

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, we have certain persons in mind, but I do not know whether they will be available.

Mr. FRASER: When the minister was answering a question asked by the hon. member for Queens, he mentioned wardens being on the temporary list. Are some of them not permanent?

Mr. ILSLEY: No; none of the wardens are temporary.

Mr. FRASER: When the minister answered the hon. member's question, he put wardens in with the others. That is the reason I ask the question now.

Mr. ILSLEY: Well, I said something like this, that you cannot run penitentiaries without guards, wardens and so on; and some of your help has to be temporary. I did not intend to say that wardens were.

Mr. FRASER: I just wanted to make sure.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I desire to draw the minister's attention to what he said in the house on June 3. As reported at page 3740 of *Hansard*, he said:

... There will be occasions later in the session when these matters can be discussed more properly than they can be on this bill.

I understood at that time that the minister proposed to make a statement beyond anything he has so far made in the house as to his approach to this question. Am I right in thinking that the minister is not proposing to make any statement now?

Mr. ILSLEY: Naturally I have given some thought to whether or not I should make a statement and to just how far I should go. I think I have gone quite a distance already this session. In the first place, we secured this report from General Gibson, and I tabled the report. I said that the government was in accord with the recommendations of that report, at least generally speaking, and would proceed with the carrying out of those recommendations. That was a first step and, in my judgment, a wise and practical step with regard to the penitentiary system. I do not know that I should be expected to go very much farther. That report has a great deal in it. I said that there are some things which I am not in favour of, not in that report, but in certain other reports. I think I have gone about as far as I should go in placing myself or the government on record at this stage.

I listened to the hon. gentleman's speech asking us to proceed and saying there should be a greater note of urgency in what we say about this penitentiary question. I have taken that all to heart; I understand exactly what

[Mr. Jaenicke.]

he means. There has been an immense amount of discussion over the years about our methods. I do not know that it is so, that we are so far behind the rest of the world; and when I hear about a lot of these modern methods I am not sure exactly what is meant. I find that great confusion and great differences of opinion exist as to just what methods should be applied. I have read the Saskatchewan report, which is interesting, but I am not prepared to stand here and make a pronouncement upon penological principles or a statement about the relative advantages of the penological approach and the psychiatric approach, about which there seems to be quite a lot of discussion. We shall set up our commission just as soon as we can, and proceed just as quickly as we can.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I am not going to take time to labour this point. I think I fully understand the difficulties the minister has outlined, and I believe I fully understand his unwillingness to step out and make a statement *ex cathedra* about a lot of things until he has had a chance to consider them. But I would make this point, that I believe the people of this country are entitled—obviously not tonight, and I am afraid not this session, but as soon as possible—to much more from the minister than we have ever had. I believe the people of Canada, particularly those who are concerned about this matter, of whom there are many, are entitled to more than merely a report by a commissioner, though I think that report is very good and I believe the commissioner is a good man. The people are looking for something from the minister as to what he believes about this thing, what his aims and objectives are. He has not had much time to prepare that. I am not going to labour the point further now, but I suggest that before too long—I hope it might be early in the next session of this parliament—we may have from him a considered statement as to what his aims and objectives are and what his approach is to this whole question. Up to the present I submit that it has been a rather mechanical matter; we have dealt with this, that and the other point. Now I think we want to know his approach to this question in a broad and philosophic manner.

Mr. HACKETT: Possibly the minister would not object to saying whether the attitude of his department in appointing one commissioner is to be interpreted as abandoning forever some of the main points of the Archambault report. I have understood that this was a beginning, that it does not neces-