

Government Orders

Unfortunately in the old party system that is all that really matters. If the leader of a party wants it done this way it will be done this way. We have seen party discipline that is way beyond democratic. It is anti-democratic. We have seen party discipline used in the House over and over again, to the extent that the members of Parliament who know what the people want are completely ignored and are not even allowed to vote for what their constituents want.

The system is in collapse and it must be fixed. Until the system is fixed I suspect the legislation in the area of justice will do very little to improve the system.

Positive proposals like those presented by the member for Wild Rose will continue to be ignored in spite of the fact that many members across the floor, those who are still in touch with their constituents, know they should be passed. The Prime Minister says that they are not going to support it, the whip cracks the whip and those members have no voice.

I do not care much that members of Parliament have no voice, but I do care that their constituents have no voice. It is time that was changed. The changes to the justice system that we need, the changes that Reform has proposed in the House over and over again, will not happen until the system is fixed. We have to fix it. We have to fix it quickly, but I am afraid it will not happen with the government that is in place.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 16. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

We will now deal with group 7

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-45, in Clause 56, be amended

(a) by adding after line 8, on page 36, the following:

“(1.1) An inquiry shall be held to determine whether any member of the Board should be subject to any disciplinary or remedial measures where the member has recommended conditional release for a violent offender and the violent offender has committed a violent offence while on that conditional release.”;

(b) by replacing lines 10 and 11, on page 36, with the following:

“appropriate that an inquiry under subsection (1) be held or where an inquiry must be held by virtue of subsection (1.1), a judge, supernumerary judge or former”;

(c) by replacing line 46, on page 37, with the following:

“member’s office,”; and

(d) by replacing line 3, on page 38, with the following:

“the due execution of the member’s office, or

(e) has recommended conditional release for a violent offender and the violent offender has committed a violent offence while on that conditional release.”.

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 19 concerns a difference of opinion about whether or not there should be or may be a mandatory review of parole board decisions if someone who is out on parole commits a crime.

Our belief is that there should be a mandatory review of parole board decisions when it makes errors. I will give some examples. I have mentioned it twice but I have to mention the Wayne Perkin case again because it is so close to the real problem. This fellow went into a home, coerced an individual in my community into her garden shed, beat her over the head with a hammer, raped her, taped her hands behind her back, injected her with cocaine and left her for dead. He got six years, which is light, was put out on parole and while on parole murdered Angela Richards.

● (1225)

I always wondered in that particular case as I attended the sentencing hearing where the parole board was. What responsibility and what accountability are on the parole board for the absolutely disastrous error it made? Had Perkin not got out on parole the first time for such a terrible crime, Angela Richards would be alive today. I have talked with Corrine and Ron about it, Angela’s sister and brother-in-law. That is one of the significant questions they have.

Why is the parole board that made this terrible decision going on with more decisions? Why is it not held accountable? Why was it not brought in to listen to the whole court case? Surely we need to have better answers.

This is what the motion is talking about. It wants a mandatory review of its decisions. I am for the termination of employment of those people when they make such drastic decisions. What we