

must do something to provide him with suitable employment on the outside.

Senator Thompson: Is there any trade union in Canada which has given recognition to the training they get in penitentiary?

Mr. Faguy: Yes. First of all, the provinces recognize our training.

Senator Thompson: But I am talking about unions.

Mr. Faguy: Yes, the unions also. We have found, for example, that the Teamsters' Union was very co-operative. They have accepted our people in a plant where they do aviation work. They have been hired and accepted.

Senator Thompson: The period of training they have had in the institution has been recognized by the union as an apprenticeship training?

Mr. Faguy: Yes.

Senator Thompson: But there are a number of trades where they are not as yet recognized?

Mr. Faguy: Well, the bricklayers are recognized and the barber is recognized when he gets out.

Senator Thompson: He is recognized as a barber from the training he had in the institution?

Mr. Faguy: Yes.

Senator Thompson: And then he can go to, say, Toronto and get a job there?

Mr. Faguy: Yes, and many have done just that. It is a popular form of employment and is quite successful. Wherever we can do so we try to give training which is recognized by the provinces.

Senator Hastings: These 130 classification officers are supported by guidance officers. How many of those do you have?

Mr. Faguy: We have very few guidance officers left. I have decided that there should be living-unit officers, which in fact are guidance officers, or classification officers. The official classification of guidance officer is disappearing from the books. You will have either classification officers or living-unit officers.

Senator Hastings: Or correctional officers?

Mr. Faguy: No. Living-unit officer is a promotion from correctional officer and classification officer, so there are three steps. In other words, a correctional officer can become a living-unit officer (1) or (2) and then he can become a classification officer or a supervisor of a section. There is now a promotional ladder for these people if they want to participate and study and get involved.

Senator Hastings: Perhaps we could now turn to a new subject. I would like to discuss mandatory supervision, in view of the fact that

this has now been invoked. Do you not think that the terms "earned remission" and "statutory remission" are obsolete and should be removed?

Mr. Faguy: Well, here I must be careful and consider whether I am talking policy or not. I should not make policy statements. I will give you a personal opinion. There is a difference.

The Chairman: However, not for long.

Mr. Faguy: I feel that everything should be earned. We should not say that if you come in automatically you will receive so many days of remission. However, you will lose them if you do something wrong. I feel it should be the other way around, where you enter an institution and you earn what you get. There is a difference. I feel this is a positive application of the program.

Senator Hastings: We have both, do we not? We have the statutory remission which he receives automatically, and then he can earn extra days of remission.

Mr. Faguy: I feel that everything should be earned. You enter a penitentiary and you participate in their program. You are rewarded for your behaviour, for your work, and for your activities.

Senator Hastings: Then it is taken away from you by means of mandatory supervision.

Mr. Faguy: Mandatory supervision is law now. This affects the people who are probably in most need of it, the people who have been refusing to take parole or have been refused parole. These people, therefore, are in need of supervision and counsel. And with the additional correctional or rehabilitation centres which we have across Canada this will benefit these people. I feel they will receive more help than they have ever received in the past.

Senator Hastings: I agree they do need assistance, but it is difficult to assist those who reject such assistance.

Mr. Faguy: Yes, unless they are motivated and want to be helped, it is difficult. Nevertheless, we have seen time after time that at first they are very reluctant to receive help of any kind, but eventually they realize that there is something to be obtained from this service.

Senator Hastings: I was very interested in the increase in population. It is now up to 7,600, and this was reduced by 140, and of this number 15 have returned. It would appear we are not contributing very much to the statistics.

Mr. Faguy: Well, we are dealing with the difficult cases. We cannot expect the ratio to be low. It may very well be high. These are the people, as I have said, who have refused or have been refused parole, so the ratio may very well be high in problem cases.

Senator Buckwold: I feel that 10 per cent is very good.

Senator Hastings: However, that is only for one month.