

Parole Act

would provide a mother who would look after the needs of his three children—

I do not think for one moment that the then minister wrote those words. Somebody in his department wrote them, and he read them. He was led to the slaughter. If this was a genuine case, why was it not examined properly? Then the truth about the custody of this man's children would have been known. If everything had been above board then surely a man, once he married while out on parole, would not have headed off to Spain and deserted the children.

That is the point I am trying to make with respect to decisions made on an ad hoc basis. I am not blaming the commissioner or the officers in charge. How were they to know who should be released? That is why local parole boards must be provided with proper screening and proper documentation. In that way the risk would be minimized. I believe that some day this case will be written-up in *True* magazine. It might even make *Playboy* because it's a joke.

My hon. friend from Skeena said we should not talk about these cases. The minister talked about minimal error. I have many cases I could recite. I have a fine clipping service of my own and I can document many errors. The risk is not minimized when an ad hoc basis is used; that is absolutely wrong. Then there is the example of the man named Head. On January 20, 1967, he was charged with attempted rape of a nine year-old girl. On January 31, 1967, he was charged with indecent assault on a nine year-old girl. On May 26, 1967, he was sentenced to life for the rape of a six year-old girl, and to a five-year concurrent sentence for rape of a nine year-old girl. On June 15, 1967, he was found mentally ill while in jail and declared criminally insane. On November 1, 1967, he was declared a dangerous sexual offender—DSO they call it. His other sentence was reduced to 15 years and then he was given an indeterminate sentence.

● (2110)

This is the record of a man who had to be sick. Surely any psychiatrist or psychologist would say that. I have heard that the reports from British Columbia said he was sick. But he was released under the ad hoc, back-to-back program despite the act. He certainly was not released with the type of illness that would warrant his release, although of course he might have been mentally sick. He was not released on humanitarian grounds. This was not the way to release a dangerous sexual offender, Mr. Speaker. He had a long list of sexual offences.

Of course, the government took responsibility. Any one of us, Mr. Speaker—you, myself or my colleagues, but in this case it happens to be the Solicitor General—would have to take the responsibility. I am not talking politics now, but facts of law. He was released. The evidence is that he disliked one of the wardens. He waited on the road until a little girl only six or seven years old came along, Tanya Bush. That was the end of Tanya. He was tried and found guilty of murder. The case went to appeal and I think it was dismissed.

Why do I mention these horrible cases? I do it to show that you cannot operate on an ad hoc basis. These horrible facts are facts; they are the facts that have destroyed the

[Mr. Woolliams.]

parole system in Canada that was carefully set up. That is what I kept saying to the media about the Geoffroy case and the Head case. I mentioned that this had destroyed the real parole system where a man is studied while he is in custody, where his behaviour in custody, his behaviour out of custody, his background, his psychological tie-ups are all considered and the psychiatrist comes to a decision on documentation and if that goes before learned men and women who decide whether the man is safe to put out on the street either with or without supervision. Surely that is what the Solicitor General now has in mind, although he may not have enough officers.

Let me take another case. The headline of a newspaper article reads, "Murderer free on Xmas pass"—Commits reign of terror". It is datelined St. Catharines, Ontario. The article reads:

Assistant Crown Attorney Frank Keenan verbally lashed the National Parole Board in provincial court at St. Catharines for a "reign of terror" unleashed on the city by the release of Richard Swearngen on a Christmas leave pass.

Swearngen, 25, was sentenced in 1963 for the murder of a London, Ontario, man whose body was found in Rondeau provincial park. The man had been tied up and burned with cigarettes.

This is the background of the crime. The article continues:

Swearngen was granted temporary leave of absence—

Not parole, Mr. Speaker. All these things are talked about as if the parole board, George Street and his men, made the decision. I want tonight to defend the parole board of this nation. They have made mistakes; the mistakes have been made under section 26 of the act.

I do not know what my friend down there is talking about, but it does not matter. I do not want to get into an argument. This problem is too serious to be joking or heckling about. These are serious matters because every one of us has been elected by the citizens of Canada; it does not matter whether we are Liberal, Conservative, NDP or Social Credit. To continue with the article:

—from Collins Bay penitentiary on December 23 but failed to return by December 28. On January 6, he was driving a car on the Queen Elizabeth Way near Niagara Falls when he picked up a hitchhiker, Michael Savoie, 22, of Park Ave., St. Catharines, and held him (Savoie) at gunpoint.

I want to pause there. They say that this fellow got a little upset. Well, he had two guns; he was ready to be upset.

He robbed him of \$70 and identification papers. Swearngen also had identification belonging to Laszo Ulman, of Hamilton. With the latter papers, he rented a car and drove it to Bogart Street, St. Catharines, where he was staying with friends.

Two friends of Swearngen told him they had had trouble with three men at the Henley Hotel. Swearngen and one of his friends went there and, when the trio emerged, Swearngen shouted: "I've got something for you."

He had a Christmas present. He opened fire with two automatics. This is a fellow on temporary release, and the parole board was blamed for it. Let us see what happened. The article continues:

William Harper, 20, of Marlborough St., St. Catharines, was shot twice in the face and his jaw was broken, and Douglas Nicholson, 18, of Parkview St., St. Catharines, was shot in the left shoulder. The third man was not hurt.

Police arrested Swearngen at the Bogart Street address—