

[Texte]

actually happens on visits to the institutions, where men have been returned to the institution because their parole is forfeited. I think there was a little part that might be clarified.

**Mr. Street:** The difference now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, is that panels of Board members will visit federal prisons and interview everyone who is eligible for parole, at least 35 days before his eligibility date. They have a hearing with the inmate and he is invited to say whatever he wishes to say in his own behalf and then he is questioned by the Board members. The Board members at that time decide whether or not they will give him a parole and if they decide to give them a parole they tell him. I think that is not as important as being able to tell him why he did not get a parole, if you did not give it to him then you would tell him why.

If a man is going to get a parole he does not really care whether he gets it through the mail or handed to him on a platter by a Board member. So I do not think that is as important except that when the Board members do give the parole right then and there and tell him, which everybody likes much better, they are able to give him a little counselling or guidance or to say something to the effect that this means we have some faith in you and we hope you will get along all right and give him a little guidance.

However, it is even more important to tell a man who was not given a parole why he was not given a parole and tell him in words of one syllable what he should be doing to try to get a parole. Is that what you mean, sir?

**Mr. McIlraith:** Yes, I wanted you to explain that.

**Mr. Gilbert:** This takes place right in the institution.

**Mr. Street:** Right in the institution.

**Mr. McIlraith:** This is the new aspect of the handling of the parole and parole hearings since last August.

**Mr. Brewin:** Mr. Chairman, might I ask a supplementary relating to what Mr. Gilbert has raised? You were going on to somebody else I think, but my question is related.

**The Chairman:** Well if it is supplemental to this question, yes.

**Mr. Brewin:** I may not understand proposed Section 17 as we have it here, or I may not have understood what was said, but this

[Interprétation]

**M. Street:** Dorénavant, des panels formés de membres de la Commission vont visiter les pénitenciers et accorder une entrevue à tous ceux qui sont admissibles à la libération conditionnelle, au moins 35 jours avant la date d'admissibilité. Ils entendent le détenu et s'ils décident de lui accorder dès ce moment la libération conditionnelle, ils l'en préviennent. Mais ce qui importe le plus encore, c'est de lui dire pourquoi il ne l'a pas obtenue, si on la lui refuse.

Qu'importe au détenu d'apprendre sa libération conditionnelle par le courrier ou par un membre de la Commission sauf si la décision est faite au moment même de l'entrevue. Car alors, ils peuvent en profiter pour l'orienter par des conseils appropriés et lui manifester leur confiance.

Mais il demeure qu'il importe plus d'apprendre au prévenu les raisons du refus qu'il a essuyé, lui indiquant le moyen d'obtenir gain de cause la prochaine fois. C'est bien l'explication que vous vouliez?

**M. McIlraith:** Oui, précisément.

**M. Gilbert:** Ces événements se déroulent à l'institution même?

**M. Street:** A l'institution même.

**M. McIlraith:** C'est le nouvel aspect de cette question de libération conditionnelle en vigueur depuis août dernier.

**M. Brewin:** Monsieur le président, puis-je poser une question complémentaire à celle de monsieur Gilbert? Vous étiez sur le point de donner la parole à quelqu'un d'autre, je crois, mais ma question porte sur le même sujet.

**Le président:** Une question complémentaire? Oui.

**M. Brewin:** Soit que je ne comprends pas l'article 17, ou je n'ai pas saisi les explications qu'on a données, mais il semble que là où le