

bring up the question about the continuity of treatments to be administered; the walled-in psychologists work with certain inmates, and they have acquired thorough familiarity regarding their problems, and they have already established an excellent relationship with those inmates, and these psychologists should normally be permitted to continue their work once the inmate leaves the institution—since that work has been initiated, but it is not pursued further. The inmate has undergone an in-depth study, but he blocks up at once, all at once, and treatment must be renewed from scratch with other persons—when that is possible. This consists of what might be called a slicing of the treatment—that which presently occurs in psychiatric hospitals—precisely—these are in effect, outpatient clinics. Once the individual has left the hospital, he is permitted to see that same doctor in the outpatient clinic—who is thus permitted to continue has treatment task. Presently, this is absolutely impossible. Much as we may start a given type of psychotherapy, or a given type of treatment affecting an inmate, he will leave, and we are incapable of sustaining him on the outside with that same type of treatment—in order to help him adapt to reality.

Senator Flynn: Why, because there are too few of you, or ... ?

Mr. Bourgeois: Primarily because these are two entirely distinct organizations. We do not work outside institutions. Our duty consists of working inside the institution from nine to five, then, that's it.

Senator Lapointe: Should the parolee have to visit you at the institution, or will you go to see him?

Mr. Bourgeois: It may be incumbent upon the parole officer. That is why we suggest a measure of flexibility, of agreement between those two organizations—something that would look as a single programme, rather than different programmes subjected to by the inmate—and that would carry him through different stages by nearly the same persons having to deal with the inmate—from the outset of his incarceration until the end of his parole.

Senator Lapointe: Yes, but that's quite difficult—let's say that in Cowansville, where specialists, psychologists, and social workers are found—well, should the parolee head for Montreal, he is unable to return to Cowansville so as to be guided by those inside the institution, who know him quite well—then, how do you solve this problem?

Mr. Bourgeois: Well, Madam, from the psychological viewpoint, I personally feel that should the Parole Board have psychologists among their ranks—it's easy to transmit to them the information, to attune them to that guy's problems: what we have done, what we have not done, to what we should have done; and that person being qualified, might continue—since it's impossible to do—there is only 50 to 60 miles between Cowansville and Montreal, anyhow.

Senator Flynn: On the whole, you seem to be treating the problem of the inmate, or of the institution, as that of a large hospital where all services are to be improved or integrated, etc.; however, from that moment, am I to understand that you are considering the inmate's release as the first step on the road to rehabilitation—is that not the case?

Mr. Bourgeois: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Thomas: As the last one.

Mr. Bourgeois: The last step—the one made subsequently.

Senator Flynn: To rehabilitate him from within, but—doing what? I understand that you analyze his case, but him, he may be insensible regarding the fact that he is being looked after in this way—during the time of his detention.

Mr. Cyr: Evidently, within a given system, whenever we discuss the treatment tasks regarding an individual prior to his being released on parole, and that we actually carry out such treatment, well, evidently, this includes a good many things: it includes apprenticeship programs, social responsibilities, among other things—within the scope of work undertaken by the inmate in a workshop, for example. This also requires the animation of inmate groups, programmes related to a more unified lifestyle. Furthermore, this requires personal attention on the part of psychologists, and by others responsible for treatment. Evidently, under such circumstances, it requires that the individual be mentally prepared, that is, motivated, in order to permit us to probe and thereby to face certain behavioural difficulties, due to the fact that, at a given time, he feels incapable of functioning adequately within society. Now, at this point, one must make it—and that is why it is said that release becomes the last stage whenever the first stage has been achieved, where he has developed an awareness regarding certain required steps he should take in order to solve them—or to place at his disposal, conditions whereby he may continue that type of treatment—that is why we say that this then becomes a rehabilitation process.

Senator Flynn: When you look after rehabilitation, all your proposals, your entire system—your ideal institution—with all required personnel, everything you need, all necessary technique—all this evidently gives rise to release, but, are you facing this in relation to the role played by the judge, who, while rendering his sentence, had to take into consideration the seriousness of the offense, of the crime, of the necessity for deterrence—for others, at least, who might be tempted to do the same?

Mr. Bourgeois: That's altogether true. This consists of a court-level problem, and without being an expert at that level, let's say that by keeping in mind the seriousness of the offense, that's certainly to be considered. Hence, the judge hands down what, ten years, five years, seven years, eight years—is it our purpose to get rid of him for eight years, then we imprison him, or will it require eight years in order to be able to accomplish an efficient task with this inmate. This then becomes the philosophy: to know, why this, or why that?

Senator Flynn: Because, a decision has nevertheless been ...

Mr. Bourgeois: Yes, agreed.

Senator Flynn: Made by someone who allegedly had in front of him a record related to the individual, besides the brutal fact of the proven crime—a decision has been made.

Mr. Bourgeois: I agree, completely agree with that. But, just the same, we do have to work with that, and we ask ourselves: must we respect these 10 years? We cannot