

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, October 7, 1971

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Seventh report of Standing Committee on Public Accounts—Mr. Hales.

* * *

HEALTH

SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to present a motion to the House concerning the scarcity of doctors. I rise pursuant to the terms of Standing Order 43 to ask the unanimous consent of the House to propose this motion in connection with a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

Canada has reached a crisis which, unless federal and provincial governments act more quickly than they have, will escalate to tragic proportions on a national scale. This crisis has been caused by Canada's failure to train enough doctors to meet the increasing surgical and medical needs of Canadians. Last year Canada trained 1,152 doctors to our high Canadian standards, but had to import 1,113, many of them not trained to our standards.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare told the House yesterday it is not clear that the provision of additional funds for medical schools for Canadian students is the right solution. Perhaps not, but in the name of those countless Canadians who, now and in the future, will suffer from this indecision, let us make an end to it.

I therefore propose to move, seconded by the hon. member for Perth-Wilmot (Mr. Monteith):

That the matter of the increasing shortage of doctors who are trained to Canadian standards be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs with an instruction to inquire into the matter as quickly as is consistent with a thorough study and, from time to time, report back short-term and long-term solutions.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Simcoe North. Under the terms of Standing Order 43 this motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

24319—49!

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity; the motion cannot be put.

* * *

[Translation]

PENITENTIARIES

STATEMENT BY SOLICITOR GENERAL ON PENAL REFORMS

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House of Commons on the present situation of the federal penitentiary system, which pertains to persons convicted of sentences of two years or more, give an outline of our policy and explain the reforms that were undertaken a few months ago by the Penitentiary Service, and other reforms that are planned for the future.

I will start with some figures on the present situation.

First of all, as far as expenses are concerned, the government must spend about \$10,400 a year to keep an inmate in an institution while it costs only \$415 to the government if an inmate is on parole.

During the last month of June, 5,257 offenders were on parole across Canada. A study carried out by the National Parole Board of 2,663 inmates on parole showed that 2,078 or 78 per cent had a job. They earned, for that month only, nearly \$857,000. On the basis of such results and of money earned by the same persons for a whole year, this adds up to more than 10 million dollars and their income tax, both federal and provincial, has been estimated at nearly 1.3 million dollars.

Let us take a look now at the social angle. In Canada, close to one million persons have a criminal record. Each year, on average, 3,750 persons are admitted in our 36 federal institutions. At the present time, there are 7,270 inmates in our institutions, whose average age is 35 years and 80 per cent of them are recidivists.

These few figures point to the obvious conclusion that rehabilitation of offenders remains one of the major problems of our times. The present situation results from the fact that protection of society has received more emphasis than the rehabilitation of inmates.

For too long a time now, our punishment oriented society has cultivated the state of mind that demands that offenders, whatever their age and whatever the offense, be placed behind bars. Even nowadays, too many Canadians object to looking at offenders as members of our society and seem to disregard the fact that the correctional process aims at making the offender a useful and law abiding citizen, and not any more an individual alienated from society and in conflict with it.

Consequently, we have decided from now on to stress the rehabilitation of individuals rather than protection of society.

Minister's Statement on Penitentiaries

Criminologists, psychologists, psychiatrists and senior officers with a long experience of the correctional field are agreed on the fact that at least 80 per cent of our inmates can be rehabilitated.

Therefore, a policy must be established concerning those 80 per cent, that is, the larger part of our inmates, rather than a punitive policy intended to meet the needs of a minority. We will undoubtedly have to keep on protecting society against dangerous criminals, but we will also take into consideration the fact that most inmates do not belong to such a category.

Reforms are undertaken on the basis of two essential principles. Firstly, an inmate is always a citizen who, sooner or later, will return to a normal life in our society and, as such, is basically entitled to have his human dignity, of course, but also his rights as a citizen respected by us to the largest possible extent. Secondly, in order for the rehabilitation to be as successful as possible, we must take advantage of participation from the community, both inside and outside our institutions, so as to have within our institutions a way of life that is as similar as possible to the normal life of citizens.

With such principles, we hope to change in our institutions the climate of tension that results from useless coercion, obsolete policies, and to create in the old-style institutions a more relaxed atmosphere more conducive to the rehabilitation of individual inmates.

