

refuses the values of society, he refuses emotional involvement, he refuses the respect of others—it's "me, myself, and I", in all areas of personal activities. Hence, so far as he is concerned, much time will be required to effect a worthwhile change.

Mr. Albert: I wish to expand upon my colleague, Paul's opinion regarding what was mentioned earlier concerning "reality therapy"—based upon reality. For example, an inmate will show up, and after I will have become familiar with his problems, he will tell me, simply: I have a two year term, whether or not they release me on parole, upon my return to society, that should extend over a two year period at most—it's less than that, since in reality, there will be a compulsory supervision period,—he will tell me: I will relapse into crime, I will continue,—coldly, logically, just like that.

What should I tell that fellow, well, should I be permitted to do so, I would merely tell him: you will not be paroled, you are going to stay here, you will remain. Under such circumstances, I have to personally accept the law, as drafted; this law has been established by the society of which we are part, and which enacts that, in those cases, the term is of two years. Well, so far as I am concerned, I would personally tell him: you shall stay, you will remain, because I am unable to tolerate your prevalent attitude, due to the fact that it is unacceptable to society.

Senator Lapointe: But, this does not involve parole, where he has been sentenced?

Mr. Albert: No, this is one of society's laws that has established that for a certain type of offense, after having appeared in court, the judge will sentence him to two years; but the fellow himself, knows that he will relapse. For example, regarding drugs, the fellow will say: I'll become a peddler, once I'm out, I'll keep on. But he serves his 2 years, for, as a general rule, no positive recommendations will be made, in principle, regarding such cases. But he will return to crime, that is a sure thing.

Senator Lapointe: You might estimate that in those cases, the sentence be prolonged?

Mr. Albert: I see it somewhat along the lines that Mr. Thomas mentioned a while ago—it ought to be indeterminate—or to an extent, definite, since in truth, the fellow leaves, he is released—but he still remains a menace to society.

Mr. Thomas: We cannot do anything—it's the end of his sentence, and so long.

Mr. Albert: The individual says: I've calculated the risks, I'm now paying the consequences, I know what I'm doing; and I also know what I'm about to do.

Mr. Cyr: In the final analysis: "I've paid for my crime".

Mr. Cartier: But if we should consider definite sentences, then let us first think of multiplying the services within institutions, since then, this would be the equivalent of condemning everyone to remain there.

Mr. Cyr: For the maximum period.

Mr. Cartier: Yes.

Mr. Albert: Yes, it's a two-edged sword due to the fact that the institution really ought to be oriented toward treatment—so that a team be really involved, nearly 100%, to be able to work, to have a sufficient amount of time to deal with cases, and to be enabled to accomplish a job that will in time and place, permit the making of decisions, for, otherwise, it becomes: we'll see, we'll see. It's no question of "we'll see, we'll see"—we must work, we must do something.

Senator Lapointe: Are you truly optimistic regarding the possibility of rehabilitation for a large number, or is it only a small number?

Mr. Albert: It's quite difficult to answer, Madam; just the same, we have to be realistic so as to see just what we have going for us at the present time, its potential, or, in short, its elements—such as classification officers, social workers, psychologists, workshop instructors, finally, all these people—we must make use of what we have. It is not that we do not wish to have new staff, certainly that such staff would be welcome—that's for sure.

To give you numerical estimates whether our chances would be improved, or whether they'd be lessened, whether we'd be more optimistic, or less; we just must be optimistic, for, otherwise, we'd drop everything,—and we cannot drop them.

[English]

The Acting Chairman: In your submission you state that a prisoner will be ready when specialists in the institution make that decision. I never cease to be amazed that everyone seems to think they can make better decisions than the Parole Board: the police want to make the decisions; the judges want to make the decisions; even the inmates from Drumheller felt they could make better decisions. The question I want to pose you is this: who are these specialists? I want you to be specific and tell me.

[Translation]

Mr. Cyr: In order to answer that, I think that what we meant by "specialist", we subsequently corrected. This involves all the treatment-dispensing staff: not only psychologists, not simply, criminologists; this may also involve animators connected with group homogeneity activities; it may involve the parole officer—it involves all those who look after the treatment of the individual, who are involved and engaged in the treatment of inmates,—the treatment-dispensing staff.

[English]

The Acting Chairman: All of whom at the present time have an input into the decision finally arrived at by the Board.

[Translation]

Mr. Thomas: Yes, we ourselves nevertheless corrected the expression that we previously used—not the expression—in our minds, it corresponded to a reality—it was far too restricted. I think that the police might have its word to say. I think that guards, who work with the inmates on