

*Criminal Code*

indicate that we should enlarge or increase our parole system. I hope that in the not too distant future we begin to catch up with the federal policy in the United States.

A number of us had the privilege of going to the United States for a number of days as members of the joint committee of the House of Commons and Senate on Penitentiaries. The United States instituted this policy some three years ago. I refer to the fact that they began to allow prisoners out of jails before the period of parole eligibility, after prisoners had demonstrated a social attitude which convinced the guards, officers and educationalist, that they had been rehabilitated. These people are let out in the morning to go to work and come back at night and on weekends. They continue this procedure until such time as they are eligible for parole. These prisoners are able to support their own families and they pay room and board at the penitentiaries. This all takes place before they are eligible for parole. We were told when we were in Washington that this practice was so successful in the first year they hoped to more than double the number of people allowed out under the system in the second year.

It is my hope that we will go ahead with such a program and that we will have the power to do so. I hope we can proceed with this type of progressive, modern penology policy under the proposed amendments in this bill. A lot more people should be let out under supervised probation. Perhaps many should be put on this basis before they even enter reformatories or penitentiaries. If a judge and an investigating officer decide that these people have made a mistake, there is no need to put them behind bars.

There are some things about this bill in respect of paroles that I find difficulty in understanding. There is one part which deals with the Prisons and Reformatories Act. The principle sounds pretty good, but let me read one of the new policies which this bill enunciates.

Where, in the opinion of an official designated by the Lieutenant Governor of the province in which a prisoner is confined in a place other than a penitentiary, it is necessary or desirable that the prisoner should be absent, with or without escort, for medical or humanitarian reasons or to assist in the rehabilitation of the prisoner at any time during his period of imprisonment, the absence of the prisoner may be authorized from time to time by such official for an unlimited period for medical reasons and for a period not exceeding 15 days for humanitarian reasons or to assist in the rehabilitation of the prisoner.

The principle is excellent. If the person designated by the Lieutenant Governor feels [Mr. Winch.]

that a boy or a girl in a reformatory has adjusted, has a new sense of social conscience and is ready for rehabilitation, in order to assist in that rehabilitation the law of Canada will state that this person should be allowed to be absent from the reformatory for a period of time not exceeding 15 days. I am sure that a person is not going to be released for 15 days unless the official is pretty certain that the individual is ready for release. If the official is correct, and this is the right thing to do, why should he be allowed out for only 15 days? Following that time he will be returned to the reformatory. What kind of nonsense is that? The proposed measure states that the individual may be absent from time to time. Perhaps at the end of the 15 day period, the prisoner will be released again. Surely, that is too short a time in which to decide whether rehabilitation has taken place. If it has not the prisoner will be brought back. If rehabilitation has occurred, why put the individual back behind bars? A little more thought should have been given to matters of this nature, and I sincerely hope that some change will be made before this bill becomes law.

Before concluding I should like to stress another point. I am very fond of animals, as I think most members are, so I welcome the changes that will provide greater protection for animals and make more severe the penalties for those who are guilty of cruelty to animals. Why does the measure stop at that point? Why do we not follow the example of other countries and have something on our statute books about licencing and inspection of premises as well as the methods used in the name of scientific research? Millions and millions of animals are victimized and brutalized in the course of scientific research. Perhaps it is necessary that these animals be used, and I do not deny that, but I cannot understand why it is not possible to carry out this scientific research without this brutalization of animals.

As long as the present practice continues it remains a disgrace to this country. This has been a disgrace not only in the past but is a disgrace at the present and will be in the foreseeable future if we do not adopt a law in respect of licencing and inspection to give the government control over the use of animals for medical and scientific research. We must put something on the statute books in order that the government can make sure the best possible treatment is given to these animals. It almost passes all comprehension that whilst we are improving the act and making the penalties more severe for cruelty to pets, we completely ignore the millions of animals who