

day long; I was locked in to see how the men are trained and taught and how they are reclaimed. They are separated. The first offenders, or young men, are not in the same part of the prison in Glasgow or Wakefield, near Leeds, as the hardened criminals. Whether we can do that in Canada I do not know. I shall be anxious to hear what the minister proposes or hopes will be the outcome of the legislation to be founded on this resolution. I for one—and I am sure the same can be said for all other hon. members—will support him to the limit if he brings down a programme whereby the reformation of criminals in Canada can be greatly improved over what it is today.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) is a great humanitarian. His tribute to the late Mr. Lapointe was felt by all. Hon. members are, I am sure, grateful to him for remembering a great minister of justice and for recalling what he meant at the time when he sponsored the idea of the penitentiary commission. I also remember two persons who insisted on that and who were our mutual friends, the late Harry W. Anderson of the *Toronto Globe* and our former colleague Miss Agnes MacPhail. They did not belong to the same political faith, but they both believed in the reformation of criminals and their change of heart after a certain period in the penitentiary.

Naturally, the purpose of the penitentiary commission was excellent. If Mr. Anderson and Miss MacPhail had not insisted so much, perhaps we would never have had such a commission; but I remember the day in the house when Miss MacPhail undertook the defence of a convict and a former minister of justice, Mr. Guthrie, took out of his pocket a record of that individual which was quite different from the description which Miss MacPhail had given of him. It is all right to be kind, but there are some convicts who are dangerous men, and there are recidivists, which proves that sometimes it is dangerous to be too kind. I will not mention minor offences and first cases of petty smuggling or things like that. That is just the spirit of adventure; but when a man goes into housebreaking or commits a crime mentioned in the criminal code, he has to be examined by doctors, and perhaps his mind is not all there. He must be treated as humanely as possible. I do not believe in galleys and the punishments of the middle-ages, in the carcan and all that. I do not believe in that system at all, because it is my deep conviction that even those who infringe upon the provisions of the criminal code and have been found guilty of a crime should be

treated just as well as it is possible for society to permit. On this I do not believe that there is any difficulty; but there is something else. I have read the report of the commission. I remember the day in late summer when the hon. member for Vancouver South asked Mr. Lapointe, who was then Minister of Justice, why the commission had not been named. I told him plainly, in as good English as I could use, that I was responsible for it because I had told Mr. Lapointe that there were intrigues behind the appointment of the commissioners, and Mr. Lapointe promised me that no one who had been on the investigating commission would be appointed to the penitentiary administrative commission. I wonder if my hon. friend remembers that. It is all on *Hansard*. It took place on the last occasion when Mr. Lapointe was piloting his estimates through the house as Minister of Justice. My memory of it is so good that I remember the hon. member for St. Paul's stating that evening that he wanted the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to take the place of the provincial and the municipal police. Those are recollections of past days.

At that time there were serious objections to the appointment of an administrative commission as suggested by the investigating commission. If hon. members will take the trouble to look at their report they will see that it was padded up to make a great big book. One need only look at the bibliography of the report to realize the bluff of the investigating commissioners. They mentioned in their report all the books that had been published on penitentiaries. If they had read them it would have been superfluous for them to charge so much for their travelling expenses. If they had read those books it would not have been necessary for them to visit Sing Sing and other penitentiaries. They had no reason to go there because the books gave complete information on the subject. If they went there it was because they had not read the books. But why pad the report? The expenditure was extravagant. I complained about it, and one of the commissioners told me that I was not a friend of his because I had spoken my mind in the house and said what I thought about the matter. There must be an end to that kind of vagrancy in bureaucracy.

My hon. friends are complaining all the time about bureaucracy. They say there is too much bureaucracy. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is so much more bureaucracy that we are asked to instal today. I wonder if a single member who votes for this resolution will be justified in speaking one more word against bureaucracy. Everybody has his mouth full of bureaucracy—bureaucracy here, bureaucracy there. This