

Mr. Street: As both Mr. Carabine and I have said, in certain instances an officer making an investigation may have thought it appropriate to talk to the police because of certain information he thought they had, but it is not usual to consult the police in the case of a community investigation report.

Senator Hastings: It is not?

Mr. Street: It is not usual, only in preparing the case in the first place so we are aware of with whom we are dealing.

Senator Hastings: I am sure you do not want to mislead the committee. You have indicated that when a man receives his decision, and the reason for the decisions it is done right here. Many decisions are received by mail with no reasons, are they not?

Mr. Street: In dealing with provincial prisons we have to do it by mail. We are not able to visit all the provincial prisons. If we have a reserved decision it is probably conveyed by mail.

Senator Hastings: And there are no reasons given along with the decision?

Mr. Street: I do not suppose the notification would state the reason. If he wants to know the reason he is entitled to speak to one of the officers in the field who dealt with his case and that officer will give him the reason. He would be able to interpret the reason from the file.

Senator Hastings: I feel this is one of the great complaints. I know the Board is doing a good job; but it seems to me that at the particular instant he is denied parole he is under great emotional strain and is not listening to anything else. I feel the Board is perhaps telling him the reason but it does not get through to him.

Mr. Street: I am afraid that is right.

Senator Hastings: He does not hear anything after he is denied.

Mr. Street: The same thing is true when he hears the word "parole". He forgets everything you tell him after that.

The Deputy Chairman: It is after twelve o'clock and I imagine there are other areas we will want to deal with. You gentlemen will be available tomorrow?

Mr. Street: Yes, sir.

The Deputy Chairman: I will accept a motion to adjourn now until either 9.30 or 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, whichever is more convenient.

Senator Laird: I would move 10 o'clock.

The Deputy Chairman: Is that agreed?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

The Deputy Chairman: Thank you for your assistance today gentlemen. We now stand adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The committee adjourned.

Ottawa, Friday, December 17, 1971.

Senator J. Harper Prowse (Deputy Chairman) in the Chair.

The Deputy Chairman: Honourable senators, when we adjourned yesterday Mr. Street, the Chairman of the National Parole Board, was our witness, so I suggest that we continue from there. I notice there are one or two senators present who have not been here before. For their benefit may I say that the procedure we intend to follow is to use a lead questioner to get things started, and then at any moment any senator who has a question relevant to the subject being discussed may indicate that to me and I will recognize him or her. When we change the subject we will go through the same procedure again.

Senator Hastings, would you lead off, please?

Senator Hastings: Mr. Street, I wonder if with you and your staff we might follow the progress of one individual through the system until the Parole Board hearing, being on parole, perhaps parole violation and then back in prison.

Mr. Street: Certainly.

Senator Hastings: Let us start right at the beginning. I understand you have now commenced in the province of Alberta—maybe it is extended and, if so, I would like to know—coming into the picture right after conviction in court, interviewing the man and allocating him to a suitable institution to serve his sentence.

Mr. Street: The way that started was that we were asked to have our people in Edmonton screen men convicted in Alberta to decide whether they should go to Drumheller, which is a medium institution, rather than being taken over to Prince Albert, which means a trip there, having them screened there and then sent back to Drumheller. Our people are, in effect, screening these men ahead of time, so it saves the cost and trouble of taking inmates from Edmonton and Calgary over to Prince Albert to be screened and then taken back to Drumheller. This has worked out so well that the penitentiary people have asked us to do this in Winnipeg, the Maritimes and Saskatchewan.

Senator Hastings: So the better inmate, or younger inmate, according to record, personality and characteristics, avoids the traumatic experience of Prince Albert, or a maximum institution.

Mr. Street: Yes. It means he does not have to go there at all, because he is screened immediately after conviction before being sent to any federal prison; he is sent to the one that he will end up in anyway, rather than being taken to a maximum institution, like Prince Albert, and then being brought back. This is just another example of how we work with the penitentiary people. They were so pleased with how it worked that they have asked us to do it in these other provinces.

Before going on with Senator Hastings other questions, there are two points I would like to clear up, to make sure the record is straight. Yesterday there was some talk—I am not sure whether I said it or not—of how we sometimes get bad publicity for things we have not done. We make