

additional members. Big deal! If I were on the government side, I would be ashamed of this legislation. It does not begin to comprehend the problems that beset the penal colony in this country—and it is a colony.

We must accept the fact that there are good criminals and bad criminals. So let us have people in these institutions who can separate the good from the bad. I have often gone into a judge's chambers with the Crown attorney while the jury is out to discuss sentence. The judge will say, "All right, boys; if it is guilty, what do you think?" and we discuss the kid in question. Surely we can ask the Parole Board to do the same with the judges. The judge knows how defence counsel and the Crown attorney feel, so for goodness sake let us do something with the Parole Act and consult the judges who are intimate with these boys. They can look up their notes, review the evidence and make a solid evaluation whether there should be parole. They could act in an advisory capacity.

What are our judges for? They are not "dum-dums", sitting up there on the bench doing nothing. They have intelligence just as much as people on the Parole Board. They assess these boys. They have seen the pre-sentence report and heard the evidence, whereas the Parole Board has not. A parole officer does not have time to look over the evidence in a given case to see what were the motivations and what were not the motivations. Is not this what judges are for? They are there to sentence people, to say whether someone is guilty or not guilty if there is no jury. If the answer is guilty, then give the judges a chance to have a say in the parole action. I suggest that only makes good common sense.

What does the government do with the sex criminal? They treat them as if they are armed robbers. Most of these people need psychiatric help, there is no question of that. What facilities do we have in our penal institutions to administer proper psychiatric care, or what knowledge has a parole officer in that field? Before they make an assessment, do they consult the psychiatrist? Are they institutionalized? In Toronto there are doctors like Dr. McKnight who make assessments and say what should be done in such cases.

Even with all these facilities available to us, I suggest the Parole Act is so deficient and the government so derelict in taking action that they have reached a point where they throw up their hands, say they do not know what to do and run away from the problem. I suggest that no problem has ever been solved by running away from it. The typical reaction of the government is to band-aid this and band-aid that. As some wag said to me the other day, with this government it is like "hockery night in Canada", and how true that is. But this reflects on me too, because I am proud to be a member of this chamber. But people say all we do is to take stopgap measures, that there are no long-term programs to rehabilitate those who need our help, because the government lets the situation go on day after day, doing a little bit here and a little bit there.

I wonder why government members sit in their chairs yakking and laughing but doing nothing. The noise across the aisle, Mr. Speaker, tells me what interest they have in what other people think or say or do. I do not say that I am an Einstein or a brilliant criminologist, but at least I give

Adjournment Debate

some thought to what I try to do and I pay attention to the problems besetting this country. When someone else is speaking, I do not yak away and pay no attention. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, as a result of some of the words I hear from across the aisle I do not learn very much, but at least I have the decency to listen because maybe, just maybe, I will pick up an idea, though there is not much hope of that.

An hon. Member: Not from over there you won't.

Mr. Morgan: "Hope springs eternal in the human breast: Man never is, but always to be, blest."

If the National Parole Board has far too much to do, we must realize this. That is number one. Number two: I think the provincial governments must take responsibility for their own prisoners. It is about time the National Parole Board, through this government, said to the provinces that they should set up their own parole system. We have our problems, they have theirs, and we cannot accept responsibility for doing more than we are at the moment. I see no reason why the National Parole Board should, I was going to say "fry the fish" but I do not like that expression. I see no reason why they should settle the problems of the provinces, which should have their own parole system. They only come back to us, and nothing is accomplished because the workload of the Parole Board is too heavy.

Let me say in summary that I do not approve of the two amendments. I would feel much better about saying that if I could believe the Solicitor General when he says a native person will be appointed. Assuming he will, let me go on to say that the answer is (a) let the provinces go to the judges in the matter of parole, and (b) go to the provinces and tell them to set up their own parole system. If such a provision were written into the act, I think we would have something worth while, not the wishy-washy, ad hockery that we have at the moment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Horner (Crowfoot): Ten o'clock.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—GARRISON DAM DIVERSION, NORTH DAKOTA—FURTHER ACTION BY CANADIAN GOVERNMENT—CONSIDERATION BY INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION

Mr. Bill Knight (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, this is the first evening in many a long while that I have had more than one fan on the "late show." I rise to discuss a matter which poses an alarming and insidious environmental danger to Canada, to inquire about what steps the govern-