

a sense, in the decision. Also at times even the inmates participate in the decision. I feel this is excellent.

**Senator Hastings:** Do you find giving your reasons for parole or denial of parole important?

**Mr. Stevenson:** Extremely important; when parole is granted it is very good.

**Senator Hastings:** To carry this forward, on reserved decisions or decisions made in Ottawa, is it not true that the inmate is not made aware of the reasons?

**Mr. Stevenson:** There are times when our communications break down because the decision is made at a later time. In most cases, however, or in as many cases as possible, the field officer receives the reasons. He then goes to the institution, interviews the inmate and interprets the reasons for him.

**Senator Hastings:** Did you say, "in most cases"?

**Mr. Stevenson:** In most cases. I know for a fact that in some cases it is not done.

**Senator Hastings:** I know that in many cases all the man receives is a letter from the Parole Board saying his parole has been denied and the institutional staff or the agency working with the person is unaware of the reason.

**Mr. Stevenson:** They can obtain it from the field staff. Again, because of the work load, I think they do not always go out for the second interview after the decision has been made, but I know that in many offices they do make a point of seeing the person to ensure that he understands why the decision was reached.

**Senator Hastings:** Mr. Stevenson, how do you feel about the veto power which is granted the Solicitor General of the Province of Quebec?

**Mr. Street:** There is no such veto power.

**Senator Hastings:** Did I not understand you correctly that on your terms of five years or more—

**Mr. Street:** They have an opportunity to make representations to us. The reason for this is to ensure that no person involved in organized crime slips through without our knowing it, because if he is involved in organized crime, or the Mafia, it would not necessarily show on our files. We give them the opportunity to make representations. However, there is no such veto power on the part of anyone concerned.

**Senator Hastings:** Would that apply to the Attorney General in Ontario?

**Mr. Street:** No.

**Senator Hastings:** This would only apply to the Province of Quebec?

**Mr. Street:** No, the Province of Quebec does not enjoy more privileges than any other province. Anyone can make representations. It occurred because of some difficult cases in Quebec, and they asked for the opportunity to make representations to the board. This is what happened in Quebec. I think it arose in connection with FLQ cases.

**Senator Hastings:** How long has this procedure been followed in the Province of Quebec?

**Mr. Street:** About six or seven years, I think.

**Senator Hastings:** Six or seven years, and before the FLQ—

**Mr. Street:** We had FLQ cases then, and I feel for this reason, the opportunity to make representations was then provided, if not the whole of the reason.

**Senator Hastings:** As you are aware, Mr. Street, I am concerned with the discrepancy in the treatment provided in the Province of Quebec, and I am wondering if there is not some correlation in that treatment—and I am not sure what you would call it—which you provide for the Solicitor General of the Province of Quebec.

**Mr. Street:** No, I do not feel there is any difference. Did we not send you some statistics? You have obtained more statistics than most other members have, and I thought we sent some statistics to you, but I am not sure.

**Senator Hastings:** I am just wondering why the Solicitor General of the Province of Quebec enjoys this procedure and no attorney general in any other province does?

**Mr. Street:** Anyone else can do this also if they wish to. Anyone can make representations to the board if they request to. They were concerned about the FLQ cases at the time and they wanted to ensure that no person involved in organized crime, especially on an international basis, was denied this opportunity. It would not necessarily show on our file if he was suspected of being involved in organized crime. We have the same arrangements with the Ontario Provincial Police and the R.C.M.P.

**Senator Hastings:** Is this recommendation not given to you on a mimeographed form at the time of the conviction?

**Mr. Street:** Is that the form letter they send to us? I do not think they send very many to us. They do not write to us very often, as I recall.

**Mr. F. P. Miller, Executive Director, National Parole Board:** If a sentence is for five years or more, they send us a letter in which they give us information. It is relatively short and it tends to be stereotyped. It is difficult to make short comments on quite a number of people in which there is not much differentiation between them. They express a view which goes on our file, the same as any other report which we request. Other attorneys general from time to time have made representations in particular situations. In the case of a group such as the Doukhobors in British Columbia, for example, the Attorney General of the Province made representations. In my opinion, it is not a matter of any special privilege being granted. They simply suggested that they wished to proceed in this routine manner and we, of course, would not prevent it. Their reports receive the same consideration as any others.

**Senator Buckwold:** Does the report from the province prejudice? In other words, do they state that in their opinion an individual should not be eligible for parole? Would the short report with regard to sentences over five years prejudice in so far as the possibility of parole is concerned?