

*Measures Against Crime*

derived directly or indirectly from illegal wiretaps is also inadmissible.

I think there is also some concern over the aspect of the requirement to notify persons under surveillance. I find the provisions whereby this would be repealed to be somewhat difficult to accept, and I am hopeful that there will be a great deal of discussion of this matter when the bill goes to committee.

The next aspect of the bill that I would like to talk about is that relating to dangerous offenders. At present there are two existing categories of offenders known as habitual criminals and dangerous sexual offenders. These two categories will be replaced by one category known as dangerous offenders. The classification of dangerous offenders will have to be made before sentence is passed, whereas at present I understand that these other two categories can actually be named any time after three months following sentence. There are also broad avenues of appeal still open to anybody who is labelled in this way.

One concern with this dangerous offender clause, and another item that I hope will receive considerable discussion in committee, is the anomaly that may be introduced under the indeterminate sentences rather than using a sentence of a fixed number of years, and this anomaly arises in that under the indeterminate sentence provision parole review will be carried out after three years, and each two years after that. One could end up with an indeterminate sentence as a dangerous offender and be subject to earlier parole provisions than in the case of a fixed sentence of say, 15 years, whereas at present it is my understanding that parole can only be considered after five years. I believe that a Senate committee has already discussed minimum sentences of ten years for dangerous offenders, and I hope that might be looked at again a little more carefully during the committee stage.

The next aspect of the bill that I would like to discuss relates to special crime inquiries. This is mainly intended to deal with the growth in organized crime that we are recognizing in Canadian society. The normal police investigation powers are often not sufficient in this area. A recent example has been Quebec's special inquiry into organized crime which has been shown to be an effective alternative method of investigation. When Bill C-83 was introduced, the legal status of Quebec's crime probe was being challenged. The fact that the Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that crime probes come within provincial jurisdiction may necessitate some review of these sanctions in Bill C-83. These questions will have to be considered carefully in committee. I think that the important point is that there is an endeavour on the part of the government through Bill C-83 to move into the area of organized crime and to give it special attention.

A concern has been expressed to me which I will mention because I think it is perhaps somewhat farfetched, nevertheless it could lead to some misunderstanding. It relates to the attempt within the bill to define organized crime. It has been suggested that at present it is defined, I believe, as planned and organized by a number of persons acting in concert. There is some suggestion that this could lead to the ridiculous situation where a group of teenagers could be involved in a minor crime, such as robbing hub caps or other incidental items, and this would be deemed to

[Mr. Martin.]

be organized crime. Obviously this is not the intention, but I hope that in committee there might be some endeavour to find a better definition of organized crime, or perhaps leave the term as it is defined at present.

The next point that I would like to speak about in connection with the bill relates to the parole provisions. Perhaps the most important aspect here is the matter of earned remissions. There will be no more statutory remissions, meaning in effect no more automatic decreases in the period of a sentence. Early release will have to be earned by an inmate under the provisions of Bill C-83.

I think that attention should be drawn to the reorganization and make up of the parole board, which will be increased to 26 full time people from the present nine full time members and ten ad hoc members.

The other aspect which I think is of interest to people in various communities is the determination to include regional parole groups and the fact that indeed the regional people will be involved, in the case of a life sentence, on the actual parole board, with full voting rights. In other words, the community will always be represented in these major cases, and I think this is most important.

Reasons will also have to be given for the decisions of the parole board, and it will be made somewhat easier for inmates to appear at hearings. If parole is broken under the provisions of Bill C-83, there will no longer be a need to go before a magistrate in order to get the inmate back into prison, and the maximum penalties for escape or attempted escape will be increased from five years to ten years.

In finalizing my comments on the bill I should like to say that it is important to note that there are a number of administrative provisions which are also intended to be implemented which will assist in making our penal system more effective. I will enumerate them in summary form. First, there will be a clearing house of information established on police programs which should help in prevention, identification, and related matters. Second, there will be developed better training programs in community relations and preventive policing. Third, there will be a development and dissemination of model programs. Fourth, crime prevention through environmental designs, studies, etc. Will be undertaken, and sixth and last, there will be victimization surveys, which are studies to determine the incidence of crime, the effect on victims, etc.

● (1530)

All in all, these administrative changes and the entire legislation under Bill C-83 are really aimed at giving greater protection to society while maintaining a fair criminal justice system.

**Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak on Bill C-83, the government's so-called peace and security legislation. I do so because of the intense concern created by this bill throughout my constituency and throughout Canada. On June 10 of this year I will celebrate 19 years of service in the Canadian House of Commons, and during this period of time, to the best of my recollection, I cannot recall any previous bill which generated so much correspondence and almost violent reaction from the people I am elected to serve.