

his application on file and we have an up-to-date report on the penitentiary service, and we have the outside or community report and now he is all ready for the hearing.

Mr. Carabine: At that point, yes.

Senator Hastings: Can we stop there? The only contact he has had has been with the parole service on his arrival, and then there was the briefing and now he has one more interview at the end.

Mr. Carabine: That is correct.

Senator Hastings: So, between the beginning and the end he has had no contact with the parole service.

Mr. Carabine: Not in the usual fashion, no.

Senator Laird: You have mentioned he was examined as to whether or not he had a trade. Let us suppose he does have a trade. What steps, if any, are taken either to have him continue in his trade or to learn a new trade?

Mr. Carabine: There again, we are talking about penitentiaries. As I have spent a little time with Penitentiaries, I suppose I can answer this. There are various institutions that are specifically designed for training inmates, for example, Collins Bay in Kingston, the Federal Training Centre in Montreal, and so on. Other institutions are geared more toward industrial production rather than training. However, good working habits are, in many respects, as important as a trade in the sense of employment. The classification team, classification board, or treatment team—they use a variety of names—interview the inmate and this interview concentrates on the inmate's interests. He will appear before a board of senior officials within the institution and they discuss with him what he wishes to do and how feasible it would be for him to do this.

Senator Thompson: Mr. Chairman, will you advise me regarding trades within the penitentiary which prepare a man for a job? Would you say that the equipment within the trades are up to date in comparison with the outside world?

The Deputy Chairman: I cannot allow that question, Senator Thompson. you know better than that.

Senator Thompson: I think it is a very pertinent question directed toward rehabilitation.

The Deputy Chairman: Let me make this point clear. We are not dealing with the entire question of correction. Our mandate is to deal with parole. I appreciate the fact that in order to understand parole we need to look at corrections, and I will allow some leeway here. However, to ask a member of the parole services whether facilities which are available within the prison services are adequate is a question he obviously cannot be expected to answer. That is the observation I make, at any rate.

Senator Buckwold: As I listen to the speakers, the classification staff within the penitentiary becomes a vital part of the whole program. In your opinion, how efficient and qualified are the classification staff members?

The Deputy Chairman: No, Senator Buckwold, I will not change my opinion. I intend to give complete leeway here.

But as a general rule, our witnesses are members of the parole services, and it is unfair to ask them these questions because they have to refuse to answer them. How can they possibly answer that question? At some later date we might very well have witnesses who could. I imagine such a meeting would have to be held in camera.

Senator Quart: Mr. Chairman, it might give them food for thought.

The Deputy Chairman: The question gives them food for thought. However, I am sure they have already thought about it.

Senator Fergusson: Will you permit us to ask these questions of other witnesses . . .

Senator Hastings: . . . such as the Commissioner of Penitentiaries?

The Deputy Chairman: Right now, it is obvious that the next witness we will likely have will be the Commissioner of Penitentiaries. He has not been warned about this, but your questions have made this quite obvious. However, I cannot allow this witness to be put in the position you are putting him.

Senator Buckwold: May I ask another question?

The Deputy Chairman: You can try.

Senator Buckwold: In the final judgment, how important is the report of the classification staff?

The Deputy Chairman: That is a good question and it is acceptable.

Mr. Street: Senator, I think it is fair to say that all reports which we get within the institution are very important indeed, because if any change in an inmate is going to take place it will take place there. We are looking for changes in attitude. It is the duty of the classification officer to interview the inmate and assess and classify him. As Mr. Carabine mentioned, all these reports are very significant. Our officers interview the inmate and also interview other members of the staff, apart from any written reports they receive, to check on any deficiencies or other available information. We are dependent upon them to inform us how an inmate is getting along.

Senator Buckwold: Are there many occasions on which the parole officer, when he is making his final judgment, will disregard the general implications of the classification staff report?

Mr. Street: He is not allowed to do that. We receive these reports also. The members of the Board, or it might be the entire Board, review these reports. Our officers receive supplementary reports, but they also receive these reports. We will see them, whether he agrees with them or not.

Mr. Carabine: He might disagree with the reports.

Senator Gouin: The witness has referred to pre-sentence reports and has indicated that some provinces were not sending in these reports. Is that what has been said? I was not sure whether all of the provinces . . .

Mr. Carabine: Senator Gouin, I believe it was the Chairman who was speaking; and he referred to the pre-sent-