We have therefore endeavoured to liberalize the system. On the one hand, we have closed the maximum security section in St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary and we have transferred most of the inmates of the old Kingston Penitentiary to Millhaven.

We have suspended all work for the construction of the new Mission Correctional Centre in British Columbia and appointed a task force whose terms of reference are specifically to assess the entire problem of maximum security institutions and to report to me at the end of October.

At the present time, we anticipate the creation of a greater number of pre-release centres. We also are working towards providing for visits by the inmate's family under conditions which are to comply more fully with the requirements for privacy, especially in the case of maximum security institutions.

In other institutions, we are considering the possibility of allowing the inmates to go out, following the adoption of a leave system which will be along lines similar to the "military leave of absence" system; such leave is to be periodical and regular and provided on the basis of merit. Already, in Warkworth institution, some inmates hold a regular job in a local industry; they therefore leave the institution daily.

On the other hand, we have already instituted a Permanent Advisory Committee of eight psychiatrists to help us improve mental health conditions for the inmates who are ill and to study shortcomings in the present system. We expect a first report from this group some time during the month of November 1971.

I would also like to announce the forthcoming arrival within our medical services of a permanent advisor on nursing. Moreover, a meeting is to be held in October, grouping all the medical doctors who are working in

[Mr. Goyer.]

penitentiaries at the present time, in order to determine the inmates' medical requirements and to review the services provided for them so as to operate on a rational basis.

We have promoted the creation of inmate committees within the institutions. Elections have taken place within all 36 institutions and each one of the committees has held at least one meeting. The idea of inmate committees was enthusiastically received by the inmates. These committees will make it possible to establish more satisfactory co-operation between the inmates and correctional staff in order to gain better knowledge of the inmates' problems.

In another field, we have relaxed the regulations governing communications of inmates with Members of Parliament and the Commissioner of Penitentiaries. For a few months now, letters addressed to Members of Parliament or the Commissioner are not being opened or censored by the institutional authorities.

Quite recently, we brought the inmates' haircuts more up to date and provided the inmates with clothing which is similar to that worn in the outside community, especially clothing worn for leisure. We have also abolished the humiliating custom of identification numbers on clothing.

Within the same perspective, we intend to give increasing application to the "living unit concept" which we have been testing successfully within some of our institutions. This is a matter of reorganizing a normal community on a small scale: a limited number of inmates are grouped within the same wing and they share the same premises with the Correctional Officers who are in charge of the group. We are, in fact, carrying on a kind of group therapy. The result will be that the inmate will no longer be depersonalized, a frequent occurrence under the old system.

We are also proposing to establish the cafeteria system within our institutions to replace the system of meals eaten within the cells, a practice which added to the dehumanizing character of prison life.

And among the most significant of proposed reforms, I would like to point out the new concept of work and industry within the penitentiaries. It is a well-known fact already that the organization of industries within our institutions at the present time tends to promote unsound production habits. The efficiency rate for our inmates is assessed roughly at one third that of a normal worker. In order to cope with this problem, we have put into practice two projects on an experimental basis.

At the William Head minimum security institution on Vancouver Island, a regular wage will be paid for the construction of a building required by the institution. The inmates will be required to comply with the same requirements as those in force in private industry with regard to working hours and productive capacity. Instead of the present daily allowance which varies from .55 cents to .85 cents, the inmates will receive the federal minimum wage, which will make it possible for them to pay for their room and board in the institution, to pay for their clothing, to help support their family, to save money for their eventual release from prison, to pay their taxes and to be eligible for payments under unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation acts. Once released, an inmate may

Minister's Statement on Penitentiaries

be less inclined to rob a bank; on the contrary, he will already have a bank account. He may even, as in the case of other workers, receive unemployment insurance payments during the period required for finding some employment.

In Drumheller, Alberta, we have already gone one step further: the inmates are fully responsible for the construction, the organization and the operation of a golf practice range. And the money derived from the income of this business is entirely invested into a trust fund for inmates. This pilot project, in which we have a good deal of hope, will show that it is possible to allow the inmates themselves to assume responsibilities and thus to act as they would within a normal community.

