

Mr. Faguy: Some members of our staff at the present time have been in services other than the Penitentiary Service. Some of the directors just nominated, in fact, are sociologists and criminologists. We have also qualified for directorships at least one member of the Parole Service, and I think he will be a most suitable person to become a director. In fact, we hope to have a mix of professional and hard core experienced people working together so that our study of the inmate is complete as well as our understanding of the inmate, and our decision with respect to the inmate is a logical one, keeping in mind our knowledge of the inside as well as the outside. The best correctional administrator would be an individual with professional qualifications and background who also happens to be a good administrator by temperament. This would be the ideal combination.

Senator Hastings: And who has done time.

Mr. Faguy: We have not quite reached that stage yet, senators.

Mr. J. W. Braithwaite, Associate Deputy Commissioner, Canadian Penitentiary Service: Most of them feel they have done time.

Senator Buckwold: One last question; and I think this should be explored a little further. In my experience the so-called senior police administrator—one who has had some experience in a small city as chairman of a board, police commissioner, or this type of thing—develops, no matter how objectively the individual tries to be, a police mentality, and even people who you might say are enlightened, when you get them down to the thinking of the chief of police or something like that, the police mentality always seems to come through. My question is: Will you be able to prevent a parole officer from developing the police mentality?

Mr. Faguy: Your point is an excellent one, senator, and we would hope a unified service would prevent a penitentiary officer always being a penitentiary officer, and this also applies to the parole officer who is only—and I do not mean this facetiously—a parole officer. In other words, we hope they become both and are knowledgeable with respect to both services. If this were the case we would have—I was going to say the complete man, but I do not suppose there is such an individual—but you would have, as far as I am concerned, an individual who knows both sides and is capable of moving back and forth. I feel this would be of extreme value in preventing what you are referring to, and this happens now with our own people inside the institutions whether we like it or not.

The Chairman: Senator Hastings, do you have a question?

Senator Hastings: Mr. Faguy, you spoke earlier of the needs of the inmates. One of the major complaints of the inmates in this respect is that his only exposure to the Parole Service is the week he arrives. In other words, his first exposure to the Parole Service, apart from a short briefing with other inmates, is a short interview before he goes before the Parole Board for his hearing. Because of this it is quite conceivable and, in fact, quite common that his activities within the institution have been completely misdirected. Certainly, it seems necessary, in dealing with the whole man, that there be input through the whole period from the court to the Parole Board hearing. I gather that is your objective.

Mr. Faguy: Yes.

Senator Hastings: This was recommended in 1967, I believe; it seems to be moving rather slowly.

Mr. Faguy: Yes, and we hope we will finally make it happen. We get advice from everyone in Canada with respect to correctional administration, but the fact is that we want a better system and we hope to achieve this.

Senator Hastings: Perhaps we will assist you materially in that respect.

Senator Goldenberg: Mr. Faguy, would you tell us the criterion for the granting of temporary absences? Could you give us an example or examples of what you call humanitarian reasons and rehabilitative reasons?

Mr. Faguy: A directive was sent to the various institutions clearly defining the conditions under which an inmate can be released. These reasons are outlined in the report which we will make available to the committee. There are such reasons as: visiting a wife, family, or friends; leaves for university education—by the way, approximately 50 per cent of our extended temporary absences are either for work or educational purposes; specialized programs such as Alcoholics Anonymous meetings; the Native Brotherhood for the Indians; religious services—we do have some of those activities—work release; job seeking. We have some also for sports activities, where they participate themselves, or sometimes for spectators, like most Canadians are. Other reasons are family and marriages—as we know—family anniversaries, death in the family, other special family occasions; medical attention or psychiatric treatment. These are the type of reasons we have. In the report you will find the number given for each month, September to December 1971.

Senator Goldenberg: Would there be additional reasons, where the release is for more than three days? That is not within the discretion of the warden, I understand.

Mr. Faguy: No. For more than three days it must come through Ottawa. Then we look for, for instance, work release programs. We know that they need to be out for more than three days. We arrange a grant for these people of 15 days at a time, to go out and work in the community.

The Chairman: This is repeatable?

Mr. Faguy: Yes, it is. We repeat these 15-day temporary absences from time to time, as we call them, "back to back," and this policy, I think, is to be reviewed.

Senator Hastings: Can they report by postcard?

Mr. Faguy: No. Usually in the community we know where they are, what they are doing, and we keep an eye on them. We know very well where they are going. Even though they are without an escort, we know what is going on, and employers are pretty quick to advise us if any problem arises.