

The Chairman: So he is now going to serve two years from the time that he gets into trouble and this rides with him until when?

Mr. Street: Well, if he goes back for two years, then he starts earning good time again.

The Chairman: But supposing the fellow is out during this earned remission period of two years which he has carried with him, and he gets into trouble within that two-year period, then he loses all the remission he has already had?

Mr. Street: Yes, he would be returned to prison to serve the two years, but he can earn more remission during that time.

Senator Hastings: But then that would be a total of seven years on an original six-year sentence.

Mr. Street: If you count the time he was out on parole, that is true. If he spends a year on parole, that would not count and he would go back to prison for two years. Then he would start earning one-third of that two years. This is not popular with dangerous, violent or vicious people or those who intend to commit further offences, but then I am not running a popularity contest for criminals who intend to continue to break the law. I am concerned with protecting the public against these people. As I say, I am not popular with those prisoners because I think these things, but then I am not concerned with those who intend to commit offences. They should be brought under control either in or out of prison.

Senator Hastings: I quite agree, but I do not think the National Parole Service or the Parole Board are the institutions to fulfill that purpose.

The Chairman: Well, I think you are writing our report for us at this stage. Try to keep your statements as short as possible in laying a background for the question you wish to ask. We cannot just have a debating society here.

Senator Thompson: Following on that point, Mr. Street, would you prefer that the dangerous criminals whom you would not wish to supervise on parole, or for whom you would not suggest parole, should be supervised on mandatory parole by a police force?

Mr. Street: Yes, I would be glad to get rid of that headache. I have enough headaches as it is. We get blamed for everything in sight, including the things they do. I would be glad to dump that one into somebody else's lap. But I think we are the people who should do it because we are organized to do it. Besides, it is not just a matter of surveillance. Our men have to try to get through to these men, to establish a relationship with them and communicate with them and try to gain their confidence to help them. It is not just a matter of breathing down their necks to see that they do not step out of line. It is not for that we have parole officers with master's degrees in social work. We have 200 of them, and they are out there to help these men as much as they can. Now while some of these men do not want it, even if they are forced into a quasi-treatment situation, some of it may rub off and some of these men may get some confidence in their parole officers who are

dealing with them and impressing upon them the desirability of leading a law-abiding life.

Senator Thompson: Do you see a relationship between the police forces and these difficult disciplinary cases?

Mr. Street: Very much so, particularly in cases where they see these people misbehaving. As the police chief in one of our cities told me once, if he sees a man hanging around a dock area where there are warehouses at 3 o'clock in the morning he naturally becomes concerned about it. But if that man is on parole, we can see to it that he does not hang around the docks in the vicinity of warehouses at 3 o'clock in the morning. However, the police could not stop him if he was not on parole. In other words, it gives you the means of controlling the people who are likely to commit offences.

Senator Thompson: I think there are some first-class community people in the RCMP. I do not quite share the point of view of my colleague who has mentioned the question of rehabilitation. I raise this question because I know that in the police forces there are those who are very much concerned with the rehabilitation of offenders.

The Chairman: Senator Thompson, one of the things I want to avoid is asking people who are in one department what they think about people in another department. We are going to have the Commissioner of the RCMP here to tell you what he thinks about his people, and we are going to have the Penitentiary Commissioner here to tell you what he thinks about his people, but at this particular stage of the proceedings I think it may be embarrassing, and I am not sure it will give us very much useful information to ask people from one area to pass judgment on those who are their equals in another area of the work.

Senator Thompson: Mr. Chairman, with respect, I think you are prejudging my question.

The Chairman: If you would get to it faster, I would not have to.

Senator Thompson: I apologize for my slowness. Do you feel there is any merit in some kind of inter-relationship between parole officers and, let us say, the RCMP? Let us say that the RCMP officers could take a course in parole, and your people could take a course in police instruction or something like this. You have mentioned something about a master's degree. Is something like this already being done?

Mr. Street: I think it is very important that parole officers work with and understand the functions of the police, and that at the same time the police understand what our functions are and that we work very closely together. I feel we do this. We are certainly at some pains to establish liaison at all levels, and I think this is very satisfactory and desirable. Although the police are primarily concerned with surveillance as part of their function, I do not think there is a police officer in the country who has not gone out of his way to help a criminal at some stage.

Senator Thompson: Do you, or someone from your department, go and speak to the RCMP trainees in Regina?