Another important project in the field of correctional education is presently being implemented. Last September, the St. Lawrence Community College of Kingston extended its campus in order to include the Collins Bay Penitentiary. The institution will therefore be integrated into the campus and the inmates will be able to follow the same programs, have the same teachers and receive the same degrees as the college's fulltime students. This will improve the structure of educational programs as well as the turnover of teachers. The inmate will thus have contacts with a larger number of persons from the outside and this will facilitate his eventual re-integration into society.

The Canadian Penitentiary Service is involved in yet another research project in co-operation with the Donner Foundation of Toronto and the University of Victoria. In a year's time, we want to have determined the effects of correctional education in order to assess inmates' activities following their release.

However, it will be impossible to achieve these reforms if we do not have a highly qualified staff at our disposal. We want to expand our vocational staff—criminologists, sociologists, psychologists, correctional technicians, etc.—in order to increase the ratio between professionals and inmates. We have vast reserves at our disposal, since already the junior colleges, the colleges and the universities offer technical and vocational courses in the correctional field.

We also want to provide our employees with every opportunity of retraining themselves.

(2:20 p.m.)

English]

Mr. Hees: For heaven's sake, he has two more pages!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is there no limit on the length of time the minister can take? I think he is trying to talk himself out.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows that under the standing orders no time limit is imposed in respect of a statement made on motions by a minister. The limitation of time applies only to the replies made by spokesmen on behalf of the opposition parties. There may be some unfairness to this. I have in the past expressed the view and made the suggestion to ministers that perhaps some thought should be given to making statements

on motions shorter rather than longer, and I would hope ministers would take this into consideration. If a minister makes a statement which takes 20 or 25 minutes I believe in such a case the House and the Chair must be prepared to hear longer comments by spokesmen on behalf of the opposition parties. It may be that when we are considering a matter as important as that now being dealt with by the minister we would want to devote more time to the subject. I do think, however, that there should be an effort made by ministers making statements on motions to present them within reasonable time limits.

[Translation]

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I apologize for interrupting the hon. minister.

[English]

Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. MacInnis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, considering the fact that the minister obviously has three or four more pages to read, what about the rule that forbids the reading of speeches in the House?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member knows, of course, that that rule does not apply to statements on motions.

[Translation]

Mr. Goyer: We have great confidence in our personnel and we will give them both the educational and the monetary facilities to enable them to undertake retraining.

So that all may have a better understanding of the new policies, the heads and officials of our institutions will also be given the opportunity of improving their training. The administrative and organizational structures will be updated and we will emphasize further regionalization.

All the reforms pertaining to our correctional officials and personnel are conceived in a spirit of consultation which we intend to further develop. To that effect we will increase the meetings so as to ensure continuous communications.

A third major element in the implementation of these reforms is the citizens' involvement. The program which the members of our society have to set up in order to foster the ex-offender's rehabilitation is an important one. We have undertaken long-term studies on community relations to improve the planning of the programs in which citizens, employers, voluntary agencies and professionals are involved with us; and we have also encouraged Canadian employers, as well as our own departments, to employ parolees and ex-offenders.

As our society becomes better acquainted with the problems of crime and rehabilitation of offenders and as citizens realize both the economic and social advantages of a rehabilitation program, a major part of the challenge that faces us will have been met.

Our reforms will perhaps be criticized for being too liberal or for omitting to protect society against dangerous criminals.

Indeed, this new rehabilitation policy will probably demand much striving and involve some risks, but we cannot maintain a system which in itself can cause even more obvious dangers.

Minister's Statement on Penitentiaries

We are conscious of the fact that some of our inmates are dangerous and we do intend to protect society against them.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind hon. members that these are objectives towards which we strive and we realize that it will take time before the fundamental changes are implemented.

Bearing this in mind we intend to develop a mechanism for consultation with the provinces in order to improve greatly the Canadian penitentiary system.

[English]

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, this is an important subject because we are dealing with a class of people in Canada, if they might be categorized in that way, who do not have the right to exercise their franchise. They are the only class of Canadians, apart from the judiciary who are independent of our democratic institutions, who have all the qualifications but who, because they happen to run afoul of the law, are incarcerated and cannot really speak in this place or in a community through the ballot box.

