a healthy economic environment for Canadians so that the incentive to commit crime and to repeat crime after one offence is taken away. In fact, there would be an incentive to live a law-abiding and normal existence, working and taking part in Canadian society.

That is what the government should be providing. That is the kind of environment that it needs to create. Providing for additional lock-up at great expense to the taxpayer is not necessarily going to solve these problems. It is a temporary measure at best.

Instead of spending its time and energy on relatively minor but important updating of this act, the government would be better off spending its money trying to create a healthy economic environment in Canada, trying to create jobs for Canadians so that they are able to obtain employment on release from penitentiary or whatever it may be.

*Government Orders*

We need to provide the necessary training and work experience in the institutions so that, on release, the persons who have been incarcerated are able to take their place as working partners in our communities. In fact, I am safe in saying that some of the programs that the government has have been worth while in that regard, but we need more of them and not further cuts as we have been having for the last few years.

I encourage the Solicitor General to follow up on that aspect of this bill instead of dealing entirely with legal, technical changes.

**Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca):** Madam Speaker, I would like to say at the outset that in speaking to this particular bill, I am handicapped by the fact that I actually have some knowledge about this subject. Beyond that, my comments will be relatively minor but somewhat concerned about the lack of focus of this bill.

First of all, we have to understand in dealing with this particular problem that we are really defining class. I have spent seven years of my life working in prisons as an administrator, as well as outside of prisons as a probation officer supervising paroles. It was some 30 years ago when I was last directly involved in institutions and services on parole and probation and frankly things have changed very little since that time.

We currently have a situation where money counts when it comes to criminal justice. The people who end up in jail are generally poor. Poor people make up the vast numbers of our population in prisons that cost us so dearly out of our annual budgets.

We also have the victims of crime who are generally overlooked except for lip-service with regard to rehabilitative services or support services after they have been victims of serious crimes.

• (1150)

The most obvious, glaring lack of service is in prevention. We have in this country tens of thousands of young people whom we hear about during Question Period who are not even adequately fed, let alone nurtured and sufficiently concerned about to ensure a minimum of criminal activity as a cause of that neglect. I am not suggesting that poverty is the only reason for criminal activity, but I am saying that a poverty background breeds the potential for the development of alienation which ultimately leads to criminal activity.

We have the phenomenon of a breakdown of a family

and we lament about it, saying that we wish we could return to the old values. Wishing for the return of those values and actually going back to them are two different things. The reality is that a significant number of families in poverty are single parent families. Single parent families, by their very nature, are marred by the fact that one person, usually a young woman, is responsible for not only raising the children, but being the bread-winner and also the home-maker at the same time. For a significant number of these people, the only means of income should they wish to spend the time with their family, is welfare.

We actually have institutionalized in North America a welfare family system that is known in the United States as an under-class and here in Canada just blandly as the poor.

We have talked many times about altering the social welfare system, the support systems, in terms of economics for these families, but we have done very little to radically alter the kind of structures that these people must operate in.

The consequences of our neglect of the economic and social problems relative to this group of people is that it is a breeding ground for a continuous supply of deviant behaviour by very young people.

In the past we used the classic orphanage or training school as an arena within which we sent young boys or young girls for "correction". We have been shocked to learn, over the last few years, the response to some of the activities of the training schools that are not just confined to religious communities, but are actually the practices, tragically and unfortunately, in many state-run training schools.

We have now evidence of the continuation of these kinds of problems by seeing in every large urban area very young women, ages 15, 16 and 17 and younger, whose only economic source to survive in our society is prostitution. I must say, tragically, not only just young women, but young men as well. The free enterprise system allows the only marketable thing that they have to be marketed on city streets right across this country.

*Government Orders*

We have a serious problem of youth prostitution, and again I repeat, no preventive services.

How does a government morally justify a high level debate about some minor corrections in the correction services when in actual fact it avoids discussing the real problems that exist in real lives in every part of this country? Does anyone in this Chamber think it is by accident that a young woman or a young man ends up on the street as a prostitute? Does anybody think it is purely by happenstance or the uncontrollable lack of will that creates the number of young, poor people who end up in our institutions or on our welfare rolls? Is there anybody in this Chamber who believes that the very breeding ground for the kind of violence that we see in our communities is no one's fault, that it just happens and we do not know the reasons for it and we do not know what to do about it?

As a fact, this Chamber's antecedents, through many parliamentary reports, have time and time again laid out the problems in the corrections field, only to find time and time again that governments of the day have lacked the will to deal with the real problems.

When a child is without love and security from its own natural parents, it is the responsibility of the state, i.e., the rest of the community, to ensure that what can ever be replaced for that child must be replaced. It cannot be replaced in the classic orphanages. We have found out now what a failure they were. It cannot be replaced in training schools. The best effort is given through foster homes or alternate options for that child.

Do we really provide service that is adequate for children in those foster homes? When I worked as a social worker, the maximum case-load was around 80. Now we have social workers in this country with case-loads of 300, 400 and 500 children in foster homes. Do we really know what kind of service we are providing? No we do not. Is it predictable that some children will end up in crime? Yes it is. As a matter of fact, the last place to go is to the professionals who work in this field: the psychiatrists, the psychologists and the social workers. All you have to do is look in any community and the neighbourhood will be able to tell you what child is heading for trouble.

Who of us in this Chamber has not sat at our own kitchen table and said that if somebody does not do something for Johnny or Susie, soon they will be in

trouble. All of us have said it in our own communities, in our own neighbourhoods. We know and sense, as we see children grow up in the areas we live in, that some of those children are going to be in trouble and we also know that there are no real adequate services for them.

We do not supply the school districts with the wherewithal to assist services in the classroom. We do not focus preventive services right at the lowest possible level in the community. We do not ask the religious communities nor do we ask the existing public organizations to co-ordinate efforts toward prevention of crime through better child protection.

As a result of the difficult economic times we have in this country and the number of children who we are able to define right now as living in poverty, any one of us is able to say that a percentage of these children will indeed become our criminals in the next generation.

I want to read a quote from a Canadian Police Chiefs Association brief. This is the police of Canada making this statement, not a social worker, not a parliamentarian but the police of Canada making this statement and this appeal through their Canadian police association brief. "The answer to the crime problem is simple. We must eliminate poverty, hunger, prejudice, violence, drug use and mental instability. Additionally, we should provide quality education for all and stable employment to everyone". The Canadian police association brief.

Hardly a Liberal Party statement. Hardly a New Democratic Party statement. Hardly a statement by the Conservative government. This is not a political statement by a political organization; this is a statement made by those people who work in the front line of these problems every single day.

What has been this government's response? Window dressing. This bill is simply nothing more, as my colleague from the Liberal Party said, than window dressing.

