

non-Indians, 64 per cent Indians; in Prince George, 49 per cent Indians and 55 per cent non-Indians; in Abbotsford, 66 per cent Indians and 59 per cent non-Indians.

Senator Thompson: You say that is the ratio granted. It could be that there is a larger number of Indians within the inmate community. Or is it that of those of Indian background who are in the penitentiary 69 per cent are given the opportunity of parole?

Mr. Street: They are all given the opportunity, and they are all treated exactly the same. Those figures are the percentages of paroles granted to Indians and non-Indians.

The Chairman: The percentage of persons who made applications and to whom parole was granted.

Senator Thompson: It may mean there is a larger Indian population in the penitentiaries.

The Chairman: No, no. These figures do not add up to 100 per cent.

Senator Buckwold: I wonder if we could get it straight. Is the 69 per cent in, say, Victoria, 69 per cent of those of Indian ancestry who applied?

Mr. Miller: Who are Indians.

Senator Buckwold: Who are Indians, and got a parole as a result of their application, whereas only 44 per cent of those who are non-Indians received it?

The Chairman: That is what I understood. Is that correct?

Senator Buckwold: Could we get it straight? I would like to know what the percentage is.

The Chairman: That is the percentage of successful applications as against the total number of applications; grants versus applications.

Senator Thompson: Is that right?

Senator Buckwold: Is it correct?

Mr. Street: I will check it, but I thought it meant of the paroles granted in our Victoria office—in other words, on Vancouver Island—69 per cent were granted to Indians and 44 per cent to non-Indians.

Senator Buckwold: That does not add up to 100 per cent.

The Chairman: It adds up to over 100 per cent.

Mr. Street: Yes, that is right. Maybe it does mean what you say. It would not make any sense otherwise.

Senator Hastings: What does it mean?

The Chairman: None of those figures add up to 100 per cent, which would be splitting it between the people there. What it obviously means, I am sure, is that if 100 Indians applied 69 of them got it, and if 100 non-Indians applied 44 per cent of them got it. This is in that particular area. I suppose it changes from place to place.

Senator Buckwold: We still have not had it confirmed. Who do you classify as an Indian? Is this anyone of Indian

ancestry? How far down the line do you go? Where is the line drawn? Or are they off the reserve?

Mr. Street: I do not know.

Senator Williams: I wonder if I might try to clarify this?

The Chairman: Yes, let us get this question clear.

Senator Williams: There are the status Indians, who are under the Indian Act, whether they be non-treaty or treaty, and possibly equally as many, if not more, non-status Indians.

Mr. Street: I do not think that has anything to do with it. If he is an Indian, to us he is an Indian. It does not matter whether he is a treaty Indian or a non-treaty Indian, or a status Indian or a non-status Indian.

Senator Hastings: Or a Métis?

Mr. Street: A Métis would be included in that too.

Senator Hastings: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if Mr. Maccagno might give us the benefit of his years of experience with this problem?

Mr. M. Maccagno, Member, National Parole Board: I can only give you the figures that I have.

Senator Hastings: I am not so interested in the figures, but I would like to have your own views.

Mr. Maccagno: I can talk of generalities. I have listened to what has transpired. At one point a comparison was made with immigration. We are talking about totally different things. In immigration you have people who want to leave the country that they are in and who come to Canada or go elsewhere. Here we have people who wish to return home.

Some of them, as Mr. Stevenson has said, would like to start a new life elsewhere. It may be that they shamed their relatives, and so on and so forth, and they want to go elsewhere. But when we are talking about the native people, they are people who would like to return home, just as I would like to go home if I were in their position, and most of us would like to go home, so we are talking about two different things.

In the area of parole and job opportunity, if there is a job there, it will help get parole. There is no hard and fast rule, but consider this. For a man who is serving time, paroling him to an area where we know, and it is quite evident, that he will never make it, we are not doing him a favour. It is better to wait a while and see what we can do or how we can use our resources to plan something better for him, if not right away, then in a month or two. Just letting him out and sending him back means that he has all his good time lost—plus. So we have to be careful of that.

Dealing with my personal statistics, I am a relatively new member of the board, and have kept track of every case that has come before me across my desk and during interviews out in the field. My studies are not yet complete, neither are my statistics. However, for the penitentiaries in the prairie provinces, my figures refer to those persons of native ancestry and include both the Indian and Metis. I have been out with different panel members on these interviews and these are listed by number. Out of all the inmates of native ancestry interviewed, my figures indi-