The minister presented a lengthy statement. He has taken almost thirty minutes. I will try to keep my speech short but there are some things that I think should be answered. I repeat that if any subject is important in this House this one is, and we discuss many subjects at length. The fact is that there are approximately 7,000 or 8,000 people right now in the penitentiaries of Canada, some of whom are young men and women who do not have the right to express themselves through the ballot box.

I have read carefully during the lunch hour the nine page statement of the Solicitor General with reference to penal reform and corrections. Many of the items contained in the report have been recommended by this party. I hope this statement involves not a question of propaganda, not a question of words but is rather an indication of some action to relieve the situation.

The minister says that reforms are undertaken on the basis of two essential principles. One, he says, is that the inmate is always a citizen who sooner or later will return to a normal life in our society and is basically entitled to retain his human dignity and have his rights as a citizen respected by us to the largest extent. First of all, I want to congratulate the minister for realizing at last that crime is not just a sordid happening but rather a result of human behaviour brought about by our economic and social conditions which we have failed to change.

Some hon. Members: Hear, Hear!

Mr. Woolliams: For years we have pushed for and supported a system of penal reform. We have pushed and fought for a more modern idea of institutions. We have fought against the unnecessary use of maximum security institutions where the lock, the key and isolation were the letter of rehabilitation and retribution was the reason for punishment.

• (2:30 p.m.)

During my 27 years of experience at the bar and in my time as a member of the House of Commons I have visited most of the penal institutions in the country. If institutions are to be used at all, Mr. Speaker, and I have questioned

[Mr. Goyer.]

that throughout my career, I point out that we in this party have fought for the use of more medium and minimum security institutions which would better serve the average incarcerated person who has been convicted of a crime for which the code by law requires the imposition of a lengthy prison sentence.

We have fought for an extension of the concept of parole under which persons could be granted wider and more humane privileges, that would permit persons in penitentiaries to attend outside educational institutions instead of remaining confined in prisons where loneliness and crime prevail, remaining in institutions which are merely crime factories manufacturing more criminals rather than dealing with persons who could and can be rehabilitated. We have fought for a wider system of parole under which a person could either remain in custody overnight and by day attend the ordinary schools in the community or be given freedom to remain out on parole during the period when he is acquiring training and education to prepare him to return to society.

We have asked for more psychologists and psychiatrists. There are not enough psychologists and psychiatrists serving penal institutions. There should be greater availability for persons convicted to obtain this kind of technical psychological psychiatry, to make certain they receive the emotional and mental treatment necessary for their rehabilitation.

I hope the minister realizes that crime is not only the fault of the prisoner but the fault of society as well. Everyone is born as clean as a white piece of paper. It is society that creates the environment which leads to crime. I respect the minister's enlightened views in this field, but in light of the discovery yesterday that employees of Statistics Canada are to be fingerprinted and photographed for security reasons I wonder whether his views will be translated into action.

This is a complex problem. On the one hand we find that the minister is imposing restrictions on Canadians, and on the other hand that he is stressing the rehabilitation of the individual rather than the protection of society. It is not clear to me which priority is uppermost in the minister's mind. It is also not clear to me why there should even be a conflict between the two.

The Solicitor General (Mr. Goyer) has pointed out that at least 80 per cent of the inmates of penal institutions can be rehabilitated. But the important statistic is that which shows that 80 per cent of those people who have been incarcerated in prisons are returned to those same institutions for committing other crimes.

I put this on the highest level, Mr. Speaker, because we are dealing with a matter which is above politics. We need reforms. All of this appears to be contained in the minister's statement. But is it a matter of words or a matter of action? Can the 7,000 or 8,000 prisoners in Canada turn over tonight in their little cots in the loneliness of their cells and say: Something is going to be done for us; things will be better for us in the future. We must be prepared to spend money on reform. It is all right to talk, but we must be prepared to spend money if we are actually to get reform.

Prisons create for the individual an atmosphere of fear, of violence, in which the problems created by lack of

Minister's Statement on Penitentiaries

education, lack of help for physical and mental illness, and the prevalence of drugs, homosexuality and so on, combine to unsettle the most stable individual. Prisons create the starkest possible segregation from the community. Months or years are spent in a prison environment, followed by sudden release and full personal responsibility. We could not devise a more traumatic social experience.