In the case of my own colleague, the member for Brant, who has worked tirelessly along with other members on the committee to try to bring about some effective changes, there is a sense of great disappointment of the elephant labouring forth and bringing into existence a mouse.

**Mr. Harvard:** At least a gerbil.

**Mr. Barrett:** At least a gerbil my colleague says.

*Government Orders*

When is this government going to assume the responsibility that belongs to the government of the day to ensure that no child is in poverty?

• (1200)

When is it going to assume its moral and political responsibility to ensure that social services are available for children when they need them? When is it going to assume its responsibility as a tax collecting agency of the state to ensure that the priorities of tax collection and expenditures are on children? When is it going to assume its moral responsibility as the state as the family collapses because of a lack of support systems to deal with the problems of that family collapse? Pious words, phoney political speeches and lying promises do not solve this problem.

In the last federal election in this country the Prime Minister said that we would protect the social services and the social fabric to ensure that the impacts of any economic changes from trade agreements would not be felt. As we talk about this particular bill on corrections, we guarantee a supply of young offenders right across the spectrum in terms of drug abuse, in terms of violent crime and in terms of prostitution simply because of the economic devastation that has been wreaked upon this country by this government's economic policies with absolutely no moral sense of responsibility of picking up the pieces.

It was this government that told the Canadian people that the Canadian safety net, built up over so many years by consensus and previous federal administrations, both Liberal and Conservative, on a mixed economy basis, had a consensus about social responsibility in this country. In the last 50 years we have never seen such devastation to ordinary folks at the low end of the scale as we have under a *laissez-faire*, right-wing government that is neo-Conservative and comes in with this kind of clap-trap bill to suggest somehow it is dealing with the problem.

The Tories are not even dealing with the problem and worse, they are not even dealing with the cause. Who is it who can justify the fact that they are capping social service expenditures right across this country when young people are on the streets as prostitutes? Who is it who can justify the capping of social expenditures while young people are dropping out from schools at a rate of 30 per cent before they finish high school? Is that the legacy this government wants to be known by?

As a politician, I have no hesitation in branding that legacy into the forehead of the less than human face of the Tory government in this country. You can go to any city and see the consequences of this social devastation. You can go to any town and village and see unemployed young people desperately looking for a place in this society in which they can express themselves in a positive manner. You can see the devastation of drug abuse, prostitution and violence simply because they are a homeless, faceless group in our society, totally neglected and have no idea of what the responsibility of this Chamber ultimately is in their lives.

Go into the urban areas and speak to a single mother and ask her how she gets by on her welfare payments and still has the time, the energy and the commitment to give comfort and love to her child. It is all right for the later day yuppies who are privileged in our society by a rapidly changing tax system that allows the wealthy to have nannies and day care for their children. The poor end of the scale that needs these basic support services for families, for crime prevention, if nothing else, is being left out.

To burden this House with a bill that is fraught with all kinds of political jargon about somehow changing things in our society is to make a mockery of the whole system that we say we are committed to as politicians.

How do we morally justify the fact that in the last five years low income families have actually seen their disposable income reduced the first time since the Great Depression in this country? Who is it on the government side who is standing up and speaking for the poor? Who is it on the government side who is standing up and demanding basic services for young people? Who is it on the government side who is responsible to ensure that no

*Government Orders*

child goes to school hungry every day? Who is it on the government side who is responsible to ensure that children stay in school?

Crime prevention, as pointed out by the Police Association of this country, is what the focus should be. I repeat what the Police Association said in its brief:

"The answer to the crime problem is simple. We must eliminate poverty, hunger, prejudice, violence, drug use and mental instability".

Name one part of this bill that deals with these basic problems. Name one speech you have heard from a leading cabinet minister dealing specifically with this problem. Name one time when you heard an emotional comment from those on the cabinet bench saying that they too have been on the food lines and seen children waiting for food in this nation.

My colleague is right. I know that I am not known to make heavy, serious speeches. I said at the outset in my comments that I hesitated to speak because I happen to know something about this subject.

The bottom line of our value as politicians must be measured by the compassion and the sensitivity we have in dealing with public funds. Spending \$50,000 for a photo opportunity of the Prime Minister with children around him and at the same time not having \$50,000 available for preventative services for children is frankly not immoral, but amoral. It is hypocritical for this government to spend \$15 million on productivity propaganda while at the same time family life in this whole country is under serious threat because of economic limitations.

It is amoral for this government to spend massive amounts of money on propaganda for self-aggrandizement and at the same time ignore the needs of humble people who have no idea of what the nature of politics is, what the nature of power is and who essentially are absolutely powerless in a system, with very little idea of its functioning.

How does it feel to walk down the streets of our great cities and see very beautiful young men and women selling their bodies on the streets? How does it feel, when we make pious speeches about other countries' problems, to see the huge line-ups of women and children waiting for food? What impact does it have on the government benches to know that women actually

turn their children over to public agencies for the opportunity of better care and a foster home, rather than maintaining the child in the home themselves.

It is a fact that if you add up the amount of money the state pays to place a child in a home away from its parents, or a single parent, it is more, if there are two, three or four children involved, than what it costs to keep the family together. The focus is totally wrong. The whole approach begs questions about our serious commitment to the protection of the community.

The last comment I am going to make is about the protection of the community. If we are really concerned about the protection of people and property, crime must be prevented by being concerned about the causes of crime and the people who are involved and the victims.

I am disappointed in this bill. Needless to say, I am disappointed in this government. More than anything else, the need for an election in this country is embodied in this bill itself. It is a total failure to deal with the basic causes of social disruption in our society by a government that, in my opinion, long ago abandoned its moral commitment as the overseer of expenditures for the needs of people.

Needless to say, I will not be supporting this bill. I am proud to associate myself with members of the Liberal opposition and my own party in making these statements and being critical of a government that deserves to be criticized and, frankly, thrown out of office.

• (1210)

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West):** I am pleased to rise in this, the highest court of the land, specifically on the third reading of Bill C-36 as put forward by the Solicitor General.

When announcing this legislation, the Solicitor General boasted that it was the most comprehensive parole reform we have seen in years. He also noted that through this legislation: "Protection of society is the primary objective of this act. The bill reflects the government's determination to restore public confidence in the corrections system".

These are noble words, but does the bill really take a strong stand in favour of protecting society? Does it tighten up day parole and temporary absences so that it meets the minister's own test: the protection of society and the restoration of public confidence in the system?

*Government Orders*

Or, as we have heard time and time again from this side of the House, is it merely window-dressing?

My constituents, many people from southern Ontario and across this land know too well the tragedies that have befallen too many area residents in the recent past. Their names are painfully familiar: Klaudusz, Mahaffy, de Villiers, Anderson, Edwards, French.

