

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Paul Dick (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall all questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 31

NORTHLAND BANK SITUATION

Mr. Speaker: I am in receipt of a notice under Standing Order 31 from the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent).

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, you will recall that last Friday I brought to the attention of the House my intention to move a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 31. During the proceedings on Friday you indicated your view that the subject matter, namely the crisis faced by the Northland Bank and the implications should it go belly-up, to put it bluntly, for the banking sector in general was, to use your words, a genuine emergency. You indicated at that time that you were not prepared to accept the motion, but clearly the logic of your argument was that if we did not soon have that subject before the House for debate, you would be prepared to recognize that emergency in the form of a debate. Therefore, I gave notice earlier today of my intention to move the same motion and if you make the appropriate ruling in that context, I would be very happy indeed to do so.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member for Oshawa. He did indeed give me the appropriate notice and I did indeed make such a comment on Friday, and I intended it deliberately. I think the Hon. Member will know that it was precisely for the reasons for my reservations regarding the question of urgency that I was particularly interested in hearing the comments, and clarifying what they were, that were made by the Parliamentary Secretary. Given the Government's intention to call that matter for debate tomorrow at three o'clock, apparently, I take it all Hon. Members will have an opportunity to put on the record—

Mr. Deans: There will be no debate.

Mr. Speaker:—their views, I suggest to the Hon. Member that, yes, I continue to hold the same views which I held on Friday with regard to the emergency provision of Standing Order 31. However, it is my view today, given what I heard three minutes ago—

Mr. Deans: Which we heard for the first time.

Criminal Code Amendments

Mr. Speaker:—that there is not now sufficient need to vary the proceedings for today in order to allow a debate under Standing Order 31.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PAROLE ACT, PENITENTIARY ACT, PRISONS AND REFORMATORIES ACT, AND CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motions of Mr. Beatty that Bill C-67, an Act to amend the Parole Act and the Penitentiary Act, and Bill C-68, and Act to amend the Parole Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act, and the Criminal Code, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes I have left I would like to indicate part of the reason we are not supporting these two Bills. Just before lunch I was making the point that the Parole Board is going to have a difficult time handling the increased load resulting from passage of these two Bills. Having spoken to inmates in the penitentiary in my home constituency, I can say that they feel very strongly that the things being put forward in these Bills will increase the frustration and the reaction to that frustration in the institution. As well, it will affect the surrounding community, in this case Prince Albert. Consequently, we should take into account the fact that if these Bills are passed we may be causing an increase in tension and possible violence in the institution.

Officials have told me that inmates who would probably be able to use mandatory supervision have refused to do so because they do not feel that the kind of services they get when they are out on mandatory supervision are adequate. They would rather put in the extra three or four years than go out under circumstances which do not contribute to their return to the community and to society. Many communities are quite willing to work with inmates if the services were available to help integrate them into the community. Therefore, our main point is to question whether it is better to spend \$40,000 to keep one inmate in an institution or to spend it on services in the surrounding communities in order to help integrate these people back into society. We should increase the scope of these Bills so that we can provide the services needed to make mandatory supervision work.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions or comments? Debate?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.