

given to them to do that. It is much more efficient and much more expedient to do this way.

At one time a man phoned me in a hurry because he got 14 days in jail for being drunk—it nearly makes me cry to tell you about this one—and his little boy hanged himself because his daddy was in jail for two weeks. So we were not going to keep that man in jail when he had got three days more to go, and we were not going to keep that man in jail when his little boy was being buried. This has to be done quickly, though. With this system now, the warden can let him go.

Senator Laird: In regard to one answer, you mentioned the case of a person who, when he was out for treatment, shot a policeman. Was he a mental case and was it mental treatment that he was out for? Do you know?

Mr. Street: I think it was. I do not know.

The Deputy Chairman: Let us watch it. We are going to have the penitentiary people in later. I do not want to cut down questioning at this time because we are just getting started on as broad a basis as possible, but there are some questions that really it is unfair to ask Mr. Street, who is the head of one service, when the question and the answer really ought to be dealt with by another service. If we establish that practice, Mr. Street may be able to say that in some of these cases the answer ought to come from the head of the other service, and that will take care of the situation.

Mr. Street: I was not trying to blame anyone, because I think it is a good system; but there is some misunderstanding about these things, and that was only one of three different types of situation which can occur.

The Deputy Chairman: I do not want to interfere with that explanation.

Mr. Street: There was also some talk yesterday, Mr. Chairman and honourable senators, about payments to after-care agencies. I am not sure that that was fully cleared up. There was a question in regard to the time when the agencies were under the grant system and just got the grants. Senator Fergusson raised that question. In the last year they were under that system they got \$165,000 from us.

Senator Fergusson: I am sorry, I did not hear you. Who got it?

Mr. Street: All the after-care agencies. It was \$165,000. In 1965 that amount was just \$96,000, so there has been an increase between 1965 and 1969. Then last year they received from us, in the way of payment for services, \$700,000. This year we expect that they will be paid about \$800,000, so they are much better off now than they were before, when they were under the grant system.

Senator Fergusson: That is, all agencies. That does not seem to work for a small agency.

Mr. Street: Yes, I did not realize that, and I am glad you have mentioned it. Other than that, they are, generally speaking, getting about three times as much as they did before.

Senator Fergusson: Certainly the agency that I know of is getting less than it got before.

Senator Thompson: Might I ask if you are happy with that situation, of 50 per cent of the parolees being handled by after-care agencies rather than by your organization?

Senator Quart: Yesterday I asked that question.

Mr. Street: As I said, I do not know whether I should comment on it any further. We do not have any choice in the matter.

Senator Thompson: I can comment on it, and I think that if we are setting up a professional parole system . . .

The Deputy Chairman: Senator Thompson, the purpose of the inquiry here is to have us ask questions. I have allowed a lot of comments from senators at this stage of the proceedings; but, properly, you are supposed to be questioning witnesses and not putting your own opinions on the record. With all respect, I make that suggestion.

Senator Thompson: I will put my own opinions later.

The Deputy Chairman: There will be full opportunity. Could we come back to Senator Hastings?

Senator Hastings: If we come back to the man, you have screened him as to the institution. He arrives. We will say his term is three years. He arrives at the institution, and I think your file is open. Could we continue from there?

Mr. Street: I will ask Mr. Carabine, who is in charge of this operation, to explain the various steps to you. Mr. Carabine is our chief of case preparation. He is a psychologist who, before he came with us about ten years ago, was the classification and treatment officer in Kingston penitentiary.

Mr. W. F. Carabine, Chief of Case Preparation, National Parole Board: Mr. Street has already spoken of the situation where we have our staff in the Alberta area do what could be called the pre-selection for the other institutions. He also indicated that this would broaden out. This, of course, is a relatively new approach. Normally, other than that type of activity, the first contact with the parole service staff would be at the time of the inmate briefing with respect to parole. This is done as part of the penitentiary intake orientation program.

As institutions differ in their intake, the timing of these briefings would vary in Montreal and Kingston. Kingston, of course, is approximately 100 a month, so you could not wait a month. But, at any rate, at given times all the inmates admitted in a specific period of time are brought together and they are briefed as to the meaning of parole. The time rules are explained, the conditions of parole are explained, and much of the time is consumed in overcoming the inmates' misconceptions about parole. Some of this is institutional folklore or inmate folklore and often there is a need to overcome the statements of those who have actually failed on parole. Normally, of course, people do not blame themselves for their failures. Neither do inmates, and, hence, this is something you have to overcome. You also have to overcome the idea that the inmate needs a job in order to get out. That is more or less but not entirely true. You have to overcome the idea that the