The provisions of Bill C-36 cover parole and temporary absences of all inmates. What Canadians are really concerned about are dangerous offenders being released from prison on day passes, escorted or unescorted temporary absence. There is ample evidence of persons who, while at large from a penitentiary, have committed various violent acts that could have been avoided by detaining inmates until the expiration of their sentences.

As I have stated before, not all inmates are in prison for violent crimes, nor will many be repeat offenders. However, this bill, Bill C-36, does not afford society the protection it deserves.

On June 29, 1987 a penitentiary inmate by the name of Daniel Gingras escaped an escorted temporary absence while visiting the West Edmonton Mall for the occasion of his birthday. What an ideal place to wander off and make good an escape. Daniel Gingras was later apprehended by the police but only after murdering two people, for which he was later convicted of first degree murder on both counts.

Members of this House may also remember Allan Legere, who terrorized the Miramichi region of New Brunswick after having escaped while on escorted temporary absence in Moncton, New Brunswick. Legere was eventually convicted of murder as a result of his attacks after having escaped.

There are other individuals who, while not murderers, have nonetheless been convicted of serious offences such as sexual assault, which society today is demanding it be protected from. Bill C-36 does not offer any consolation, nor does it protect society as the minister suggests.

Half of the question of the protection of society cannot even be addressed at this point because of the absence of corresponding sentencing legislation. By moving certain time periods for mandatory release and temporary absences upwards, the minister is trying to toy with the

notion of sentencing in only an indirect way. This is what Canadians have been asking for some time now.

They do not want dangerous offenders let loose on the streets on day passes. They do not want temporary absences and day parole made so readily available.

At the time the minister introduced this bill, he said the Minister of Justice would be bringing in some changes to sentencing. So far this House can only rely on the half-hearted measures contained in this bill.

The bill attempts to draw a line through first time non-violent offenders and repeat dangerous offenders. More clearly, the bill tries to distinguish offences such as break and enter, robbery, violent sexual assaults and murder. For the so-called first time offender, the bill creates a revolving door through which these classes of inmates will go.

My colleague from Scarborough, the critic for the Solicitor General Official Opposition described it best when he noted that first time non-violent offenders will be mandatorily paroled after serving one-third of their sentence even if the National Parole Board believes they will commit further non-violent offences. Talk about a rubber stamp.

This measure of mandatory release for first time non-violent offenders is one of the major parts of this bill. I ask this House, does this measure promote public safety as the minister has repeatedly stated? They are non-violent offences, after all. We are talking about house break-ins, for example.

Let us turn our attention to this for a moment because more than one constituent in my riding of Hamilton West has put the following scenario to me. What happens when a thief is alone in the house and unexpectedly the homeowner returns after an evening out? What ensues? What could happen in the heat of the moment when the thief with the TV set or the stereo system under his or her arm encounters the homeowners? Would he drop it, politely say excuse me and walk out the door? Maybe a fight will occur and then the incident does become violent.

Obviously the minister is running the risk of an incident like this happening again because of releasing the inmate after only one-third of his or her sentence, thereby increasing the odds of a violent offence.

*Government Orders*

I want to congratulate my colleague from Scarborough West on one of his amendments relating to escorted temporary absences. In the bill, an inmate may seek an escorted temporary absence for medical, humanitarian and personal developmental reasons. My colleague rightly felt that personal development was too ambiguous a reason and moved an amendment which classified this last reason as personal development for rehabilitative reasons.

As my colleague also noted, there is an absence of legislation dealing with the rehabilitation of inmates. We are not helping those inmates who are within the prison walls. Much of the rehabilitation for inmates is done by sociologists and psychiatrists and other professionals.

There is another area in which the public wants action. It wants serious programs for inmates that will prepare those inmates for reintegration back into society after serving time in jail. That is an example of constructive results from programs on which you spend money.

In the past, parole devices such as escorted temporary absences and day parole were used to bring inmates back into society on a gradual basis. I can see there is some merit in that but I cannot ignore the danger signals.

• (1220)

I want to read into the record the information I have from the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 1990. In that year there were 234,836 reported cases of violent offences in Canada. These offences ranged from aggravated sexual assault to assault with a weapon, to discharging a firearm with intent of harm. Approximately 100,000 persons were charged.

In 1990 there were 1,000 reported cases of abduction in Canada. Roughly 100 persons were charged. There were 28,000 cases of robbery, with about 14,000 of those incidents involving firearms.

What I am saying, and this is my own belief, is that for violent crimes, inmates should have no access to day parole or escorted temporary absences and certainly never, under any circumstances, unescorted temporary absences.

I have introduced a private members' bill, Bill C-330, which is coming up for second reading debate in this highest court of the land very shortly. For violent offences, my bill would totally prohibit day parole or escorted and unescorted temporary absences for inmates unless for rehabilitative, medical or humanitarian reasons.

The one important caveat would be that for these

reasons I just mentioned, permission would have to be sought from the Governor in Council, the federal cabinet. If dangerous offenders such as murderers desire a temporary, escorted absence, they would have to make that appeal to the ministers across the floor. They would decide whether to give permission.

This would be accountable responsibility and would remove that decision-making process from the National Parole Board and the corrections commissioner. Canadians are telling me in my constituency of Hamilton West—and I am sure in constituencies across this land that they demand accountability. Another aspect of that—bill which will shortly come to the floor of the House is that for first degree, premeditated murderers, life in prison would mean just that: life. There would be no chance for parole.

The bill before us today, Bill C-36, does not address any of that. It still allows for a judicial review after 15 years and eligibility for parole after 25 years. It is called the "faint hope" clause. It would be faint hope for the premeditated first degree murderer.

People say to err is human and after time in jail the person would be allowed the faint hope of returning to the outside world. My constituents are telling me that for the victims of that murder, the victims of that first degree premeditated, violent act and for their families, there is no faint hope.

Bill C-36 does not deal with that. I am reminded of the parable of the prodigal son. It is the story of the lost son who returns and is spurned by his brother because of the lavish feast set for his return. After bitterly disappointing his family for many years, the son who had been there for his dad demanded an answer. His father tells him that there will be more joy in heaven upon the redemption of one sinner than upon the 99 who need no redemption.

For those convicted criminals who have not committed what I see as the most serious crime of murder, these individuals must always be given the opportunity to redeem themselves and reintegrate themselves into society. There is no question of that. But for those who have committed first degree premeditated murder the redemption for them, I believe, is not to be found within society but within themselves.



*Government Orders*

This bill before us today will certainly not get support from this side of the House. There is the lack of funding for those programs that are truly essential to deal with the root cause, the problems in our society today, in order to prevent the creation of more people to feed into a criminal justice system.

