

Mr. Cyr: That's it.

Senator Lapointe: No longer by people from within the penitentiary?

Mr. Thomas: Well, evidently, still under the jurisdiction of the commissioners—that's quite important. Evidently, it seems that in our proposals we made little allusion to that—however, it's quite important, since I feel it will frequently occur that should it become in force, especially at the outset, one may ideally anticipate for example, that what will happen will be that the inmate will appeal frequently, and that he will say: I do not agree with you. I say that, despite everything, the commissioners all across the country will have much work to do. The commissioners shall then see to it that another report be requested regarding more involved cases—having on hand a first report—and they shall then say: listen, what's going on, what's wrong, etc.?

Senator Flynn: Are you not rather saying this: that the commission does not presently have on hand, due to its present mode of operation, all the required information, and that this information is not made available to it quickly enough? Isn't this what you wish to say?

Mr. Thomas: That's one of the big basic problems; that's it. Not only does it not have the information, but further, it lacks in information quality.

Senator Flynn: Yes, well, this gives rise to the necessity for having a greater number of personnel at the institution level, so as to enable it to report to Commission members—and the latter continuing to make decisions?

Mr. Thomas: It's more than that. Let me explain: should the Parole Officer be more fully integrated within the institution, whenever the fellow is released, the officer may continue the work, but under an altogether different mode—he then faces the real aspects of a problem.

Senator Flynn: I have no objection; I find that important—an accessory to the general principle; but I was given the impression that you wanted to give a kind of autonomy to institutions. However, if we are to go deeper into this, you seem to want, rather, that within the institution there be an increased number of personnel looking after parole preparations, and, once the parole release decision has been made, the individual is to be closely supervised by said personnel.

Mr. Thomas: Practically speaking, I feel that you have the substance of our thinking.

Senator Flynn: In other words, you are saying that there is an insufficient number of systems, not enough techniques in practice?

Mr. Thomas: That's it.

Mr. Cyr: We're placing more emphasis upon the participation of leaders on the inside.

Senator Lapointe: For example, you say that there are only two psychologists for every 400 prisoners. From a logical standpoint, how many would you require? Should there be ten? Should there be 20? I'm in no position to know; it's up to you to answer.

[English]

The Acting Chairman: What is considered the normal work load of psychologists?

[Translation]

Senator Lapointe: Just what does your work consist of?

Mr. Belanger: What goes on in institutions regarding psychologists, in fact—they do different things: they have roles affected to inmates, for example—individual therapy, personal intervention. They behave as consultants toward social workers and criminologists working there; they behave as consultants in reference to institutional framework—helping out prison Directors and their assistants, etc. They also help in the education and training of the personnel—when time or opportunities allow for this. There is also group therapy; they meet with trade instructors, etc. They also must satisfy the demands of the inmates themselves—those who require the services of psychologists; they must reply to questionnaires submitted by doctors of general medicine, or others sent to psychologists by doctors of psychiatry, requiring their attention. They must satisfy parole requirements, making assessments, and, nearly each one of these evaluations—should the individual be little known from the psychology viewpoint, this certainly requires an in-depth study and evaluation necessitating two or three work days, if we are to present something worthwhile in terms of assessment. Which means that ours is a multiple role; hence, it would be quite difficult to say how many would be required for that, since consultation involves greater or lesser time: you may allow little or much time for consultation down through the ranks, little or much time at the officer level, at the social worker level, for criminologists, and so on. Hence, it's quite hard to answer such a question.

Senator Lapointe: Is there no existing standard regarding the ratio of psychologists to the number of inmates, for example, five per 400, or ten per 400, or other?

Mr. Belanger: A certain criterion has already been established in the U.S.—in this respect.

Mr. Cyr: One may illustrate by example: in a psychiatric hospital, you may have one psychologist for every five inmates, or one psychologist per every 20 inmates, in a psychiatric hospital—but this evidently depends upon existing programmes.

Senator Flynn: But these are not prisoners?

Mr. Cyr: No, no, but these are nevertheless people who benefit from psychological services. It's precisely from that viewpoint that I can answer, since other criteria may equally come into play.

Mr. Belanger: That's where one can perceive at the clinical level, I believe, that even where one has a highly developed programme, or even the world's best programme, each of the inmates is in prison for a very specific reason, for his own unique requirements, applicable to him alone, and I feel that in order to satisfy such requirement, as well as to his personal deficiencies, having contributed to his present incarceration—he requires that his problem be closely supervised by other persons, so that we will be enabled to satisfy his own personal requirements—which necessitates individual