For those who make up our crime problem, penitence has little meaning. By and large their lives are so empty, they are so full of frustration and despair, they are so sick in mind and body, and their entire life experience, providing them grist for thought, is so totally lacking in charity that contemplation is more likely to cause anger at society's sins rather than remorse for what they themselves have done.

At the beginning of these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I said that I had visited many penitentiaries, both as a Member of Parliament and as a counsel. I have seen the terror, the emotion on the faces of young people incarcerated as late as 1968 after having been sentenced to five years for trafficking in, being in possession of or using non-medical drugs such as marijuana.

We can only rehabilitate the convicted if the law is reformed to bring it in line with the 1971 concept of what is expected in a highly complex, technological age. Political and economic reforms must come now. Above all, those who have been given the privilege to govern must respect and obey the law themselves. The flouting of the law by the government will do more to encourage crime in society than any other factor.

I would like to read a newspaper clipping I received this morning which was sent to me by somebody in my home town. I do not know who sent it to me, but it reads:

The University of Calgary called yesterday for 400 volunteers to take part in its research project on the non-medical use of marijuana. The two-year project, financed by a \$100,000 grant from the federal government, will be an attempt to determine the physical and mental effects of marijuana smoking under controlled test conditions.

The point I am making here is that young men attending our universities and colleges are charged under the Narcotics Act for doing the very thing that the government will now be paying other young people to do. There cannot be one law for one section of the population and another law for another section. That is what I mean by flouting the law. You must have respect for law and order if you are going to try to prevent crime.

The social and economic changes about which I am talking include the development of a creative society in which all young persons will have an opportunity to succeed. Last year thousands of young people in universities were turned down and failed simply because of a matter of a decimal point in their marks. Thousands were denied the right to study medicine; thousands were denied the right to study accounting; thousands were denied the right to study law, pharmacy or other professions, and thousands of others were denied the right to be trained in some skill simply because we do not have enough institutions for all our young people. These young people are being denied by a system of human computerization. Somebody makes a differentiation of .06 in their academic marks and that is sufficient to set them apart from

somebody else. The time to start reforming our institutions is now in order to give all our young people a chance and remove their frustrations.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read one short excerpt from a book which I think everybody should read, "Crime in America", written by Ramsey Clark, the former Attorney General of the United States. In it he writes:

If rehabilitation is the goal, only the indeterminate sentence will be used.

In other words, what he is saying is that under a modern, streamlined criminal code a judge could make more use of indeterminate sentences, because what judge knows how a man or woman will react six months, one year, or five years after their appearance in court? Indeterminate sentences would be one way by which young people would have a chance to become rehabilitated and attend educational institutions. That would be a starting point in reform.

I have been speaking for just ten minutes, Mr. Speaker, while the minister spoke for 30 minutes. I want to repeat that this is the most important matter raised this session in reference to human dignity and the quality of life of the individual. The minister is a young man and I congratulate him on many of the views he holds. I hope he will translate his words into action in order to relieve the terrible frustrations of the convicted and to change our prisons from factories of crime to factories of rehabilitation and prevention of crime.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my remarks by thanking the minister for sending us a copy of his statement in sufficient time so that we could make an adequate reply.

• (2:40 p.m.)

The minister has brought to his new portfolio a great deal of vigour and concern with regard to the problems of the penitentiaries. But, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to congratulate him because his government is the one responsible for not implementing reforms many years ago in order to develop an adequate penology system. When one looks at our prisons today I think we are fortunate that we have only experienced the incidents at Kingston and Dorchester within recent times.

Another reason why I hesitate to congratulate the minister is that for most of his reforms no definite period of time for implementation is given. For example, in his statement the minister said, "We anticipate the creation of a greater number of release centres", "we are considering the adoption of a leave system", "we intend to give increasing application to the living unit concept", "we are proposing a cafeteria system". Such words as "anticipate", "considering", "intend to give increasing application" and "proposing" are not sufficient. When the reforms are definitely implemented we in the New Democratic Party will be the first to commend the minister. At this time, however, we are not prepared to congratulate him on a mere statement on motions in the House which only sets forth indefinite future actions.