I am sure everyone would take great delight in closing down a federal prison or a jail in any community because there were not enough people to put in it. Would it not be a marvellous day one day to be able to do that?

When you think about it for a moment, the only way we are going to be able to do that is if life or property or the values of your neighbour are respected so that of course that crime is not allowed to happen in the first place.

Where do we start? We start with our youth. We direct our love and our compassion and our concern and our aid and do everything we possibly can to ensure that that young individual does not have to turn to a life of crime.

Sometimes it is not because they have turned to the life of crime, for whatever reason. It is because they have grown up in an environment that has caused them to turn to a life of crime. Has this government ever come forward with the fiscal policies or monetary policies or the programs for the children who are in need of help today in order that we can prevent filing them in a line and sending them off through a judicial system because they, through virtually no fault of their own, have had to turn to that life of crime?

Is it because we do not help those who are unable to find a job, because we have cut back on programs and services and the opportunities for those people who want a job, who want to be able to feed their families, whose children sit at home and must end up after school, sometimes not even in school, at the corner shopping mall? Is it because their parents did not have the money to provide or give them the opportunity to participate in the extra-curricular activities?

This government has presented for me personally, for my constituents in Hamilton West, for this side of the House, example after example after example over the last three and a half years, closing in on four years, of neglect of our communities.

I have always said that I have tried to bring Hamilton to Ottawa. Unfortunately what I have seen this government do is bring Ottawa to Hamilton. Be in your communities. Talk to your people. Get a feeling and understanding of what the root causes are of this problem. The government created Bill C-36 which is nothing more than weak-kneed rubber-stamping and toothless.

We have a future and our future is with our young people. Let us direct our resources at the programs that can ensure that we have youth who will one day hopefully grow up in a society that will not see all the problems which have caused the government to create a judicial system that is neglectful and that does not answer the questions that my constituents and other constituents want answers to today.

• (1230)

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Madam Speaker, I congratulate the member for Hamilton West and the previous speaker because both of them underlined looking at the causes of crime, something that this government is not doing.

My riding is in the Toronto area and his riding is in the Hamilton area. The bill says that the purpose of the bill is to contribute to a just, peaceful and safe society. It then says "assisting the rehabilitation of offenders and their re-integration into the community as law-abiding citizens through the provision of programs in penitentiaries and in the community".

The member has studied this bill quite closely. What is meant in this bill by community? If an offender from his riding, for example, commits a crime and then is rehabilitated back, would it be back to his community? The problem I am getting in my constituency is that people are being integrated back into the community, but the poor people of Parkdale—High Park are integrating former offenders from all over Ontario and from all over Canada.

Is it fair for the Parkdale community to be doing a job that other communities are supposed to be doing? Does the member have the same problem in Hamilton? How does he see the definition of community?

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Keyes:** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the member for Parkdale—High Park, for that question.

I suppose we can break it down by looking at the big picture. The big picture is that we seem to have a bill that is building and building and building. It gets larger and it is being adjusted and readjusted and worked on from a root or from its original conceptions, which I believe are very different today than they were years ago when we first started to put a law like this together. Maybe what we have to do is just set this bill aside, set this type of legislation or this direction aside for a moment. Let us start fresh. Let us clear our heads for a second.

This leads me into the second side of this issue. If there is a criminal who performs a criminal act, and we can break it down into the non-violent and violent, et cetera, and he performs that criminal act within the community of Parkdale—High Park or Hamilton West then the community deserves the payback from that individual who did the injustice in that community.

The member is absolutely right about where these criminals are being rehabilitated and where the day passes and parole and the rest of it is being carried out. We all know that it boils down to the almighty buck again with this government because it says that it is going to be more convenient. Go to a city and create a building where we can put all these individuals in order for them to try to rehabilitate themselves. What we are doing is we are taking these individuals, again lumping them all together with all their problems, where they are together in one building or one area, and then hopefully instructing them with books and what have you to rehabilitate themselves in order for eventual release back into the community, not into the community where the offence occurred, but in the community where the government has deemed that it will put all its resources together at one spot in order for that individual to be part of the lump of individuals that are eventually going to have to be released into the community.

**Mr. Flis:** An abandoned liquor store in my riding.

**Mr. Keyes:** An abandoned liquor store in Parkdale—High Park, the member says. That is just terrific. Where is the rehabilitation, a cot in an abandoned liquor store?

This bill does not put the emphasis on prevention and how to help an individual who is rehabilitatable, who has not committed the offence a second time but a first time, a non-violent offence, and went wrong somewhere along the way. Maybe we can help him or her adjust with the situation that created that individual to carry out that particular crime. Maybe they are very rehabilitatable, but let us rehabilitate them back into their communities where they are very familiar, where the crime took place. Maybe they broke a window at a grocery store and now part of that rehabilitation is to work in that grocery store and repay that grocer who had to pay for his window to be fixed.

Maybe that is the kind of rehabilitation we need but in concert of course with the programs that would be provided by psychiatrists and psychologists and all the other professional people who would help that individual.

Is that part of this bill? Is prevention part of this bill? Is money being directed or spent or part of this legislation being created in order to help those individuals who are currently in jail, who are in our society headed toward jail? No. That is what makes this bill a toothless, pathetic response to our communities.

**Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre):** Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on Bill C-36, an act to amend the correctional system in Canada and to set out in the government's mind, new ways of proceeding with problems in the penal and correctional system.

Our party has opposed this piece of legislation. I would like to spend a minute explaining why we oppose it and then explain what I think should be done at the community level.

The purpose of the bill according to the government is to reform the correctional legislation so that it better reflects the values and concerns of Canadians. Above all, these measures assert that the primary duty of the correctional system is the protection of the public.

Our response is that the vast majority of the bill either codifies existing procedures or restates what is already in the Penitentiary Act or the Parole Act. It is therefore a deceiving piece of legislation, pretending to do what it does not do, namely reform correctional legislation. It only tinkers with it.

*Government Orders*

The government states that it is to establish a statement of purpose and principles of parole and establish public safety as the paramount consideration in decisions relating to correctional release of inmates. Our response is that the bill pays lip-service to the protection of the public. The government is pretending that it is protecting "law and order", yet the bill exposes the public to danger in many different ways.

For someone like myself, as a member of Parliament who represents a very poor part of the country and a very poor riding, the question of parole, the question of institutionalization of inmates, the question of when people should be on the street, and when in an institution is not just an academic question, but is one which is paramount to the safety and concerns of citizens.

When we look at a piece of legislation such as this we must ask ourselves what is it that we are trying to accomplish here in Parliament.

• (1240)

What we are trying to do is to reach out and help people in communities to survive in what sometimes can be very dangerous situations.

