

Delta (Mr. Reynolds) concerning Mr. Glen Jansen, may I state that this man was serving an aggregate term of eight years, four months and two days for kidnapping and armed robbery starting in February, 1971. Before being sentenced to penitentiary, he had been paroled twice while serving short sentences in provincial institutions. Although during his last incarceration he appeared to have gained insight into his problem and made efforts at rehabilitating himself, the board did not see fit to grant parole at his eligibility date which had been set, according to law, at November 22, 1973. The National Parole Board granted him a day parole to a community correctional centre in October, 1974, for a period of four months, which was renewed on a few occasions. He was working for the Vancouver city works department, and reports from the Burrard Centre were positive.

He did not return to his institution at his curfew time on June 25 and was declared unlawfully at large and his day parole was terminated. It is true that he is a suspect in the murder of Mrs. Freda Boxbaum. However, he has not been charged to date.

Both the Chairman of the Parole Board and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the board takes great care in granting parole. When making a decision as to whether parole should be granted or not, the National Parole Board and the parole service hold an appreciable amount of background information on each parole applicant which includes: first, a police report containing the circumstances surrounding the investigation as well as recommendations as to whether the person convicted should be granted parole; second, a copy of the criminal record based on fingerprints; third, a complete personal and family history; fourth, detailed reports on the individual's day to

*Adjournment Debate*

day activities within the penal institution; fifth, psychological evaluations prepared by institutional authorities; sixth, a thorough assessment of what is available to the individual in the community where he is planning to live following release. In addition each case is individualized by following up any special factors which appear to require attention.

Let me state that the National Parole Board is seized with an onerous responsibility. On one hand they are required by law to use parole as an aid in the re-integration of inmates into society. On the other hand they must ensure the protection of the community. In trying to exercise their discretion to meet these two goals, they are faced with a particularly difficult assignment, namely, attempting to anticipate the future behaviour of those persons they place on parole. For this reason they are especially cautious in extending parole to individuals whose behaviour suggests that they might be a threat to the community.

As for the recent budget cuts, the cutback has been for the most part with respect to two new institutions, but we are still proceeding with several other priority institutions. In any event I would like to point out that the building program of the Canadian Penitentiary Service has not been progressing at the rate we had anticipated because of problems of site selection and local approval.

I can assure the House that there will be no relaxation of security within the Canadian Penitentiary Service as a result of the budget cuts. The internal security arrangements in penitentiaries are currently under close examination, and all necessary and possible steps will be taken to ensure an adequate level of security, especially to the staff who have day to day contact with inmates.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.29 p.m.