

sentence should be disregarded. Men who commit that sort of crime should serve the full term; there should be no question of the government taking the stand that they are reformed; men of that type are not likely to reform in a penitentiary. For the protection of our womenfolk these men should be kept in the penitentiary as long as possible. I urge on the minister that he see to it that the remissions branch change the rule and keep men of that type in penitentiary for the full term of their sentence.

Is any step to be taken by the government by way of appointing a penitentiary commission? That was recommended in 1938, two years ago, and this government are supposed to be a government of speedy action, although I have never seen much trace of it myself, but they are supposed to be fast workers. This is not a very good example of speed. Why has that commission not been appointed long since?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): As my hon. friend says, this was recommended two years ago, and two years ago a bill based on that recommendation and that report was introduced in parliament. The bill went through this house but met an unfortunate fate in the other place, so one year must be taken off the calculation of my hon. friend. Last year a bill was passed, and the commission would have been appointed last fall; I was doing my best to find the personnel best qualified for the work. It was the intention of all hon. members when that bill was considered in this house that the best available men should be chosen for that work. Frankly, I say that the war first interfered with the selection of the men, and then the general election came later—

Mr. GREEN: That should not have made any difference.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): It did, because one or two of the men who were being considered thought they could serve their country in another capacity. However, as my hon. friend knows, we have been very busy during this session. I can assure him that the commission will be appointed as soon as possible, but I prefer even to take a little more time and have good men than have men who would be criticized at the next session of the house as not doing the work as it should be done. I shall do my best when this house is closed. The item in the estimates on penitentiaries includes the salaries to be paid to the commissioners, and all that is left is to have the law proclaimed and the commission appointed. I must say that I had

recommended the inclusion of a larger estimate, on account of certain reforms which ought to be made at the same time, but unfortunately the money requirements for the war have played havoc with my estimates as well as with those of other departments. But the commission will be appointed and will try to put into practice most of the recommendations of the report.

Mr. POULIOT: I congratulate the minister upon not having appointed that commission.

Mr. GREEN: This hon. gentleman was not one of the applicants, was he?

Mr. POULIOT: I congratulate the minister very warmly. I opposed the bill and I am glad that the commission is not appointed. The minister is saving trouble for himself and the department by not appointing the commission. I believe the minister is a good minister; I believe the gentleman in front of him is a good man, and I do not see the use of that commission. We have enough commissions. I hope the minister will comply with my request rather than with that of the hon. member for Vancouver South.

Item agreed to.

103. Payment of gratuities to the widows or to any dependent children of judges who die while in office, \$15,000.

Mr. MacINNIS: Could the minister tell the committee what payments were made under this vote in each of the last two years?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): This provides for the payment of two months' salary to the widow of a deceased judge. This practice has been followed for many years, for as long as I can remember. This is the amount voted each year for this purpose. I do not know how much was paid last year. I suppose it is about the same every year, since providence usually acts in much the same way year by year.

Mr. MacINNIS: This is one of the items I do not like, because it comes under the head of what might be called class legislation. I see no reason why the widow of a judge should receive a gratuity from this government any more than the widow of a longshoreman, of a farmer or of a letter carrier. The judges receive fairly good salaries; and if a man being paid from \$7,000 to \$15,000 a year cannot make provision for his widow and family, how can we expect persons receiving less than one-tenth or one-twentieth of that amount to make such provision? When our old people reach the point where they must