This debate includes not only those people who are so-called law and order people and so-called reformers of the system, but also citizens who are afraid to step out of their houses and who are not quite sure why they are afraid to step out of their houses. Many are convinced that they should not be afraid to step out of the house. People are concerned that their children cannot get to school safely. People are concerned that they do not have a playground.

There are areas in my city in which people leave their kids on a bus. They send their kids on a bus a mile and one-half away rather than have them play in a large park right across from their apartment because of the drug dealing taking place.

The question of keeping people off the streets and in prisons and other institutions is by no means the only answer. In reviewing the legislation, I am struck by the limited approach of this government. One of the basic premises of our criticism and one that has taken place in this House since 1984, particularly since 1988 when I first came here, is the amount of money being taken out of

the system to deal with basic questions such as penal reform.

Look at the cuts in transfer payments, which we have discussed at great length, and the end product of the number of people who did not have access to proper training is one example. Look at the removal of the core area initiative with its many community infrastructures and how that affects downtown Winnipeg. Look at the withdrawal of training moneys for aboriginal youth. You realize you are setting up a situation in which people are going to be in difficulty.

First you have to ask yourself, what is the over-all situation affecting the behaviour of people? The over-all situation is that people have less and less support from their government. Government does not represent Ottawa or the legislature in Winnipeg or the city hall of main street. When you are talking about government you are talking about people who have formed an institution to doing something in common. When that institution no longer wishes to do things in common, claiming to be out of money, claiming that you are not a priority, claiming that it does not care whatever the language is, the reality is that once people feel that their community organizations as expressed through government cannot afford or support them, it leads to all sorts of anti-social behaviour.

Some of that is plain and simply withdrawing from society, giving up quietly. Other times the reaction is quite forceful and miserable. It leads to crime against property and against people. There is no justification for it. We have to believe in each other. We have to respect each other. We have to be careful never to set up a situation in which we blame the system and not assume that an individual must take responsibility for his or her actions. When a system leaves somebody, it is going to cause a reaction back. That is, the person will leave the system one way or the other. That is one part of it.

The other part of the problem is that once you set up that a person has done something contrary to the system, then you must have within government the capacity to respond properly. That responsibility is set upon on a number of principles. For example, the principle can be that we want to keep people off the streets and in prisons as long as possible. We do not want to let them out. We do not want them on the streets.

*Government Orders*

Canada, despite having one of the highest incarceration rates in the world and one of the highest numbers of people in prisons, has seen its city life degenerate one decade after another. You ask yourself, is this strategy working? Are we getting to have better neighbourhoods when we put more people in jail? The answer is no. Do we have a way of supporting people once they leave jail to ensure that they do not go back? The answer is no.

We do have people who are interested in this. We have people working in the John Howard Society. We have in Winnipeg on Ellice Avenue a new centre which deals with the questions of justice and crime and community support for communal action. These are important projects begging for money because the government does not see them as being important.

There are transitional points in which once a person leaves the prison system you wish that they could then be part of the community. The point is that this is rarely done in this society. Instead, we end up with pieces of legislation such as Bill C-36 because people are afraid and the government responds to their fear instead of responding to the underlying problems.

In Winnipeg North Centre, when I became a member of Parliament, I saw safety as one of the major issues. There is an easy route to go such as writing letters to the editor talking about crime in the streets, joining people decrying Asian street gangs. There are 101 easy ways to go. You can see it in this debate if you follow some of the government members. They are quite anxious to see people put back behind bars because of crime in the street.

I chose a different route, one I would like to share with the House. It is essential for the many here who are interested in this particular problem to understand that there are different ways of going about it.

Over a year ago I formed the Inner City Safety Council. This is the first opportunity used in the inner city to bring together different groups concerned about safety issues. We held a public meeting in May 1991 and had over 100 people in attendance. In Winnipeg's inner city it is not safe to go out some nights to attend meetings, so that was a big accomplishment.

People expressed their anger. There were so many

fronts on which they felt threatened. We took that long list and said we should begin to work with different community groups on this list. Some people worked on their own and some people came to the office of their member of Parliament looking for support.

We used the facilities of the office of the member to communicate with others so that everybody knew what the other was doing. For example, the question of Asian gangs, is a big issue in cities such as Vancouver and Toronto, but is not an issue in Winnipeg, except in the minds of the newspaper writers. The Asian leaders feel very strongly that they are mistreated and they wish to participate in the safety council so they have an opportunity to say to people, "Do not characterize us in terms of gangs. Do not characterize our youth in terms of gangs. Help us find a recreation site". You can go for blocks in the inner city of Winnipeg and not find a recreation site.

I have had people say to me that it is a long way from the federal government, but it is not. The core area initiative, which is partly sponsored by the federal government, was about to embark on a recreation strategy. If you cannot spend time in the evening and time on the weekend with children from communities, particularly in communities of new Canadians in which people are working 60 hours a week for \$5 an hour trying to make ends meet, if you cannot bring the children and youth into the community, by definition you are pushing them out and asking for trouble. Therefore, we work closely with the Asian community to overcome this image and to build some recreational support for it.

Second, in the Wolesley area there is a concern about violence against individuals, violence against gays, violence against women walking home, violence within families. We have had a very successful approach that has led to other levels of government having safety evaluations of school areas to inform people how to make their streets safer. In all three major business districts we have had community police offices open up, on Selkirk Avenue, Sargent Avenue, Ellice Avenue and down on Broadway. In one particular case, a businessman is paying for the space himself to make sure the community policeman is there.

*Government Orders*

Those community policemen have made a big difference. There are a number of volunteers who work with them. In one of the offices there are 80 volunteers. I can say that as someone working as a politician in the inner city, 80 volunteers is a lot of people. They work seven days a week trying to help out. That is a municipal role, not my role. On the other hand, these community police officers are seen as being outside the mainstream of their police force. Therefore, they turn to us for support so that the police chief and the senior district police officers know they are doing important work and that they are supported by the community.

• (1250)

In another neighbourhood, in another community, there is a problem with drinking, which leads to dysfunctional behaviour on the street which is very upsetting to the long-term residents. We have to fight to deal with substance abuse. If you go through the federal government and try to find a department that understands the contents of Chinese cooking wine, for example, try to trace back how Chinese cooking wine gets into the country and you cannot find it. Try to read the labels, which are not even in English and French but only in Chinese, and you wonder how these products find their way to Winnipeg.

There is a role for the federal government to help these groups solve these problems.

You can then go on to the problem of street prostitution. In one neighbourhood, in the Lord Selkirk area, people regularly drive through the neighbourhoods looking for young men and women, anywhere from age 12 and up. It is very discouraging for the parents and the community groups trying to fight this problem to find that they do not have the legislative framework to deal with street prostitution. They have no way of saying to the people driving through the neighbourhoods that they should not be driving through this neighbourhood looking for our children.

