

Government Orders

He killed once, then he killed twice, then there were three, four, five, six. As far as we know, he killed about a dozen times. This individual killed once and got life and 25 years. He killed 11 or 12 more times for free; it did not cost him anything.

Then he goes to our justice department and makes a bargain. Give me \$10,000 for every body I lead you to, put it in a trust fund, and I will start telling you what I did with these children I killed. And we fell into this bargain. We bargained with an individual like that.

I dare anyone in the House to go to any community or any town in the country and stand on a street corner and ask any Canadian what he thinks of our justice system that made a bargain with Clifford Olson to the point where he now has \$100,000 in a trust account for his family because he told us where to find the bodies of the people he murdered. That is an example of what people do not want.

The message should be loud and clear to individuals of that type, these highly dangerous, violent offenders: You are not a welcome segment to our society; we do not want you; we do not need you. For heaven's sake, let us make our communities really safe. Make the streets safe for our children who are walking home from school.

Why should we have to worry about the mother who has to work at eleven o'clock in the evening in a convenience store and who was kidnapped and murdered? We have to consider whether it was a planned murder. Maybe it was just second degree or maybe even manslaughter. It was a violent act, which is not acceptable in this society. But the government will not show through its legislation that it is not acceptable. It makes it look acceptable.

The motion is going to try to send a message to all Canadians that we parliamentarians in the 35th Parliament are a little more serious than they have been in the past about doing something with those who commit a crime. We will continue our prevention programs and do as much as we can. We will continue to try to rehabilitate those who can be rehabilitated. We will do all the right things. But when push comes to shove and there are individuals such as Clifford Olson and Paul Bernardo, let us put an end to it. Never again should those kinds of things happen. Send the message and let us do it with these types of motions.

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this is a very delicate question. Obviously it will entail probably going into a very thorough debate. I think we have had the occasion to do so in committee.

I would like to remind the hon. member that all those witnesses who appeared before the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs in regard to Bill C-45 and Bill C-41 expressed the view that statutory release plays a fundamental

role in the protection of society. This period of gradual and carefully planned and supervised release is essential for assisting an offender to reintegrate into the community and is preferred over an offender's abrupt release at warrant expiry.

• (1035)

I should also add that there is a process in place. It takes a required amount of time to serve. We should also keep in mind that we do not automatically release people as the opposition likes to contend.

The provisions in Bill C-45 and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act already provide a balanced response to the concerns posed by repeat offenders. The new sentence calculation model would ensure that an offender who receives a new custodial sentence for an offence committed while on conditional release would be automatically returned to custody. New consecutive sentences would always result in the offender serving a minimum of one-third of the new sentence in custody before parole eligibility.

I think we agree here in this House and I would imagine many members in the opposition benches would agree that we need to constantly seek ways of improving public protection. That is why the government continues to focus its efforts on more effective methods, which involve better identifying, assessing, and treating violent offenders on a case by case basis. However, a blanket abolition of statutory release for certain offenders would ultimately harm rather than improve public safety.

In conclusion, the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs recognized the value of statutory release when it voted down a similar motion to abolish statutory release for all offenders.

I would also add that we will be opposing not only Motion No. 4 but also Motions Nos. 5, 11 and 17 as presented by the opposition.

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I just heard that the member of the Liberal Party opposite is opposing Motion No. 5 which deals with the revocation of parole.

Having been in many parole hearings and listened to all the cases I have listened to, I wonder why this government would not be prepared to back this. Let us say a prisoner is in for a crime that was undertaken while on drugs or a crime related to drugs. This individual gets out of an institution today and is caught in another facility while on parole using drugs. His parole is revoked. He comes back in and they say he has to serve more time. Today that inmate is entitled to again go to a parole board and get out and do his thing in the community.

We are saying that if a person is incarcerated for a crime and gets out and does something such that parole is revoked, the person should serve the full term. That to me makes obvious common sense. If we are letting somebody out of prison today