

Penitentiaries

time to deal with all of the items, but I do want to deal with one or two. The hon. member for Oxford mentioned that if we need anything, we need input. That is certainly so.

At the recent hostage-taking incident in the Drumheller Penitentiary, it is hard to believe that not one of the chaplains was called during that trying time. They had no input, those people who have an intimate working relationship with the prisoners. That is one example of where there is no input in our penitentiaries.

Another item that bothers me greatly is that some of the guards who were involved in that hostage-taking incident still suffer from nervous, physical and mental stress. It seems that once a hostage incident is over, we forget about the effect it has on those who were involved.

Another item which calls for very careful consideration has to do with the conjugal visits recommended by the minister. This is opposed by the Public Service Alliance. They say it would threaten prison security and could result in escapes, violence, hostage takings, inmate unrest and wife beatings, more commonly known as domestic disputes.

I recently met the mayor of the city of Drumheller and the ministerial association of that area. One of the first things we talked about was conjugal visits. Only one of the many ministers supported these, and he supported them only for younger prisoners. They are being confined to maximum security prisoners. It creates a real conflict among the guards and prisoners when we provide this for only maximum security inmates, murderers and so on, but not for those who are there for crimes not nearly as serious. This should be looked into before it causes another wave of activity in the criminal field in this country.

Another item concerns medium security. A medium security prison was built and then "lifers" and others who should be in maximum security were sent to that prison. That is the reason for the hostage-taking incident. There is a mix-up in all of this. The ministers were concerned about this as well. If there were better classification and segregation, there would be greater response to rehabilitation.

I am very anxious for this motion to pass. There is serious need to look into the recommendations that were made. I do not stop talking because there are not many more things to say, but because I am so anxious for this motion to pass today. I hope hon. members in this House will not undermine justice in this country by defeating this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Loiselle (Verchères): Mr. Speaker, I hear my Progressive Conservative colleagues shout "shame" because, of

course, if we speak against this motion we give the impression that we support the idea of prisons which would be like fortresses. If we are for such a motion, of course, there is the danger that some would say—

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. member for Verchères tell us in advance whether he will waste the time of hon. members during the three minutes which are left—

Mr. Loiselle: Mr. Speaker, this same motion was debated in the House last November, but those who spoke against it were the hon. members for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) and Bruce-Grey (Mr. Gurbin). After these names, I see the initials PC, which mean Progressive Conservative in our country. For his part, Mr. MacGuigan was in favour of this motion.

Now, the question is very simple. Do we really need a subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs to review each one of these recommendations? From a very practical point of view, I say that we do not—

An hon. Member: We do.

Mr. Loiselle: We do not agree, and this is precisely why there is a House of Commons. I submit that, when it considers the estimates of the Department of the Solicitor General, this committee has every opportunity to ask all its questions on this matter. In practice, this committee will review the Juvenile Delinquents Act in its entirety as early as January.

At the present time, when the House is very busy, when all the committees have much to do, when a special committee is considering the patriation resolution, when we have so many matters to discuss, I wonder how we could justify that a group of members be once again called on to travel throughout the country. I do not believe that we need such a forum or such an organization to go further than the recommendations contained in the MacGuigan report.

I believe that there is a lot to do in this area—

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. The hour provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired. It being five o'clock the House stands adjourned until Monday next at 2 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 5 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.