

Why should individual, law-abiding citizens be penalized for the delinquency of criminals? We are bound to ask ourselves these questions.

The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) spoke of proportion. Can he deny that there has been a rash of escapes across this country? I have mentioned those in the west; others have mentioned those in the central and eastern parts of the country. The large proportion of this country is composed of law-abiding citizens. They want law and order, as the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) said so eloquently a few moments ago. They deserve law and order, being law-abiding citizens, and in return for the confidence placed in us by our law-abiding constituents we should spare no effort in providing that law and order for them. One means of doing so is by instituting this inquiry which has now been proposed to us. Aside from that small proportion of our population who are law breakers there is a smaller proportion, happily, which has placed itself beyond the law and has decided to become incorrigible law breakers. Many of these people have been escaping custody. It is not alarm that is being created by this debate, as some have suggested, it is an expression of concern. This is the expression of our concern.

What happens in these circumstances to those who are charged with the responsibility of ensuring the safe custody of these convicted persons, the guardians, the wardens at prisons? Unless we in parliament act now, we will be having increasing difficulty in retaining those who are trained and recruiting the replacements and, I think we should add, in recruiting policemen. Then, surely, we will be in trouble. Their confidence in their jobs must be restored and our actions will contribute to the restoration of that confidence. Our law and the penalties under our law must be applied. Those who obey the law demand it—disobedience of the law requires it.

Many speakers who have preceded me have said—and I agree with them—that our law is a good law and our philosophy of law is right. We must not allow it to be distorted. The maintenance of our law rests on discipline, Mr. Speaker, and discipline may have to be imposed. It may be necessary to determine who among those who resist discipline in detention will have to be detained. I maintain that these are non-rehabilitable, but that is a matter of judgment. There must be a means of determining who is rehabilitable and who is not, and once that is done the methods of rehabilitation can be developed and can be effective.

● (2300)

In the process of selection, we must use some pretty refined and sophisticated techniques. I do not believe they are all in place yet. We are still experimenting, but we must not experiment at the cost of our fellow law-abiding citizens. Any margin of doubt must go in favour of society. Those who cannot be rehabilitated should not be granted parole or leave of absence unless they can, in subsequent days, prove their capacity to live within the confines of the discipline that we must uphold.

This is a matter that we must leave to specialists, but concurrently we must tighten up the administration of our penitentiaries with higher technical in-put for the entire

Penitentiaries

penal system. And I have a feeling that the minister does not entirely disagree with me. Although I would not wish to put words in his mouth, I was very pleased to hear he was fed up with the developments that had taken place when he was out in British Columbia. The Canadian law-abiding public is fed up.

As a guide to the improvement of this administration, a good point of departure is a review of where we are now in the whole penitentiary system. This can be accomplished by inquiring into the temporary absence system, security in the penal institutions, the parole system and, generally speaking, the administration of penalties arising out of the commission of crime. We have plans to get this inquiry under way soon as a result of the action taken in the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee this morning. And while this inquiry is going on, Mr. Speaker, prison guards and inmates should know what the rules of incarceration are. As a result each will know the role he has to play. Let all know who is likely to get parole, and who has earned parole. Let all know how parole can be earned, how weekend passes can be earned and how they can be lost. These privileges can not be earned escaping but by performance and proper conduct within the penitentiary.

What we all look to also is the full meaning of the mini, the midi, the maxi, and I suppose the super-maxi institutions in the penal system. Is it a matter of graduating by good conduct from one grade to another, depending on department? And are paroles granted in super-maxi institutions? This whole system must be investigated. Recommendations must be drawn up and approved by this House. That process is now in train as a result of the committee's action this morning. How better to get such an investigation on the road than by a select committee of this House representing all parties, all regions, all professions to be found here in this House? I support this proposal with every firmness I can muster.

Mr. Harry Olausen (Coast Chilcotin): Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the penitentiary system, its administration, security, parole, and the system of temporary absences. I would like to discuss something which comes within the perimeters of this debate, the parole system, which is so much a part of our penitentiary set up. The parole system, as you know, is supposedly a system by which prisoners who have served time in jail can be given an opportunity to go back into society and produce, in the sense that society can accept them as well deserving citizens who are willing to use their knowledge and efforts for the betterment of society.

We release prisoners who are supposedly rehabilitated into a society that is unwilling and unready to accept them. There is a girl in British Columbia who wrote to me recently about her problems under the parole system. She tried to make amends, to look for a job, and to give something to society. She was turned down by each and every employer to whom she applied. In fact, she listed 89 different companies that turned her down because society was not willing to accept her. This is something we cannot accept in a civilized society because we should be willing to forgive and forget. Can we understand a situation like this, when people who have served their time and are willing to make amends become disillusioned and, as a result, go back into the prison system? Are we willing to