As a result of a public demonstration and a press conference, I wrote to the Solicitor General. He wrote back a long letter explaining why this could not be done under present circumstances. To the credit of the minister, he expressed an interest in this problem and indicated his willingness to get involved with a demonstration project if the neighbours found one appropriate to the government. This is the sort of response which is necessary from the government.

It is not necessarily a large battle, but it is one so

important to the infrastructure and the stability of a neighbourhood. It is more important to spend your time providing a legislative framework for dealing with child prostitution than it is bringing in Bill C-36, which walks away from the dilemmas being faced at the community level.

On the question of youth in the aboriginal community, those of you who know the western Canadian penal system will know that there is a heavy over-representation of aboriginal youth in our prisons. This is totally unacceptable and efforts must be made at the community level through drop-out programs and through other interesting projects to ensure that aboriginal youth have a future in our cities, that they are properly trained, that they have jobs and that there are education opportunities for them.

Last year, a group of youth from this community working with the Native Alcoholism Council of Manitoba came up with the idea that it should have a sobriety pow-wow. Without any particular organizational skills, the group sat down and worked out a weekend pow-wow. Forty-five hundred people showed up to celebrate sobriety. They are coming back this year to put together another program. I would challenge other members of the House to find a program that would help these young people support the reference for a sober family life and a sober personal life. It is fundamental to improving conditions within the aboriginal community in the inner cities.

There are a number of initiatives that can be taken at the community level. I look around Winnipeg North Centre where people are concerned about safety in the streets and turn to the federal government. Many of them want harsher treatment because they are frustrated and angry. Many of them want to know that the person living next door is not out illegally. They want to know that the person who has been let out on parole is a safe person. They want to know all these things and we cannot walk away from that.

They also want to know that there is a place for their children in recreation. They also want to know that if a senior is walking to the bus stop, there is enough of a support system, that there are police around and that the municipalities are not being squeezed so much by the federal government that there is nothing left for them.

*Government Orders*

These are the sorts of things that we should be doing to help people. We cannot do it in a legislative framework without money and without commitment. The old cliché is put your money where your mouth is. You go out and you help people and you do not just give them the image that you are helping them without any of the particular support systems that they all need.

I am sure that this is not the first speech in the House asking the government to be more active in the area of penal reform. There are many organizations that have put forward the case more eloquently than I possibly could have.

Members of Parliament have to realize that the price we pay for the collapse of the social network is more than we could have imagined. We look at the fear that is not only involved with traditional poor communities in which there has always been a fear on the streets, but into families. Now we are into family violence.

For violence against women, which is an emerging issue, for violence against gays, for people gathering late at night and being attacked randomly by gangs, these issues have to be addressed honestly and openly and the different perspectives we bring to bear in the debate must be shared in such a fashion that at least there is a coalition that is willing to deal with it.

I hope that by sharing my small example in the House today of the Inner City Safety Council, people will come to realize that there are ways to be optimistic and there are people willing to deal with these issues both from a traditional recognition of the need that people be punished for behaviour contrary to the Criminal Code, and also very much so that people wish to have their communities maintained and supported.

I thank you for the opportunity of joining in this debate and wish the government would withdraw this legislation in favour of more appropriate action.

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Winnipeg has added a very important element to this debate on this corrections legislation.

It is an element that perhaps was not addressed terribly well. I do not think it was addressed very much at all in the actual piece of legislation. In terms of the field, the area that he has addressed, generally called the one

of crime prevention, is one that we have not addressed well as a society.

We have a long way to go. There is a little piece of crime prevention that these correction amendments try to address. When you start off in this vicious cycle of crime, you start off with a criminal act and you have a police investigation and then you have the charges. You have the trial, you have the conviction, you have the sentencing and then you have the serving of time in a facility.

You have this attempt at rehabilitation which in many cases succeeds. In far too many cases it does not. The offender is back on the street and then you are in the area of prevention of crime before another crime is permitted.

Society can get a lot of bang for its buck in crime prevention, and this bill does not address it. There was the case in Chicago. It took 20 years to generate the statistics but back in the 1960s and early 1970s there was a great investment in day care for residents of the inner city in Chicago.

Only lately have sociologists tracked the crime activity in the area involving the individuals who were able to participate in the day care program. I do not have the exact statistics but the level of criminal activity by those generally in the community is somewhere up around 10 per cent or 15 per cent. For those who participated in the day care program, their rate is something like 0.9 per cent. That is a phenomenal difference. The investment in day care back in the 1960s has changed the lives of almost every one of those kids who were in the day care program.

I want to ask the hon. member who just spoke, how does he feel about the current federal fiscal restraints, which are impacting on social welfare programs, and about what dollars we are putting into crime prevention? How does he feel those fiscal restraints are impacting on our ability to address crime prevention outside of that cycle of criminal activity that I tried to describe?

**Mr. Walker:** The issue of social program cutbacks cannot be stressed too much in this debate. People are saying: "You are soft in the head when you talk about this. It is really just walking away from the problem of people being criminals".

*Government Orders*

Let us be practical. Let us use one practical example. When the government changed the UI legislation, it made it nearly impossible for people who were not UI recipients to receive training.

• (1300)

If you are an aboriginal youth leaving school somewhere between grade eight and grade eleven and you seek out a training opportunity and you are asked about your UI, you do not have an opportunity for UI because you have never had an opportunity for a job. How do you get into the system?

There are several training projects in downtown Winnipeg which were effectively reaching the aboriginal youth which have had to change their focus to find UI recipients. The government is leading itself away from the problem because it will not finance the proper servicing.

Rumours abound and the government hints it is going to have great new training programs and so forth. The reality is every month that passes, someone else misses an opportunity to be trained to enter the labour force. Projections in the 1990s are that one of four entrants in the western Canadian labour market is going to be an aboriginal youth.

How can you train a labour force that cannot access the training programs? It is a phenomenal problem that nobody wishes to discuss. If you are not trained, you cannot get an entry level job. What are you going to end up doing? You do not have to be a genius to figure out that you pick up a stereo some place and go sell it some other place. You do not have to be a genius to figure that you will become involved in break and enters, stealing bicycles or whatever.

If you have to feed yourself, you have to feed yourself or you enter into prostitution. Let us be practical. If there is not an opportunity to earn an income legitimately, people have to stay alive somehow and one of the options they choose, unfortunately, is criminal activity. Rather than dwell upon the criminal activity, the organization of government should be dwelling upon the reality that we are not reaching out.

This gives us an opportunity to comment on one other problem. The government has responded to a longstanding request to have an office of correctional investigator

with authority to initiate investigations rather than take them at the request of offenders.

