

Mr. Faguy: Yes, we would be more knowledgeable of the case.

Senator Buckwold: In listening to the Parole Board representatives speaking, they indicated that there was a shortage of staff in the penitentiaries. They have their shortages too, and I do not want to be critical, but they felt that in the classification service, which does the assessment of all prisoners, the staff personnel available was very inadequate to numbers. I am not speaking of the quality of the work but of the numbers available, and in their opinion this fact affected the efficiency and effectiveness of the parole system itself. Can you comment on that?

Mr. Faguy: I would certainly agree that for a period of time, until recently, in fact, we were short of qualified classification officers. We are not being critical of those who are in the service because they do a good job. However, we have taken some action. We have just completed an extensive recruiting program of classification officers, and in the last two months we have added some 30 classification officers, for a total of 130. I hope to recruit yet another 13 to add to the staff establishment, and I have had to take positions from other sources in order to fill that need which is a very basic, essential need. But at this point in time we are meeting a new ratio which we announced last year—a few months ago—whereby in a reception centre we would have one classification officer for every 40 inmates; in a living unit institution for young adults and young offenders such as Drumheller, Cowansville, Matsqui, Warkworth and Springhill and the Prison for Women, one for every 50; and in the maximum security institutions, one for every 75. We have met this quota with our recent recruiting program which has just been completed two weeks ago.

As I said, I have now authorized 13 additional positions because we have an increase in population right now. This has been an unexpected increase, so I have authorized the further positions. The result is that, taken all across the service, we will have a ratio of one classification officer for every 57 inmates. That, of course, is an average because you have 40 in some places and I think we need a very reasonable ratio, so we will be able to give individual attention to the inmates.

The Chairman: What was the ratio?

Mr. Faguy: It was as high as one-to-150, and one-to-200 in some institutions. It was unbelievable.

Senator Buckwold: What qualifications do you look for in a classification officer?

Mr. Faguy: A professional social worker, a criminologist—that type of person.

Senator Buckwold: When you look for him, does he have to have some other experience? Do you take them out of universities?

Mr. Faguy: Well, some of them come straight from university, and they get training on the job with our people; but many of them have experience in other places.

Senator Fergusson: Will there be enough people interested to keep this going?

Mr. Faguy: We find that to be the case, yes. We were concerned about that for a while, but I would like to think that because of the reforms we have made and because of the favourable publicity among that type of person, the correctional people, they will realize what we are trying to do; and they are willing to come in and help.

Mr. Braithwaite: I think the other advantages we have, having brought our ratios up to one-to-57 and having made the presence of trained classification officers apparent and real, make it possible for us to attract other professional people because the presence of professionals tends to attract professionals.

Senator Hastings: But out of this 130 you immediately have to deduct 35 for the senior classification officers.

Mr. Faguy: In each institution we have allowed only half a position for the supervisor to deal with inmates because the rest of the time he is supervising, co-ordinating and talking to the staff. So the supervisor's job is not full-time with inmates but only half-time.

Senator Hastings: So that your ratio of one-to-57 immediately goes out.

Mr. Faguy: Yes, but, as I said, we are adding 13 positions, so we will meet that ratio.

Senator Hastings: Dealing with classification, I have always thought we classified institutions and not inmates. But on December 7 you declared the Manitoba Penitentiary, Stony Mountain, a medium-security institution. What happened on the night of December 7 to the inmates?

Mr. Faguy: Stony Mountain, Manitoba, had been used for medium-security type of inmate for some time, and then there came the point in time when I had to announce it officially for everybody so that they would know the type of inmates we had in there. It affected the question of staff classification, staff grading, et cetera. So, we had to make an official announcement, but to all intents and purposes it had been a medium-security institution for some time.

Senator Hastings: With reference to medium and maximum, we have been told that there are 2,400 men under maximum security when only 700 are actually in need of maximum security, so that we have 1,700 in maximum security who are being denied the benefits of the programs and of working towards a parole, by virtue of their being penalized by our keeping them under the restriction of a maximum-security institution.

I am quoting from Special Report 1, entitled "*Design of Federal Maximum Security Institutions*," at page 10:

We feel that in principle this is a misuse of the medium security inmates who should be experiencing the correctional program best designed to aid their own growth and development. It seems also to be ineffective as the aggressive inmates will usually