

*Supply—Solicitor General*

**Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to discuss this question with the minister and the committee chairman to see whether an appropriate reference could be evolved for launching the work of the committee.

**TELEVISION****EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION FOR PROGRAM "OUR WORLD"**

**Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Secretary of State I wonder whether her parliamentary secretary could pass on our congratulations to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the other broadcasting companies involved for the program "Our World" which was broadcast yesterday and which I think was a success, even though the eastern European countries withdrew.

**SUPPLY**

**Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare)** moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Batten in the chair.

**The Chairman:** Pursuant to the special order made this day the estimates of the following departments for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968 are now being first taken up and entered for consideration in committee of supply: Legislation, the Department of Manpower and Immigration, and the Privy Council. Shall I report when the committee rises later this day that the estimates of these three departments for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968 have been first taken up and entered for consideration?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

The estimates of the following departments were first taken up and entered for consideration.

Legislation.

Department of Manpower and Immigration.

Privy Council.

**The Chairman:** The committee will now proceed to the consideration of the estimates of the Solicitor General, vote No. 1. Vote No. 1 will be found on page 478 of the blue book and the details are listed on page 480.

**DEPARTMENT OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL**

1. Departmental administration including administrative expenses of the committee on corrections plus such fees, salaries and expenses as may be approved by Treasury Board for members and the panel of consultants and staff named by the minister to advise and assist the committee, and grants as detailed in the estimates, \$1,015,400.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

**Mr. Pennell:** Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the constructive criticism by hon. members during the course of the debate and I should like to express my appreciation of the non-partisan spirit in which hon. members entered into the debate.

First of all I propose to deal with some of the salient points raised in the attractive speech made by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. I wish to assure the hon. member that I am in full sympathy with what he said with regard to minimum security institutions. I can assure him that the Beaver Creek minimum security institution will not be closing. On the contrary, it will be expanded to a 150-man minimum security training institution over the next two years, and preliminary discussions have been entered into with officials of the Ontario department of forestry. There will be no cut-backs in the program for minimum security institutions. The program is directed toward making them more permanent and more effective in all regions of the country.

The hon. member also made some interesting observations relating to the National Parole Board. I hope he will permit me to say that this debate pointed up the difficulties confronting the parole board. On the one hand we heard hon. members expressing the opinion—I say this with great respect—that perhaps the parole board is being overly generous in granting paroles and is not scrutinizing applications closely enough. At the same time criticism was raised that the board was not generous enough. So it is caught between two fires. I should again like to put on the record my view that non-institutional treatment such as probation and parole offers the best hope for human renewal.

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka suggested that the parole board should give reasons for refusing to grant paroles. I concede at once that quite a valid argument can be made on this point, but I would also point out that perhaps there are overriding arguments on the other side of the question. At the present time I understand the parole board receives very valuable information on a confidential basis from respectable citizens, and it seems to me that if reasons for refusing parole were made public the sources of information coming to the board would be materially reduced. This might adversely affect the number of paroles granted.

The hon. member went on to raise the question of the erasing of criminal records. He mentioned the difficulties confronting the