I wanted to say it is this sort of opportunity missed that makes this legislation so weak. Here we have a public problem. We all treat it as a public problem. We are discussing it in Parliament. We have an opportunity to open it up, to have people approach an investigator with specific complaints, and the government pulls away from the public dimension and makes it solely a person who reports to the Solicitor General. This is an opportunity lost to make the public more aware of some of the concerns of the Solicitor General and of an investigator.

Our party has worked on this since the mid-1970s. We were hoping that this particular legislation would be an opportunity to make it an officer reporting to Parliament. That way we could, from time to time with a committee, hear about these issues firsthand and make it a little bit simpler for the public to get involved.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I would like to advise the House that we have now completed five hours of debate at third reading of Bill C-36. We will now continue with 10-minute speeches which will not be followed by the usual period of questions or comments.

**Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing):** Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that there are serious problems of crime in Canada, serious concerns Canadians have about the level of criminal activity and real concerns on the part of those who have been unfortunate enough to be victims of crimes. Their concerns, interest and views are not being considered.

Once the government decided to look at the question of the detention of offenders and the release of offenders, one would have thought that the government would have looked at how best to solve the problems of criminal activity and that the government would have asked what causes criminal activity and how best it can prevent it.

Instead, the government has pursued its normal route which is not to look to prevention, but to look to what we do after criminal activity takes place and look to ways we might deter criminal activity, not by any mechanisms of prevention, but by mechanisms of punishment; not by asking what we can do to ensure our society is better for people so that they do not turn to criminal activity, but to blame them and punish them if they do turn to criminal activity.

*Government Orders*

A good example of this arose last week with the presentation by the Minister of National Health and Welfare of his brighter futures budget which was designed to address the concerns and the problems of children at risk.

All those advocates for children and all those social policy groups that face the problems of children and attempt to help children on a daily basis and attempt to address the concerns of poverty pointed out to the minister that a national child care program was the single most important vehicle through which to assist children at risk.

Needless to say, the minister did not pursue that route and went on to engage in what is partly a public relations exercise and what is clearly a band-aid approach, and not a very effective band-aid approach at that, to the concerns of children living at risk.

If we want to look at where this approach takes us, this approach which does not deal with prevention but deals with punishment, at finances or resources available for the building of prisons but not available for community projects, for social services to ensure that crime does not take place, we only have to look south of the border. If we ever needed to be reminded of the problems of a society with a very large gap between rich and poor, with a very large lower class, with a large group, millions of people whose concerns are not addressed, high unemployment and so on, we could look at the examples in Los Angeles of where that neglect leads a society.

In Canada the gap between rich and poor is getting larger, not smaller. Those who are poor are getting poorer and those who are rich are getting richer. Unemployment remains at extremely high and totally unacceptable levels.

It is no wonder that, faced with despair, with lack of opportunity, with no hope, some Canadians turn to crime. It is not enough, as this bill tries to do, to stress that the government does not have the money to deal with crime, that the approach taken is one of ensuring that through a competitiveness approach people will find jobs and will therefore be able to sustain themselves and their families.

It is not a question of whether the resources are there. It is a question of when we are going to spend those resources and when we are going to assist people rather than make life more difficult for them.

The Canadian Police Association, in its brief to the committee, was quite clear on how to deal with criminal activity and how to reduce it. I am sure we would all agree that the police forces across Canada have a great deal of experience and expertise in dealing with the issue and understanding why people commit crimes, in meeting criminals on a daily basis and learning about their problems and their needs.

The Canadian Police Association said the answer to the crime problem is simple. We must eliminate poverty, hunger, prejudice, violence, drug use and mental instability. Additionally, we should provide quality education for all and stable employment for everyone.

Why would the government not listen to the Canadian Police Association? Why would it continue with its approach to keep prisoners in jail longer without any effective rehabilitation programs, without any approach at the provincial level, at the level of providing people with adequate incomes in order to maintain themselves and their families? Why would the government not pursue an approach of providing hope and a future for Canadians?

Criminologists would point out the same approach. One criminologist who appeared before the committee, Irvin Waller of the University of Ottawa, said the exclusive reliance on cops, courts and corrections is not sufficient to stem the tide. Over and over that evidence is being presented. We know that is the case and we know that prevention is what we must do in order to deal with problems with crime...

The Canadian Police Association said we must educate our youth about all drugs and the dangerous results if they abuse these substances. In order to accomplish this goal, someone is going to have to jar federal, provincial and municipal governments into providing funds to deal with this danger. Responsibility is passed from federal to provincial to municipal authorities with no additional funds being granted.

• (1310)

It is going to take an investment in people. It is going to take an investment in Canadians to ensure that we really and truly address our concerns and our problems about crime in Canada. This bill does not even begin to address crime from a prevention point of view. Surely that is the only approach that will work.



*Government Orders*

The bill raises some issues about victims and the treatment of victims. We all know that the victims of crimes have very legitimate concerns and worries. They have not been listened to. Their concerns have not received a response. They have basically been forgotten by the criminal justice system. They have demanded leadership. They have demanded that their views, their concerns and their emotional problems be addressed. They do demand harsher penalties because at the moment that is all they can get from this government.

What we need is a concerted approach to deal with criminal activity, not the approach that this bill presents.

Just in my closing minutes, we have to ask ourselves, bearing in mind the concerns that Canadians have with criminal activity and the level of crime in Canada, whether or not this bill will make Canada a safer place, whether or not it will reduce criminal activity, and whether or not it solves any of the problems that Canada is facing with regard to criminal activity.

Clearly this bill will not. Clearly the witnesses at the committee pointed out that it would not do so. Why would this bill be introduced? Why would we be introducing a bill at this time which will not deal with our crime problems in Canada? It will not attack the root causes of criminal activity in Canada such as poverty, desperation and loss of hope which this government has compounded by cutting funding to provinces, downloading to the provinces so that they do not have the funds to address these concerns either. Why would the government do this?

Presumably it is to show Canadians that this government is getting tough on crime by responding to that need for harsher penalties rather than addressing the core issues. It is a hoax on Canadians to address the issue in this way. We should be addressing the issue at its core. We should be trying to solve the problem, not trying to perpetuate the concerns and the demand for harsher penalties without dealing with the core problems of poverty, social unrest and despair.

This bill will not help address the concerns of Canadians about crime. It will not help the case of victims. It will not begin to address the serious concerns we face in this area today.

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to follow the hon. member for Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing since he is my twin for the Voyageurs Program. I know that our students are going to enjoy the twinning. The students from Parkdale—High Park will be visiting Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing and his students will be visiting Parkdale—High Park where they will see that we are a just society and that we have a real community feeling. I compliment him on his remarks.

