

remember: "Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to the fact that it is 10 o'clock." Immediately, I was asked by all the parties whether I could not make my remarks immediately to expedite the third reading of Bill C-2. I agreed with pleasure.

I made my remarks as brief as possible as I was anxious to co-operate with my colleagues and in order that the bill could be dealt with tonight. However, the House deprived us of our right to speak to get it over with the bill tonight. It is then on the basis of this same point of order that my colleague for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) would like in his turn, even if he has only brief remarks to make, to have at least the privilege of making them; otherwise this would mean that I have been misled. I said I would be brief—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order. I would point out to the hon. member that, as far as the Chair is concerned, this point of order has already been clarified and I do not see, unless the House decides otherwise, any need to come back on our decision to sit beyond 10 o'clock and how the Chair can prevent the member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) from presenting his point of view.

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my hon. colleagues.

In my opinion, this bill is quite important. I have had no opportunity to make my remarks before today. I have personally received many letters concerning certain paroled people who are well known in my riding. It was my duty to rise at this stage of the debate and contrary to the statements of the parliamentary secretary about this bill, my remarks will dwell mainly on the parole system. The *Journal de Montréal* of November 21, 1971, on the occasion of a convention of the Quebec Police Association reported that the chiefs of police were "fed up"—this is their own words—with the Parole Board attitude. Me too!!

Yet, when we are blamed for not attending the committee meetings which studied the parole system and ignored the recommendation already made to the government by the Quebec Police Association, it seems to me that we are wasting our time in this committee, for we know very well at the present time that some things are taking bad turns in this field.

I have here a pamphlet published by the Parole Board which states on page 3 or 4—the pages are not numbered—and I quote:

Parole in Canada—

—The inmate should normally complete one third of his sentence before he can obtain parole.

Mr. Speaker, on May 12, I received a letter—I refrain from giving names, but this is a patent case—in which the author told me, and I quote:

We have just learned that—, an inmate at the prison of—, is going to receive permission to go outside to work and will have to come back to the prison only on evenings and weekends.

This case is really shocking. This is something that is taking place in the Eastern Townships.

I keep on quoting:

Presently, he goes out as he pleases, accompanied by a guard. It is revolting to consider that the taxpayers' money is used to hire a private chauffeur for this prisoner. Why did he not remain in a

prison of— It would be interesting to find out how he could manage to be transferred to—

Why is it that some persons can thus dispose of the life of their spouse, and in spite of an 8 year sentence given in October 1971 by Judge—, he is released six months later, even though a parole investigation has been refused in February 1972? Is this the only punishment inflicted on a man guilty of murdering his wife, a few months in jail with as many furloughs as he wants,—all this with the taxpayers' money? We protest against such a use of revenues—

Mr. Speaker, I could go on *ad infinitum*, citing similar cases. The parliamentary secretary can well say that his bill will bring improvements, but some public agencies, police forces, public bodies in Canada have known of some premature releases. Even if a prisoner is supposed to serve a third of his sentence, we have evidence showing that prisoners sentenced to 8, 10, 12, 15 years imprisonment have come out three or four months after their conviction.

Here is an article published in the *Journal de Montréal* of November 21, 1971, and I quote:

The Quebec Association of Police Chiefs is fed up with the Parole Board. It feels that it is too generous towards repeaters.

Mr. Guy-Paul Simard, vice-president of the Association and chief of police of Trois-Rivières, told us yesterday following a meeting of the council that a resolution was unanimously passed in order to draft an exhaustive brief on the matter.

We would like the Board to give a little more consideration to criminal records and show a little more rationality in its proceedings, Mr. Simard said. He added, we have been deploring for some time now the death of policemen killed in the performance of their duties because of individuals who had benefited from the leniency of parole.

Director Simard also mentioned that in many cases, especially in armed robberies policemen were shot at by gangsters who, and I repeat, should have been behind bars.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a complete set of documents, correspondence and even editorials from newspapers, from television and radio, which all express opinions against the bill we want to railroad through tonight.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), the following amendment:

That Bill C-2 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for the purpose of reviewing clause 44 and particularly paragraph (a)

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

[English]

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour, and the arrangement that did not contemplate a division at this hour of the night, I wonder if hon. members would agree to defer division on this amendment until tomorrow. There seem to be no further speakers. We could deal with this amendment and have third reading immediately when orders of the day are called tomorrow. If that were agreeable it would assist the situation.

**Mr. Bell:** Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very practical idea, particularly because of the "late show" and the staff.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, could I accommodate by moving the adjournment of the debate?