respected criminology professors and this is what they have to say with respect to the proposition that is now before the House:

> The Solicitor General of Canada is once again prepared to change the rules of the prison system by giving increased power to the National Parole Board and the Commissioner of Correctional Services Canada. We view with grave misgivings the power contained in article 15.1 and 15.3 of Bill C-67.

They point out that it is best left to the courts and not the National Parole Board to decide who is to be held in custody while a sentence is being served. They go on to say the following:

> An inmate who has been denied parole or has refused to apply for parole will not know until he has reached his probable release date whether he will be released or not. The anxiety and stress it will create among the classes of inmates who have committed crimes as noted in schedule 15.3 is inestimable. It is cruelty of the highest order and devised either by a bureaucratic mind or monster.
>
> It is a return to pre-Beccarian times, an era characterized by unequal, arbitrary and barbarous punishments obeying the whims of an impersonal fate.

They point out that the Bill does not take into consideration the reaction it will produce among federal prisoners who will basically perceive these changes as an automatic increase of one-third in their sentences. When this is put together with serious overcrowding which is already taking place within our institutions, we will have a profound institutional crisis.

The professors go on to say the following:

> Bills 67 and 68, institutionalize the arbitrary nature and severity of existing penitentiary sentences. The proposed measures contained in these bills is extremely dangerous for guards because they will have to face more anxious and frustrated inmates. These measures do not protect the community because the prisoner who will eventually be released, will have suffered greater social deterioration than he would have within the traditional carceral system, which was already highly damaging.

This motion deals with the ability of the Parole Board to look at least at each individual to see if he has made some progress during the period of incarceration. The Parole Board would have the discretion to release individuals back into the community on parole. As it now stands, it does not have this discretion. I would note that this is a provision that was not included in the predecessor legislation, Bill S-32.

As I mentioned, we heard from many witnesses on this point. One of the witnesses from whom we heard was a representative of the Elizabeth Fry Society of Halifax who expressed concern with respect to the denial of the possibility of re-applying for parole. The Elizabeth Fry Society representative pointed out that that provision taken in conjunction with all of the other provisions of this legislation might very well open it up to challenge under the provisions of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms as it is a denial of the values which have been set out and established in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.?

I mentioned earlier today that the Senate has studied this legislation and has tabled an interim report. That interim report goes directly to the amendment which is now being discussed. The interim report which was tabled on May 14 has four basic concerns.

I emphasize that this report was a unanimous report prepared by the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee representing both the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party. They said that any detention decision to warrant expiry with respect to an alleged dangerous offender should be reached by judicial resolution and not by the National Parole Board. Fortunately, my friend, the Hon. Member for York South—Weston, has come around to our side and has agreed on the fundamental point of judicial review as opposed to review by the National Parole Board.

As well, the Senate report suggested that earned remission should remain effective if revocation is a result of a contravention of the terms or conditions of mandatory supervision. In other words, mandatory supervision should not be one shot and there should not be a denial of the right to earn remission if the revocation was on a purely technical basis. I see you are signalling that it is six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I am signalling that it is about 10 seconds to six o'clock. Would you like me to put the question?

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All right, then we will call it six o'clock. It being six o'clock p.m., pursuant to order made Wednesday, June 11, 1986, the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS--MOTIONS

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AID

ADVISABILITY OF ESTABLISHING A LEVEL OF GNP

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands) moved:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of introducing legislation to establish a level of 0.7 per cent of the Gross National Product for official developmental aid.

• (1800)

He said: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to bring this motion before the House. I am very thankful that the committee, in its wisdom, decided that this would be one of the motions which could be voted upon.

The purpose of my motion is to send a strong signal to the Government that it should establish the level of official development assistance at .7 per cent of the Gross National Product, and that this should be established by legislation rather than simply at the whim of the Government of the day. It is important for all Hon. Members to be able to vote on it, and I hope the process will continue so that the issue can come to a vote.