I had the privilege of travelling with the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs when it crossed the country visiting different institutions such as St. Vincent de Paul, Prince Albert, New Westminster, Archambault,

Minister's Statement on Penitentiaries

the new Millhaven and others. Whether the institutions are new or old certain things are common to all. First, there is too much stone and steel in the construction, giving one a feeling of separation and rejection. Many of the institutions are too large, indicating a depersonalization of the inmates. Many of them are located too far from major cities, thereby denying inmates proper treatment facilities and personnel and making their reorientation within the community very difficult upon release. We found that there is an excessive use of prisons in Canada. It is only now that the minister has said that the parole system is of great value. May I suggest to the Solicitor General that we should start at the probation service stage. If this were improved within the court system, perhaps the large populations at present in the prisons would not be necessary.

Another thing we found was a too heavy concentration on maximum security prisons across the country. I am delighted that the minister told us that he has halted construction of the Mission Correction Centre. In Canada maximum security prisons are populated to the extent of 35 per cent whereas in Great Britain the figure is 15 per cent. Something must, therefore, be basically wrong with regard to classifying the inmates in institutions.

We also found that the classification centres are not adequate to diagnose the problems of inmates and set forth a proper treatment and evaluation program. The industrial training courses are also inadequate and do not equip inmates to accept their responsibilities within the community upon release. Finally, we were struck by the absence of a team approach by the staff and the inmates of the institutions.

The Ouimet report set forth two principles with regard to prisoners. The first requirement was custody of the inmate for the period of his sentence subject to remission and/or parole. The second requirement was to prepare the individual for permanent return to the community so he could live as a law-abiding and contributing citizen. Our prisons in the past have not achieved these goals nor are they doing so at present. This is one of the reasons for the high rate of recidivism. In the past, control was through containment rather than through involvement. If these reforms are fully implemented we may find a change in the emphasis with regard to prisoners.

May I add, Mr. Speaker, that some changes are still necessary. For example, the design, size and function of prisons must be blended toward preparing individuals for their return to society as law-abiding citizens. Prison programs and services must also provide adequate training and treatment both within and without the institutions. The best example of this need is the absence of treatment for many of the drug addicts within society today. Matsqui is the only centre where treatment is available. I am sure the Solicitor General looks forward to the day when treatment centres for addicts will be closely attached to the prisons.

I thought the minister showed a particular interest in inmate committees. I am sure one of the reasons for so much trouble in prisons in the past was the absence of any participation by inmates with regard to conditions of discipline and treatment. If the minister is really serious about inmate committees I would recommend to him that some of those inmate committees appear before the

[Mr. Gilbert.]

Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs when the estimates come before it in order to set forth their ideas on what a prison should contain with regard to design, size and programs regarding their treatment.

In fairness, Mr. Speaker, I think the reforms are a step in the right direction and we shall await their implementation and evaluation. Finally, I suggest to the minister that, if he does not want to see prisons in the future populated with young people, he withdraw the Young Offenders Act and replace it with modern penology concepts. This would be the greatest contribution the minister could make to this Parliament.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, more than ever we can truthfully say that we live in a mad world and are governed by the most outstanding of the mad.

Seeking to correct the effects of causes one is unwilling to change is, in my opinion, just standing still, which is absolutely no way to solve a problem which does call for a solution, but an intelligent one.

Rehabilitation of offenders, according to the Solicitor General's statement, has become more important than the protection of society. The Solicitor General does not, for instance, mention that there are causes for our having offenders and criminals, stemming from within society itself. Therefore, so long as we tolerate those causes, poverty in the midst of affluence, and insecurity, we evidently will have criminals to cope with. To try to rehabilitate them in hostile society is the solution the Solicitor General has to offer. Indeed, according to his statements, unemployed and welfare recipients would be better protected in jail than if they were free.

Please note that I am for the rehabilitation of prisoners, but in a society that will allow it, which is impossible in the present system. We want them to be rehabilitated. We now promise them university degrees or CEGEP diplomas. Therefore, our young people of 18, 19 or 20 years of age, who are honest and anxious to complete their studies and graduate will have no other choice but to commit an offence, be sentenced to prison where they will be sure to get a university degree or CEGEP diploma.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, we agree on emphasizing rehabilitation but, as I say, as long as we tolerate insecurity among prisoners—and the government very well knows it—they will be incited to return to prison and that, on several occasions.

