

would not do it again, which we were in this case, and if the reports which we got as to their conduct and progress in prison were favourable, yes, we would.

As I say, some people have more things going for them on the outside and that is a beneficial factor. If they do not have things going for them on the outside we have to get them going, but all people are certainly treated the same.

Senator Goldenberg: But they had more going for them on the outside.

Mr. Street: Yes. As I said, they all came from middle-class families, they all had jobs and a good many people helping them.

Senator Hastings: Quite apart from the reaction of the public, Mr. Street, I feel even more important is the reaction of the inmates who see this type of thing going on. The man whose wife is on welfare just does not have the resources, and so forth. You must consider the bitterness and the resentment which you create in the inmate population when they see these special circumstances or these special regulations being utilized.

The Deputy Chairman: That is hardly a question.

Senator Hastings: I am just making an observation.

Mr. Street: We are not unconscious of this. We have had experience with this before. There was criticism from one person who thought it was wrong, and this person was not only potentially dangerous but he had killed one person and maimed another, and now he is annoyed because we will not let him out. I do not think he will get out before eligibility because he is potential risk.

As I said, this is no popularity contest. It is hard to keep everyone happy. We are not oblivious to the views of the inmates because we have to keep some peace in the family, but, as I say, you are criticized for too much and you are criticized for too little.

One of the first times we tried day parole we got a terrible reaction from the inmate population. We allowed one young man to attend university, which was right next to the prison, and we were criticized for that.

Senator Hastings: You cannot win!

Senator Laird: As I understand it, Mr. Street, as a class, murderers are the best risk for parole. Is that so?

Mr. Street: The ones we do parole are, yes.

Senator Laird: How do you account for that?

Mr. Street: Well, in the first place, we only parole the good ones; we do not parole anyone who is potentially dangerous.

When the Board came into operation 12 years and 9 long, tough months ago, the people we were dealing with at that time, and for a certain length of time thereafter, were convicted murderers who had not been hanged. The dangerous, vicious, deliberate, violent type of murderers were hanged, so we did not have to contend with them. However, since we do not hang murderers any more we do have to contend with the more dangerous type, and as a result of this we are more careful in our selection process.

If we do not recommend parole, the Cabinet never hears about them, but if we do recommend parole, then, the Cabinet has to approve their release. It is somewhat more difficult now because we are dealing with the more dangerous type of murderer.

Senator Laird: Perhaps I am wrong in my understanding, but I believe I read somewhere that murderers, as a class, are the best parole risk.

Mr. Street: The ones we parole are, yes.

Senator Laird: The ones you parole are the best risk as a class?

Mr. Street: Yes, senator.

Senator Fergusson: I would like to say to Mr. Street that I certainly think that the document which he has presented to us will be most valuable to us in our study of the parole system, and we will depend on it for information. In my opinion, it should have a great deal more publicity. If people who now criticize the National Parole Board were aware of all the facts which are brought forth in this brief, there would be much less criticism. I am thinking particularly of those who are interested in the economic aspect. If they could read page 14 of this brief, where the figures are presented of how much more expensive it is to keep people in jail and how much we lose economically by doing so, I believe they would be favourably influenced.

Mr. Street, your percentage of 87 per cent success in your 12 years and 9 hard months you spoke of is really quite astonishing, and it seems strange to me that in view of that there is so little publicity given by the media to the 87 per cent success rate and so much publicity given to the few cases or the much smaller percentage of cases that are unsuccessful. I hope that the work of our committee will bring these things to the attention of the public. Those are my comments, Mr. Street.

There are two or three other matters I would like to ask you about. I would like to know about the panels of the Board that now travel throughout Canada. Do you find this more successful; and how did you come to decide to send panels from the Board out to investigate the cases?

Mr. Street: May I first comment on your very kind remarks, senator? The brief you referred to in your comments was prepared by Mr. J. H. Leroux, Assistant Executive Director, Mr. W. F. Carabine, Chief of Case Preparation, Mr. G. Genest, Chief of Parole Supervision, and other members of the staff.

As for the failure rate, I do not wish to mislead you. Out of 38,000, or whatever number I said, only 5,000 or 13 per cent went back; that is over a period of 12 years. Lately, because we have literally trebled the number of paroles, that failure rate is going up. That is an average over 12 years. Last year, for example, we paroled 65 per cent at a failure rate of 25 per cent. I hesitate to make comparisons, but the United States Federal Board of Parole had a failure rate just as high as ours. They only paroled 45 per cent. Anyone can say no; I think the test of a good parole system is how many you have on parole and how many you refuse. I am beginning to wonder whether we parole too many. We still think this is a good way to do it, because they are going to come out anyway and we still have our