Perhaps we could deal with Motion No. 20A just after the Hon. Member has a chance to speak to this.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The motions are combined for debate, so may I suggest that the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary address the issue immediately.

Mr. Robinson: Speak to them both.

Mr. Towers: I am speaking to Motion No. 20A, which would amend Clause 5, which specifies the regulation-making authority of the Governor in Council with respect to two various procedures relating to the detention review process. This motion is consequential to the one proposed at line 16 at page 8, removing the guidelines from the regulations and placing them in the statute. This motion deletes the regulation-making authority to establish a change to the guideline and to renumber the subsequent paragraphs in the subsection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): I will call on the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) for debate.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to Motions Nos. 17, 18, 19 and 20. Motion No. 17 would ensure that before the decision is made to hold a prisoner beyond the eligibility date for mandatory supervision, until warrant expiry, the prisoner would be entitled to a hearing. I think that in making such a fundamental decision, which has been held by the courts to be a decision that does involve the liberty of the subject and for which counsel should be present, the individual surely has a right to a hearing. That is the purpose of Motion No. 17. I hope that it will have the support of Members of this House.

• (1910)

Motions Nos. 18, 19 and 20 collectively, when linked with Motion No. 16, would ensure that there are more frequent reviews of an individual who has been gated by the National Parole Board. As it stands now, that review process would only happen once a year. That is simply not good enough. There should be a more frequent review in view of the fact that, once again, we are dealing with the liberty of the subject. I mention the importance of the need for a review process here, a process by which the prisoner affected might be heard.

The statistics show that the record of the National Parole Board with respect to prediction of violence leaves a great deal to be desired. I now have the specific illustration of that. On many occasions we have been told about the fact that between 1975 and 1979 some 52 people were killed by prisoners who had been released on mandatory supervision. Of that number, 31 were the victims of murder, and 21 were the victims of manslaughter. That represents the following percentage of the total releases on mandatory supervision: 1.2 per cent of all those released on mandatory supervision were involved in murder, and .8 per cent were involved in manslaughter. Of the prisoners released on parole, as opposed to mandatory supervision—in other words those released at the discretion of the National Parole Board—we have the following figures: nine of the prisoners who were released on parole betwen 1975 and 1979 were convicted of murder and a further nine were convicted of manslaughter, for a total of 18 individuals. However, because the numbers involved on parole were much smaller than for those released on mandatory supervision, the actual percentage was higher. It was 1.3 per cent.

What do we have? We have a situation in which a larger percentage of those who are released on parole at the absolute discretion of the National Parole Board are involved in crimes of homicide as opposed to those who are released automatically on mandatory supervision. What does that say about the ability of the National Parole Board to predict violent crime? It very clearly says that the board has been a failure. We are giving this body, which has so demonstrably failed in its duty, even more discretion and even more power to detain people when it has been admitted without any hesitation whatsoever, and without any doubt, that it has a bad record, and when it has been admitted that violence cannot be predicted.

It is for this reason that, among others, a major campaign was launched out of the prison at Collins Bay by the John Howard Society, Collins Bay Chapter, to abolish mandatory supervision. It was called the one-cent campaign. I personally received hundreds and hundreds of envelopes bearing one-cent stamps which urged the Government to abolish mandatory supervision.

Given the fact that we are wasting millions of dollars on a program which has been proved to be ineffective, and which results in such bitterness and such anger among prisoners who believe that they have been denied their earned remission, I believe that is a recommendation that should be very seriously looked at.

I note as well that it is a recommendation supported by, among others, the John Howard Society, the St. Leonard's Society, many distinguished professors of law and criminology, the Canadian Association for the Prevention of Crime, the Elizabeth Fry Society, and many other concerned Canadians. I hope that the Government will accept these motions, which would certainly move some distance toward ensuring adequate due process in a very Draconian system of designating individuals to remain behind bars after they have earned their remission.

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

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The question is on Motion No. 17 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.