

the gentleman just pointed out, a need for considerably increasing the number of personnel?

Mr. Belanger: I'm sorry. I was then referring to Federal institutions; I was talking about Federal institutions.

Senator Lapointe: In Quebec?

Mr. Belanger: Within Federal institutions in Quebec. In that sense, we refer to our Federal institutions, while not making direct allusion to Provincial prisons. If we are to confine our discussion to Federal institutions, we should be particularly favorable to idea of integrating certain officers within the decision-making process—from that viewpoint. That's our suggestion.

Senator Flynn: Does this mean, from a practical viewpoint, that the decision will be made within the institution?

Mr. Belanger: Listen, that's not important.

Senator Flynn: It's very important. In practice, the decision will be made within each institution.

Mr. Belanger: No. There may still be a local or regional parole office, however, there ought to be agents—within each institution's programmes—that are proportionately more active.

Senator Flynn: If, in practice, your aims are to return the decision-making process to the institution, let me then bring up the question: How can you establish similar standards in all institutions throughout the country?

Mr. Bourgeois: This question, in fact—I feel that we simply wish to work as a team.

Senator Flynn: I have no objection to that, but you're going much further. You really want the decision factor to be the institution.

Mr. Bourgeois: It's the team.

Senator Flynn: The team, if you wish; whether you have a small or strong team, your principle lies there—at the institution level. Hence, let me ask you: how are you going to standardize the policies in all the institutions?

Mr. Belanger: I think that the local or regional office would retain its importance. That is why, we feel that one of the commissioner's roles, for example, might consist specifically of establishing said standard on the national level. Which means that at a given time, what you have just mentioned might be very important—that is, within an institution, one may become biased due to certain problems, or due to certain violations, or to certain other things.

Senator Flynn: Due to one's personality, or other people's personalities.

Mr. Belanger: Due to these roles, certain things might be important—to be offered to those commissioners; and that

might be an attempt at correcting provincial or regional situations that might arise.

Senator Flynn: Do you think that might be possible—this granting such influence, such decision-making powers to institutions?

Mr. Belanger: I beg your pardon. I feel that the idea is not to grant it to institutions. But rather, it is the granting of it to a combined-services team made up of institutional people and of parole people—who might nevertheless retain their present locals, but who might have greater access to our institutions, and who might participate more fully as regards institutional activities—for a few officers, at least.

Mr. Cyr: To answer this, let's say that what presently goes on is that there exists a lag between the treatment-programme that we are proposing for the institution, and the role that one allows for parole. Presently, the manner in which parole releases are introduced—these are confined to their treatment role, as a consequence of not being afforded sufficient contact—closely supervised by institutions—for such similar treatments. Hence, should our perspective encompass the fact that Federal institutions are those where inmates undergo treatment, this requires that upon their release, they shall be enabled to become integrated within society; and, from that moment, this will also require integration with parole officers so as to familiarize them with the problems encountered by a given type of individual—thus adapting a special approach in order to help him upon his release.

Senator Lapointe: You said that you wish Provincial authorities to have their own parole system. Hence, does this exclude the Parole Board?

Mr. Cyr: Either one, or the other—in the final analysis. What we suggested a moment ago was that this is how things are at the present time—it's that they are presently being looked after by parole service employees. Therefore, what happens is that we have two types of inmates, two types of problems, finally, and this becomes an excessive burden, of work to do, and also, in assessing the sentence duration period, which varies between 3 to 6 months, for example, this becomes a much more difficult task for the parole officer who assumes such duty.

What we propose in this report, is that he be well-prepared: let the provincial authorities look after parolees, as it is being done elsewhere, such as in New Brunswick, for example—this, in order that the programme be specifically adaptable for inmates, to parolees, by considering their offenses—the majority of which are minor ones—or a first offense. I feel that under such circumstances, should there be a fully integrated programme—within this scope—there will arise improved chances of avoiding relapses, than if we were compelled to look after each such cases in our spare time.

Senator Lapointe: Then, at the Provincial level, you wish to see Provincial authorities assume the responsibility for making decisions related to parole—in lieu of Federal authorities? You want this to be a mixed group, is that it?

Mr. Cyr: That they be integrated.

Senator Lapointe: You want this to be carried out with Federal Parole Officers?