564 taps were applied for by the police. Of these, 563 were granted and one was denied. The average time of these taps was 54.1 days, and the number of charges arising from the 563 days was 18. Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General were very careful to say that only 18 charges were preferred against people, not how many convictions were obtained. I am sure it would be far less than 18. With regard to the security taps by the Solicitor General—and this is where the figures become very striking—there were 465 in 1975, each taking an average of 239.7 days. But not one charge was laid. Is it any wonder that Ramsey Clarke said it is expensive, it is inefficient, it is ineffective and it is erosive of police dignity? There are other methods of detection for some of the problems we have today. Ramsey Clarke and others have suggested special strike forces and the use of informers. These have been far more successful than the approach we are taking under these amendments.

I am not the least bit impressed by the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice saying they are not able to get at organized crime, that they are not able to get at the "untouchables". By using electronic surveillance methods they will never be able to get at the top group in organized crime. What they need is other methods of surveillance which will strengthen their approach and their ability to arrest. With regard to dangerous offenders, I think it would be fair to say we have learned from experience the two major mistakes concerning habitual offenders and the dangerous sexual offenders provisions in the present legislation. There was a lack of uniformity in the application of the law. There was a gap with regard to the question of violence of some of the acts of offenders. The Klippert case in the Supreme Court of Canada underlined the question of lack of violence.

We now have a new definition, with "dangerous offenders" replacing "habitual offenders". The new definition emphasizes violence with regard to an indictable offence where there is a pattern of behaviour shown not only of violence in the particular crime but violence in other crimes. There is also another application concerning sexual offenders and the pattern of behaviour with regard to lack of control of sexual impulses. I draw to the attention of the Minister of Justice that he is following the Ouimet report is some aspects but he is not following the definition. I think the definition proposed by the Ouimet report is probably better than the definition set forth in the amendment. At page 258, the Ouimet report reads:

> Dangerous offender means an offender who has been convicted of an offence specified in this part of the Criminal Code who by reason of character disorder, emotional disorder, mental disorder or defect constitutes a continuing danger and who is likely to kill, inflict serious bodily injury, endanger life, inflict severe psychological damage or otherwise seriously endanger the personal safety of others.

● (1550)

I submit that we should study the expanded definition given by the Ouimet report. The Ouimet report makes other important and interesting recommendations. For instance, before a dangerous offender is sentenced to an indeterminate sentence, he should be directed to a place where diagnosis and, if necessary, a cure can be undertaken. He should be there not more than six months. After that period of treatment there would at least be evidence about the serious problem affecting that person. Therefore, before we pass this law we should study what we are to do with those in custody. I support the diagnostic and cure approach. Before a person is declared a dangerous offender he should be sent to a centre where his condition can be determined and, if necessary, treated.

The bill requires certain other things to be done in the case of dangerous offenders. It requires, in certain circumstances, the consent of the attorney general; it requires expert evidence of psyschologists and others to be given at trial; it makes provisions with respect to the right of appeal, and the necessity of review by the National Parole Board prior to the termination of three years of the sentence and every two years thereafter. That approach is good. I hope the government will pay heed to my observations.

May I say a word about parole. Most of us agree that statutory parole should be abolished and that parole should be based on earned remission. The maximum penalty for prison escape should be increased from five to ten years, and the membership of the Parole Board should be increased from 19 to 26. Therefore, the provisions of the bill dealing with these matters are welcomed. We do not object to the government's position as set out in the "The Highlights of the Peace and Security Program," page 7. I quote from the pamphlet as follows:

> Some procedural safeguards will be introduced into parole hearings to ensure that the process by which the board reaches its decisions will meet the expectations of natural justice. These will include assistance to the applicant, further information to the applicant and stated reason for refusal of parole.

One cannot object to such procedural safeguards which would correct shortcomings. I draw particular attention to the last sentence of the paragraph just quoted, which reads:

> These will be defined in regulations and will be *phased* in over a period of several years.

Why will the government take several years? Considering the number of prisoners who have escaped recently, and the problems we have encountered with parole, why will the Solicitor General not implement such regulations immediately? When the committee studies the bill, why can it not also study the regulations? If we are to maintain law and order—which is the aim of this bill—and make our parole system better, we must devise the very best procedures. Good parole procedures are a necessity. As it is likely that passage of this bill will result in more convictions and longer sentences, it is incumbent upon the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice to make certain that our parole system meets at least some of the conditions set out in the government pamphlet.

I now turn to special crime inquiries. Not many will complain about legislation permitting provinces to set up special commissions to inquire, when it is deemed necessary, into crime and criminal organizations. I am talking of organizations which may not be uncovered with ordinary investigative procedures. I suppose the latest crime commission in Quebec is responsible for this provision. I notice that some of the amendments to do with special crime commissions protect individuals who may appear before the commissions or whose names may be mentioned although the individuals themselves may not appear before the commissions. These are good amendments.