Mr. Speaker, it does not seem to me a step in the right direction. That might please the prisoner, but once he is released, if he is rehabilitated he will be returned to society where he has no place. What purpose will be served by prison or penitentiary reforms? Let us begin by reforming what must be reformed in Canada: the economic system, which allows the eventual prisoners to remain in society and take part in its activities. But no, the government prefers to come to grips with problems caused by the present situation, and not with the causes themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the minister told us that it costs \$10,400 yearly to keep an individual behind bars. In my opinion it would cost less to provide for his needs or give him a job

Inquiries of the Ministry

when he is free and before he commits a crime. Furthermore this would encourage young people to abstain from committing criminal acts which send them behind bars.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to us that the psychiatrists, the psychologists and the sociologists mentioned by the minister should be used not only to study the behaviour of prisoners but also the behaviour of the government.

[English]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**THE CANADIAN ECONOMY****DEVELOPMENT BY GOVERNMENT OF OVER-ALL INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY—CO-ORDINATION WITHIN GOVERNMENT SERVICES**

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. It relates to the serious decline in the development of our manufacturing industry, particularly in the technological areas, which the Science Council says dates from mid-1968 and which just happens to be the time my right hon. friend assumed control of the affairs of this country. Does the Prime Minister now intend to have the government prepare and develop an over-all industrial strategy as recommended by the Science Council?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might reply to the Leader of the Opposition and observe that the Science Council is an entirely independent organization, independent in the sense that it is a Crown corporation. It decides what studies it will undertake and what studies it will publish. As the minister responsible for the Science Council, I shall be most interested in examining the proposals set forth in the report alluded to by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, the minister's answer goes directly to the main consideration to which the Science Council called attention. In light of the minister's answer I would again like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the urgency of the situation which prompted the Science Council to develop and prepare an interim report and in view of the emphasis placed by the Science Council upon the lack of co-ordination within government services, will the Prime Minister undertake to follow through on one of the major recommendations in this interim report of the Science Council and name without delay a central point in government that will have a mandate to effect such co-ordination?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the government has been following a concerted industrial development policy to strengthen our secondary and processing industries. A good deal of attention has been directed to the high technology sectors. Continuing attention is given within the department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and other relevant departments to the development of programs and policies to strengthen Canadian industry and to achieve more effective co-operation between indus-

try and government. The interim report of the council constitutes a most useful input into this continuing process.

Mr. Stanfield: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, we are all interested to know how amused the Prime Minister is by the sad state of industry in Canada. I have one final supplementary question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanfield: Just be patient. In view of the council's observation that the relationship between industry and government is by no means good enough and that this goes to the very root of the problem, I ask the Prime Minister whether he intends to do something to improve this situation rather than simply deliver lectures about the contributions of the Phoenicians?

FISCAL POLICY TO STIMULATE MANUFACTURING RATHER THAN EXTRACTING SECTOR—NEW POLICY FOR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVE GRANTS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact the Science Council points out that the growth of manufacturing has been marking time since 1968 and there are 120,000 fewer jobs than expected, is the minister planning to announce any fiscal policy that will help stimulate the manufacturing sector rather than the extraction sector of the economy which has been paying out only a small percentage of its profits in taxes?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Without accepting the premise of the question or the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I simply say that our present fiscal policies, including those which are presently before the House, if we ever get them passed, will be of great benefit to the manufacturing industry in Canada and, indeed, include tax decreases for the general corporations which pay corporate income tax. I hope we can get on with them very quickly.

Mr. Douglas: May I direct a further supplementary question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the council found that the work of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion was lacking in co-ordination and that many of its grants to foreign companies were squeezing out Canadian enterprises, I ask the Prime Minister if the government intends to evaluate this finding of the Science Council and to announce any new policy under which the Department of Regional Economic Expansion will operate?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not read the report which I understand was only made public yesterday. I am afraid I cannot comment on the report itself. If the hon. member is reflecting its considered judgment on that department, I would say that it sounds a bit wild to me, but I will certainly consider what they have to say and see if there is perhaps not a context which makes it a little less brutal than the member has put it in his question.