

fact that the Solicitor General shakes his head in the negative.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: On division.

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

* * *

PAROLE ACT

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL AD HOC MEMBERS TO NATIONAL PAROLE BOARD

The House resumed, from Monday, December 3, consideration of Bill C-191, to amend the Parole Act, as reported (with an amendment) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs; and motions Nos. 1 and 2 (Mr. Howard).

Mr. Reg Stackhouse (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, one of the questions that arises from the legislation before us is, will it give us more of the same? When the government came back to the House after the October 30, 1972, election this was a question that many Canadians were asking themselves generally about this government. They hoped that, chastened as it was by the result of the election, we would get something different. But increasingly both public and parliament have come to realize we are getting more of the same. We feel this is true in terms of the Parole Board and of the policies of the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand). We are getting more of the same.

As we are called upon to approve the appointment of ten ad hoc members to the board, we also wonder whether this will simply mean more of the same kind of parole policy that we have had in the past. Indeed, one might wonder whether the legislation to appoint ten additional members to the Parole Board means more of the same in the sense of appointing more ex-Liberal candidates to government office. Most of all, we are wondering whether the appointment of ten more members to the Parole Board will mean more of the same in terms of providing parole to inmates who should not receive parole.

One of the matters that has brought the parole Board and the system into disrepute in many parts of Canada has been the maladministration of parole by the board. In saying that I do not want any member of the House to think I am calling into question the principle of parole—that is an easy misrepresentation through which the Parole Board itself can be defended when it should not be defended. What I am questioning is not the parole system itself, but the maladministration of that system by the board. In raising this point I think of such example as the notorious case of the Nelles kidnapers. Ralph Cameron and Peter Burns were paroled in July, 1971, after serving 20 months of their ten-year sentence. In November, 1971, John Rogan was paroled after serving 24 months of a

Parole Act

12-year sentence. Michael Whiteside was released after serving 26 months of a 12-year sentence.

A Toronto barrister, Glen How, wrote the chairman of the National Parole Board to protest, he said, against the shortness of the terms that these men were obliged to serve. Referring to their crime, he said that this was a cold-blooded, premeditated act carefully planned by people who knew better. What did the chairman of the National Parole Board say in reply to that letter? In his letter to Glen How he said:

The board does have power to grant parole ahead of normal eligibility date—which is one-third of their sentence—if there are exceptional circumstances about the case. We are of the opinion that there were such exceptional circumstances in this case, and that it was more of a stupid prank than a real act of kidnapping.

That is the attitude of the man who was then chairman, and still is chairman of the Parole Board. So if we are going to appoint ten more men to the board, we have to ask whether we are going to receive more of the same. Is this the kind of thing we can expect? As Mr. How asked of the chairman of the National Parole Board in his second letter to the chairman:

To characterize a crime as a "stupid prank" does not change the nature or quality of the act. Was the woman seized and held against her will? Was it intended by the perpetrators? Did they try to get a ransom? Was it carefully and exhaustively planned? Were they teenage children or men of age of responsibility?

So very frequently over the years that kind of maladministration of parole has been the record of this board, for the example I have cited is not an isolated exception. I should like to quote as follows from an editorial that appeared in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of July 23, 1973:

There are times nowadays when the proceedings in Canadian criminal courts seem to follow a script written by Groucho Marx.

There was, for example, the trial in Montreal recently of Thomas Oszlansky. Last June, Oszlansky had a slight brush with the law. Armed with a rifle, he held up a delicatessen, herded four employees into a walk-in refrigerator, and shot all four of them dead. He also shot a security guard in the head, but in this instance his aim was less accurate and the victim has recovered.

At the trial, Oszlansky pleaded guilty to non-capital murder and was sentenced to life imprisonment. But the talk at the hearing was less of putting him in jail than of getting him out.

Defence counsel said that application would be made for Oszlansky's earliest possible release. The prosecutor agreed that eventual parole should be considered.

● (2140)

The editorial continues:

This is strange talk to hear after a massacre such as Oszlansky committed. It is still wierder in view of the psychiatric evidence in the case. The psychiatrists advised that while Oszlansky was not legally insane, he was subject to mental disorders aggravated by drugs; he suffered from hallucinations and was apparently inclined to go berserk when he imagined anyone was laughing at him. The picture suggest a criminal psychopath capable of any extreme of violence and liable to go off the rails again and again.

Against this background, it is hard to understand how even a defence lawyer could speak of early release—and still harder to understand how a responsible prosecutor could give the idea even qualified support. The only sensible way to handle a killer like this is to keep him confined in either a maximum security penitentiary or an equally secure mental institution for the rest of his life—or until highly qualified, cautious and responsible experts are satisfied that he is no longer dangerous. We can only hope—for the safety of everyone—that the National Parole Board will not