

Supply—Solicitor General

rehabilitation. A criminal will never be rehabilitated in this kind of atmosphere. I say that it is this type of attitude which has cost the taxpayers a lot of money. We should be directing some real thinking toward our plans in respect of penology.

I was startled when the information was given to the members of the committee, and corroborated by the commissioner of penitentiaries, that if we were to consider the cost of our police forces and our courts, and compare such costs with those of maintaining a person in the penitentiary, including the maintenance of his wife and children, in all probability we would find that if such person were married and possibly on welfare, the cost to the taxpayers of Canada would be over \$50,000 a year per inmate in our penitentiaries. When you consider the money which is spent in an effort to bring about rehabilitation, it becomes obvious that the money is well spent if the result is less institutionalism.

I also think those responsible for the penitentiary service are not thinking far enough ahead, or if they are they are doing the wrong kind of thinking. I suggest, through you Mr. Chairman to the Solicitor General, that something must be done at the federal level when we have the kind of thinking which believes that we must have the number of maximum security prisons which we have. It is maintained that 32 per cent of the criminals in Canada require maximum security. Why is the figure 32 per cent, when the manual on correctional standards published by a number of the great penologists of Canada and the United States says that 15 per cent is the figure. Why should it be 32 per cent in Canada and 15 per cent in the United States? Why is there all this hurry to have maximum security when, at the same time that we insist on maintaining that we must have this maximum security, space is available in the minimum security and medium security institutions? Why are these institutions not occupied to capacity? Why should we not take those prisoners who the warden says are coming along fine and move them into minimum security, especially when, according to the information we were given a few weeks ago, there are vacancies.

It does not make sense to me that in Canada we consider the percentage to be 32 while in the United States it is considered to be 15. We scream to death that our maximum security institutions are overloaded, while we have vacancies in the minimum and medium security institutions. I believe we should take

[Mr. Winch.]

a really good look at our policies and plans in respect of penology. I sincerely hope that the government will look into such things as the policy of work release which has been followed in the last 20 months in the federal institutions in the United States. They are convinced that if a man has become rehabilitated he is fit for society. They asked the question: If this man still has some time to serve what can he do? They began an experiment on a trial basis with 2,100 inmates. These inmates left the penitentiary in the morning, went to work, and came back at night and on week ends. They were charged a nominal price for lodging and had to maintain their families. This has proven to be such a success that we were told in Washington that not only is this program to be continued but it will be added to, because it has worked. This is work release, and I believe it is real rehabilitation.

These are matters which I believe we should be thinking about instead of spending so much money building perhaps too many maximum security fortresses. I also hope that a real look will be taken at the parole board and parole policies. We should be releasing many more inmates on parole, under supervision. For the life of me, however, I cannot understand some of the thinking of the members of the parole board. I could mention the case of one bad boy who was in the British Columbia penitentiary for the second time. He could not take it, so they had to send him to the insane asylum. In three or four months his health improved and he was sent back to the penitentiary. In another four months he went back again to the insane asylum. Then it became a matter of back to the penitentiary, back to the insane asylum, back to the penitentiary, into the narcotic institution, back into the insane asylum, and so on. I do not know where he is now. The doctors, the chaplain, the warden and the classification officer say that he should be out on parole and that he should have been out a long time ago. This is the only way in which there would be any hope that he would be able to save himself physically and mentally. That is, he should be sent out on parole in the custody of his father. When the father sees what is happening to his son, then I would become worried about the father and the effect it would have on him. Parole?—no; I believe the chairman of the parole board is in favour of it, but undoubtedly he is not able to convince the members of the board. So it is a case of back into the penitentiary, back into the insane asylum, and back into the penitentiary. One day he