

Senator Thompson: Custodial staff probably spend more time with inmates than do parole officers. What part do they play with respect to decisions concerning parole?

Mr. Faguy: I would say right away that communications could be improved. We are not communicating well enough within the service between what we call correction officers, classification officers and parole officers. Opinions are expressed by job instructors who are at the same time responsible for security. The job instructor, as well as the classification officer, give an opinion on the needs of the inmates, on his problems, and indicates whether the inmate should receive temporary absence. There is communication and participation, but it is still not good enough. As we go into the living-in concept, all will have to participate on a daily basis.

Senator Thompson: Is a directive sent to all, including the guards, in connection with any decision affecting parole?

Mr. Faguy: No directive is sent that a person shall be involved in parole recommendations. However, it is part and parcel of the evaluation within the Penitentiary Service.

Senator Hastings: Are you having any difficulty introducing this new attitude among the staff?

Mr. Faguy: At one point I was wondering what the attitude would be among the correctional staff, and what percentage of them would be suitable for the living-in concept. I have been across the country and have seen every institution twice within the last year. I met with the classification officers, chief classification officers, psychologists and psychiatrists, and asked the question, "What percentage of the staff would be suitable to become living-in officers after a short period of training, training on the job, with you people on top of the situation?" All but one said, "Seventy-five per cent of the staff are able to do it and will be pleased to do it; but give them a bit of training first, and put them into a positive situation." We hope that 75 per cent of our staff will qualify to become living-in officers, will participate in the program, and, we hope, will accept it. There was reluctance at the beginning to make changes.

Senator Hastings: There is always reluctance to change.

Mr. Faguy: Yes, particularly in accepting the unknown. People think it might affect their careers or that they will be out of a job. I recently made a film, and became an actor for a few hours. I arranged for officers of the service to come to Ottawa and ask questions, which I answered. We can now send the film to every institution and say, "This is what the commissioner is saying about the new program. This is what your role will be and what your chances of promotion will be." At the end of the film we ask that if there are any questions, they should be sent in and would be answered in newsletter form, and everyone would see the question and our answer.

With good communication and training, I believe that the majority of our staff will fit in.

Senator Thompson: With respect to communication, our committee sent, with your concurrence, 15 copies of an invitation

to submit written briefs on parole. Could you tell us what measures were taken to ensure that all inmates had access to this invitation?

Mr. Faguy: As I recall, senator, we did write to all the institutions asking them to make sure that opinions were received from the inmate population so that they could be provided to this committee. It was also requested that the questionnaire submitted by this committee be completed and returned.

Senator Thompson: Would it be possible to check as to whether correspondence submitted by inmates has been forwarded in sealed or unsealed envelopes, and whether future correspondence by way of submissions will be forwarded in sealed or unsealed envelopes?

Mr. Faguy: As you know, any correspondence to a senator comes in an unopened envelope; it is uncensored. This is a regulation. We may have had one or two occasions when this was not done and, if so, I regret it, but the regulation right now is that any mail addressed to a senator is to be unopened, as it is to me.

Senator Thompson: So that there was no censorship of those submissions?

Mr. Faguy: Not if they have been addressed to a senator. If correspondence is addressed to the secretary of the committee, then that is another matter. Only senators are entitled to privileged communication and we must make that distinction. We had one case where I became somewhat suspicious that some one was using a member of the Senate staff, so to prevent this type of thing happening we insist that the senator to whom the correspondence is addressed be identified.

The Chairman: What we are concerned with, Mr. Faguy, is this: We should like to have any submissions or recommendations by any prisoner or prisoners sent to us. At some stage we will probably send individual senators to different institutions rather than taking the whole committee, and preparatory to that we should like to have a list of the interested parties to be seen at the various institutions.

To this end, I wonder if your offices could get this information to the inmates and have them address any correspondence directly to me as chairman of this committee. This would facilitate our hearings at the institutions.

We are not concerned that members of your staff would do anything to the correspondence, but there may be a lingering suspicion on the part of an inmate writing to us that if he is relating some critical remarks to this committee he may be punished. If this were so, then we would not receive the information with which to make our findings. We are not trying to get the inside dope on the prison system; we are simply trying to learn what is going on in the minds of the inmates and how they can be helped.

Mr. Faguy: Mr. Chairman, I should like to get the dope on the penitentiary system myself.

The Chairman: Could you undertake to do that for us?