

ation necessary to achieve a future for inmates will prevail. In principle No. 4 the subcommittee states:

Only the wrongdoer can bring about reform in himself since he is responsible for his own behaviour; but the penitentiary system must be structured to give positive support to his efforts at reform by providing certain essential conditions: discipline, justice, work, academic and vocational training, and socialization.

I think I have demonstrated a few areas where the government's implementation of certain aspects of the report have met the principle enunciated above. The report also makes a distinction between punishment for a positive purpose and vengeance. Imprisonment in an environment which encourages reform from within the prisoner while at the same time imposing just and reasonable sanctions on the offender is punishment in its most positive form. Vengeance, on the other hand, seeks only to strike back at the offender with no view to the long-term consequences. While serving as a deterrent to that person contemplating a crime, simple vengeance would do nothing to reform the already-convicted offender.

In fact, merely incarcerating an offender with no concern for his future harms society itself in the long run. Society may have to face the prospect of retrying and reimprisoning the offender at a cost to the public purse and a heavier cost to society itself, one much harder to measure.

There are those who would argue that the recommendations have not been implemented quickly enough. On the contrary, I would say that significant action on 56 of the subcommittee's recommendations represents a very fast response. Many of the 56 items formed an important part of the subcommittee's report. Further, the action to date indicates the importance the government attaches to penal reform. One of the very positive results of the committee's report was the amount of study done by the government and other organizations.

I see that studies regarding recommendation No. 2 have been going on and that the government is considering alternatives to incarceration at this time. This is especially important to young offenders, first time offenders and those convicted of less serious crimes. The Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) in speaking to the International Conference on Alternatives to Imprisonment on June 8 last stated the current status of alternatives to incarceration. At their own initiative, and with the encouragement of the federal government, some provinces have initiated programs to establish options different from the traditional model. In Saskatchewan and New Brunswick fines are being considered as first options where appropriate. Ontario and British Columbia have examined and implemented programs which supplant imprisonment by community service orders. Through the federal law fund the federal Department of Justice is conducting research into the field of alternatives to incarceration. The minister pointed out that obstacles to the use of these alternatives may be found in the criminal law. Hopefully, when the Department of Justice completes its research into a criminal amendments omnibus bill these obstacles will be removed.

As the Solicitor General pointed out in his speech last June 8, alternatives must be considered, because in some situations alternative punishment may be more economical to society. No

one would suggest that dangerous criminals should be set free to save a few dollars. However, there are types of crime where it would be more appropriate to impose a sentence other than imprisonment. Last year the average cost of keeping a male in maximum security for the year was about \$29,000. Surely, there are crimes which do not justify that kind of expense. But alternatives must not be used just to save money. It would be dereliction of duty to use that as a primary reason.

The Solicitor General pointed out in the same speech that alternatives which keep the offender in the community and functioning as a family and community member would be more humane and would hold more promise for the individual and the community. Alternatives other than simple fines exist. As I have mentioned, some provinces have instituted community service programs. These are useful for a number of reasons. First, community service programs provide manpower in areas where it is sometimes not available. Further, it brings home to the offender the impact of his behaviour on the community. This is an excellent way of learning to rid oneself of the behaviour which leads to law-breaking.

I discussed probation earlier in my remarks but I think it is worth discussing it in the context of its value as an alternative to traditional sentencing. Use of probation is widespread use in Canada, though certain technical difficulties in the law hamper the mobility of the offender. These difficulties can be overcome by a federal initiative.

The Solicitor General pointed out some rather unique problems with regard to intermittent sentencing. These are important steps in penal reform. They are just as important as penitentiaries reform. Penitentiaries are not dungeons where law-breakers are sent away to be closeted from the outside world, nor are they rest homes designed for criminals to while away the years. Neither situation is true. If one or the other system were to prevail our criminal problem would be insoluble.

Mr. Speaker, by enunciating 13 principles the MacGuigan report sought to address the crisis in Canadian penitentiaries. The actions of the government have been excellent to this point. The core of the program has been implemented. Justice cannot evolve in a vacuum. The very important work of the MacGuigan committee set the stage for reform of penitentiaries in Canada. Changing circumstances will dictate that some of the 65 recommendations will be altered or replaced entirely. The situation in Canadian prisons must be constantly monitored to take account of current needs. However, just as important will be the work of people studying alternatives to the expensive and sometimes inappropriate system which prevails now.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Will the hon. member answer a brief question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The time would permit if the hon. member agrees.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. member could clarify something for me. A