I always look at the purpose of any new bill. The purpose of this bill is "to contribute to the maintenance of a just, peaceful and safe society". Is that not beautiful?

Now let us look at the reality. The purpose goes on to say:

—assisting the rehabilitation of offenders and their reintegration into the community as law abiding citizens through the provision of programs in penitentiaries and in the community.

I want to come back to the word "community". I looked at the definitions in the bill and they define what an institution is, what a day parolee is, what service is, what a visitor is, and what an offender is. But nowhere in the bill is community defined.

One of the main purposes of this bill is to reintegrate ex-offenders into the community. Whose community? My community of Parkdale—High Park? When a serious offender has murdered a whole family or a serial killer is from another city, is it fair that my community of Parkdale—High Park has to rehabilitate that person?

There is no legislation federally, provincially or municipally to protect society, to protect innocent people who go to work daily, who send their children to school daily. There is an oversaturation of group homes, correctional homes, rehabilitation homes or whatever we want to call them. Parkdale has become a dumping ground. The people of Parkdale—High Park are not putting up with it any more. They are telling that through me to the rest of Canada.

I stress again, let us define community. We can have two or three correctional homes within blocks of each other. There is no federal legislation to limit the number of rehabilitation homes that we can have in one com-

*Government Orders*

munity. There is no provincial legislation to limit the number of rehab homes in one community.

The cities have legislation, something to the effect that they cannot be closer than 800 feet or 800 metres from each other. This means we could have one on every block in a constituency like Parkdale—High Park.

All the experts drew up this legislation and all the experts went through all the stages and not one thing will improve. The streets will still be unsafe. Parents will still be afraid to send their children to school. This is why we are voting very strongly against this bill.

I appeal to the government to look at what it means by community, define it and put it in the legislation. Our community has had enough. It is to the point where it has called in the Guardian Angels to patrol the streets because it feels that the officials, politicians, police and law enforcers have lost control. The people are taking the law into their own hands. This government does not see that. The government cannot understand why there was such violence on Yonge Street in the city of Toronto just a couple of weeks ago.

A mother phoned me just the other night. Her son was picked up for theft. The mother has a good job and earns a good income, but Revenue Canada was so insensitive that it garnisheed her wages for five years of back income tax and did not notify her. She does not have enough money after paying for her rent and food to give her son spending money when he goes to school. As a result he stole. He should not have done it. He knows that.

This is how an insensitive government through a department like Revenue Canada operates. No one in that department would sit down with this mother and say: "Okay, we realize you can't pay \$1,700 monthly. Let's spread it over a longer period. Let's reduce the amount of payments". There is no one in the bureaucracy that has that sensitivity.

As a matter of fact, because of the cutbacks of this government in the Public Service there is such insensitivity to people that our constituency offices are being flooded with frustrated people who cannot get through to the bureaucracy and if they do, it will not listen to them.

• (1320)

I had a case recently where a person called because he could not get through to the UI department. He ran out of money completely. He threatened to set himself aflame in front of my constituency office. Thank God my assistant was sharp enough and quick enough to get help for this person. Otherwise he could very well have set himself aflame.

I do not think that this government realizes what is happening out there in all its departments. Be it immigration, employment or Revenue Canada, it has lost contact with the people.

One used to be able to go to Immigration and get help from a bureaucrat to fill out an application form. What has this government done? Now one fills out an application and sends it in. Six weeks later, or maybe six months later, one might hear from the government.

Is it any wonder that the Canadian public is angry, is frustrated and is threatening to set itself aflame. These are the root causes of crime in our country, especially in our big cities. This bill is not going to correct them.

The Prime Minister should change his ways. He should listen to the people out there. He should not spend \$22 million on some donkey road show. That \$22 million should be used to hire a few more public servants who will sit down with the people face to face and listen to their troubles. There is no one out there who will do this. These people are coming to our constituency offices and our constituency offices cannot handle the volume.

When I was a member between 1979 and 1984 I had one person running my constituency office. For five years one person handled all the immigration cases, the Revenue Canada cases, the UI cases, and you name it.

Then I had a four-year break; from 1984 to 1988 I had a sabbatical. I went back to education and enjoyed that very much. From 1988 to 1992 I have been back in politics. Now I have two people in my constituency office in Parkdale—High Park and they cannot handle the volume.

The Prime Minister and the government of the day should wake up, look at what is happening in this country and look at what they have done to this country.

## S. O. 31

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

[*Translation*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The parliamentary secretary, on a point of order.

**Mrs. Tardif:** Madam Speaker, does the House agree to call it 1.34 p.m.?

[*English*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to call it 1.34 p.m.?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It being 1.34 p.m., I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1.34 p.m. the House took recess.

## AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*English*]

## NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, May 10 to May 16 is National Police Week. I would like to call on the House of Commons to reaffirm and renew its support for police forces across this country by responding to some of the many challenges currently facing the police community.

Parliament must review the law governing electronic surveillance to ensure that police can effectively carry out pretrial investigations which will both provide admissible evidence and ensure safety to undercover police.

We must review the law governing proceeds of crime to allow reimbursement of police investigation expenses and to invest in crime prevention.

We must also make other financial and procedural resources available to police forces in efforts to keep our communities safer and well policed.

Better policing is part of the solution to many of our urban crime problems. I hope that all members will join with me in saluting Canada's policing authorities.

\* \* \*

## TIM HORTON CHILDREN'S FOUNDATION

**Mr. Terry-Clifford (London—Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, children going to summer camp is as much a part of Canadian life as hockey. Going to camp, however, costs money and unfortunately not all Canadian children have an opportunity to share in this experience.

One truly great Canadian, Tim Horton, recognized this fact and dreamed of creating a camp for underprivileged children. That dream has come true through the efforts of the Tim Horton Children's Foundation. This charitable organization operates children's camps in Parry Sound, Ontario; Tatamagouche, Nova Scotia; and Kananaskis, Alberta, with plans for one in Quebec.

To assist these camps, Tim Horton operators from coast to coast donated all the moneys from their coffee sales for a 24-hour period. This year's Camp Canada Day raised more than a half million dollars across the nation.

Together with members of Parliament who represent these camps, I call upon this House to give sincere congratulations to Tim Horton store owners, their staff and customers for making a summer dream for 2,000 children come true.

Tim Horton would be proud.

\* \* \*

## JOB TRAINING

**Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie):** Mr. Speaker, the government's latest propaganda piece better known as the Agenda for Prosperity is replete with doublespeak and flimflam. There is continual reference to retraining in the flyer: "Skills training and retraining are necessary tools in a competitive job market". "Promote training and learning". "I trained for a better job". "We can sell to the world".