

I want to turn, now, to a uniquely Canadian dimension of the penitentiary problem, viz., appalling mismanagement on a scale seldom, if ever, seen before in the Canadian public service.

Our chairman spoke even more strongly than I would have done about management, though I share his concern. He went on:

The Americans manage their system from a position of strength. We manage ours from a position of weakness, with weak techniques, and, worst of all, with weak men.

I hasten to add that our chairman would be the first to say there are exceptions. One of the exceptions is in the south gallery this afternoon.

● (1522)

As an over-all view of the management situation I think that what the chairman said was accurate and precise. I would like to conclude by saying a few things about what I look upon as a solution to the management problem in our penitentiary system. My colleagues who were on the sub-committee will be tired of hearing me talk about this because they have listened time and time again, and not one of them has mentioned it today. There are three recommendations I want to refer to in particular. I will read them so we will understand them fully. Recommendation 24 reads:

The commissioner should remain the chief administrative officer of the penitentiary system but he should be appointed by and responsible to a board of five members (appointed for five year terms on a staggered basis by the Solicitor General) which would have sole responsibility for the making of policy.

I emphasize that phrase "sole responsibility".

The board must not have an attached bureaucracy additional to the Penitentiary Service. It should report to the Solicitor General and should be required to make an annual report to parliament through the Solicitor General.

The Solicitor General in his first progress report referred to this recommendation in these words:

This is one of the most fundamental changes recommended by the committee—

To tie in with that recommendation is recommendation No. 26, which reads as follows:

The Penitentiary Service under the board—

I have just alluded to that; that is the five-man board.

—must be an independent agency of the government not subject to the Public Service Employment Act or the Public Service Staff Relations Act. It should resemble the RCM Police in its discipline and professionalism. Employees should be subject to discharge for misconduct and incompetence.

Once again the comment of the Solicitor General at the time was this:

This is another of the subcommittee's most far-reaching recommendations—

This has not been alluded to at all today by the Solicitor General except in a very indirect way. Indeed, these are recommendations which I am sure his interdepartmental group are looking at seriously, and I do want to say something more about them. There was a third recommendation, No. 62—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his allotted time has elapsed. He may continue if there is unanimous consent.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

### *Penitentiaries*

**Mr. Halliday:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to thank my colleagues who are as indulgent today as they have been over the past year when we were working together. We were interested in each other's presentations at all times. Let me quote recommendation No. 62:

The CPS should research the possibility of expanding, in at least one new institution, the Citizen Advisory Committee into a board of governors on an experimental basis. Such a board should consist of about 12 members and should appoint the director and senior administrative staff.

These three recommendations show a desire on the part of our subcommittee to have the public involved in the concepts, policy formation and in the running of our penitentiary system, apart from the management and administrative aspects. This suggests to me that the people of Canada have an input to make into the total penitentiary system which at the present time, under the hierarchical system, is virtually impossible. I agree that we have the citizen advisory committees in some of our institutions but they are rather impotent in most cases. We saw one or two that were effective, but by and large they were not.

My concern stems from a superficial analysis of our public institutions in Canada where people are rendering a service to other people. I am thinking, first of all, of schools, hospitals, universities, children's aid societies, public libraries and police commissions, wherever there is a public institution which renders a service for one group of people to another and results in public input. That input may be by way of an elected or appointed board, or a combination of both.

There is only one other public institution that I am aware of where there is a person-to-person involvement with no public input, and that is the army. That is the closest parallel I can think of to illustrate the point. In the penitentiary system people there have to deal with the most extreme, aberrant persons who have strayed from the normal sociological path which is accepted by society. In that instance there is virtually no effective public input. I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the main reasons we are now having trouble with the prisons. This trend will continue because the original militaristic type of system has been destroyed by regionalization and by the input of unions as well.

Let me comment on the approach taken by the former solicitor general, and a few moments ago by our new Solicitor General, to the recommendations which had been approved by the ministry and those which were under investigation. The Solicitor General forgot to mention that the comment of the then minister on recommendation No. 62 was one word: "reject". I was disappointed at that in view of the interest I have in recommendation No. 62. I want to give my colleagues credit for agreeing that that recommendation was worth including on an experimental basis. With due deference to the former minister when I made representations to the acting commissioner a few months ago he made it possible for me to discuss them with two of his senior officials and I did appreciate this gesture. I am looking forward to the next progress report from the new minister. I hope he and his officials are having a second look at my request that the CPS should research the possibility of expanding the concept of a citizen