

appeal, judges, magistrates and provincial judges because they know that I was one myself and have legal training which they have. I think it would be more difficult for a social worker, if he were Chairman, to go and talk to a chief justice of a court of appeal and all these other judges about sentencing, because it is a delicate matter. It is their responsibility, and yet we are working with them. I think it is easier for me, and that is the most important thing about it. The Fauteaux Committee recommended it should be a judge, a supreme court judge, but somebody realized that magistrates have more experience with crime than they have. I suppose that is how I was stuck with the job.

Senator Thompson: Do you think that a background as a magistrate should be a qualification for one member of the panel or for all members of the parole panel?

Mr. Street: No, not all.

Senator Thompson: Just one then?

Mr. Street: Just one, I think. I would not object if there were two, but I think we should represent different disciplines, which we do. At one time, out of five of us, four were lawyers, which I think was not particularly desirable in the sense of not having enough of the other disciplines represented. Now we do represent other disciplines: we have social workers, criminologists and an ex-chief of police. We are well represented now. There is also room on the Parole Board for a member of the public who does not have any particular training or experience but who could represent the public point of view, and we do have such a member.

The Deputy Chairman: Perhaps with good common sense and public sympathy.

Mr. Street: That is right. That is perhaps the best qualification for any job, sir. Does that answer your question, Senator Thompson?

Senator Thompson: Yes, it does, but in a sense I have been unfair to you. May I say that if some of these questions we ask refer to matters of policy, as Senator Fergusson has suggested, in no way do I want to put any one on the spot. If you just tell me that you cannot answer the question, then I shall understand.

What happens in the appointment of members of the Parole Board? I suppose it is a political selection?

Mr. Street: No, not in that sense. They are, of course, all appointed by the Government, but of the ones we have on the Board, three were members of our staff who were regional representatives before, and they are not in any sense political, certainly not in the sense that they had anything to do with politics. In some cases I was fortunate enough to have made a recommendation and the Minister agreed with it and, certainly, these were not what you could call political appointments.

Senator Thompson: But you can make recommendations for people to be appointed to the Board?

Mr. Street: Well, I always did, yes.

The Deputy Chairman: I am not about to let this go, the point where anybody is going to knock politicians.

Mr. Street: We have a couple of ex-members of Parliament on the Board and they are both very good members. I am delighted to have them both. One of them represents what I call the public, and the other was a magistrate, but both are very fine members and I am delighted with both of them. I should be glad to get a couple of dozen more.

Senator Thompson: There is some suggestion in regard to the appointment of judges that apart from the Minister of Justice making an appointment, there are recommendations made by the law societies.

The Deputy Chairman: You are getting right to the edge of irrelevancy here.

Senator Thompson: Well, there are professional associations in connection with parole. Now I do not know if you can answer this, but do they make recommendations with respect to appointments?

Mr. Street: Yes, I guess they do, but I have been fortunate in that I have made certain recommendations and most of them have been accepted, and I have no cause for complaint.

Senator Thompson: Does the Canadian Corrections Association recommend people who they think should be appointed to the Board?

Mr. Street: Not that I know of, no. I suppose that if they had any ideas they would come and speak to me or to the Minister. I do not know if they ever did speak to the Minister.

Senator Quart: You have two former members of Parliament that you mentioned. One we know, but who is the other?

Mr. Street: One was an M.L.A.

An hon. Senator: A member of the Alberta Legislature.

Senator Quart: Oh, just Alberta!

Senator Hastings: I should like to return to Senator Fergusson's views on the hearings. We got sidetracked. Leading up to the hearings, Mr. Street, as you outlined the procedure as followed, there is one thing that disturbs me and disturbs most of your clients. That is that, as you state, you get a police report and a report from a judge. You said a short while ago that the most important criterion was some indication of a change of attitude on the part of the applicant. In other words, had he faced his problem and was he doing something about it? I just cannot understand what contribution a judge or the police could make in arriving at resolving that problem when they had seen the man perhaps two, three or seven years ago.

Mr. Street: Well, that is a good question, senator. For the sake of co-operating with judges we have always invited them to write us and give us information, if they wish. Some of them like to do this, but not very many, and we invite them to do it if they wish. Quite often a judge will say that he recommends an early parole because he felt he had to give this sentence as a public deterrent or because it was a minimum sentence, but he recommends early parole. Then if he wishes he can give us his assessment of the man as he found him at the time of trial. Some of them