

Senator Buckwold: I wish to direct several questions to the Commissioner. Mr. Faguy, it seems that in the first part of your remarks—

The Chairman: Are we still on the subject of temporary absence?

Senator Buckwold: No.

Senator Hastings: Mr. Faguy, I wish to place on record the temporary absence which you granted a lifer from Drumheller, Alberta, who attended the National Conference on Law. He went unescorted to Ottawa, attended the conference, and returned to Drumheller without incident. The public should be aware of the cases where you are succeeding and making a real contribution to the rehabilitation of lifers.

Mr. Faguy: I can assure you that this was one real success case where the man participated in the conference at a high level and did very well. We were complimented for it, and I appreciated that. There are many lifers who participate in programs very successfully.

Senator Buckwold: Speaking personally and for many of my colleagues, I hope that the opinions expressed by Senator Hastings will be carefully considered. One very bad incident should not be allowed to prejudice seriously a very enlightened program.

We are looking at the parole system. We are not studying the prison system, although at times it is difficult to differentiate between them. The most significant point that you have made is that you feel there should be a unified correctional policy and programs, which is understandable, but that there should be administrative union between the Canadian Penitentiary Service and the National Parole Service; that they should, in fact, operate under one director rather than under two, with one quasi-judicial authority.

That is a key point in your submission. Some of us need to be convinced that it would be wise to place the whole thing within the prison system. For example, would the inmate be as responsive to a parole officer who was part of the prison system as to one who was completely separate? Would there be independence of thought and action? We would want to know exactly how this would work.

You have said that there would be increased potential towards more effective use of staff and improved career planning. Does that mean that a fellow might be a probation officer, move into the position of assessment officer, and then perhaps move back? If this happens, how can he escape the normal attitudes which exist among people connected with police services, despite the fact the person concerned might wish to be objective? Could you develop that aspect in more detail? I should like to know why we have the present system. Although you have given us examples of an integrated system, I gather from what you have said that most parole boards operate independently. Could we have a fairly detailed assessment of the whole proposition?

Mr. Faguy: Having visited the Scandinavian countries, Holland, some parts of the United States, and the provinces, to my knowl-

edge in most areas there is a combined, unified service. I do not know what the percentage would be throughout the world.

I should like, however, to comment on the statement expressed to the effect that the parole service was becoming part of the system. I would react very strongly against that kind of statement. I feel there should be within a unified correctional system two main divisions, namely, the penitentiary service and the parole service under the same authority and providing the same services, et cetera. In this way we could have a uniform co-ordinating plan and policy throughout, and, as you mentioned, better career planning as far as our employees are concerned.

I feel it would be extremely beneficial to have interchange between the parole service staff and the penitentiaries staff in that they would learn what it is like on the other side and what is needed. In my opinion, it would be extremely useful for parole officers to work within the penitentiaries for a period of time so that they could better appreciate the problems of the inmates, how the inmates feel, what the needs of the inmates are, et cetera. The main concern all the way through, of course, is the inmate, and his needs have to be the basic criterion for our programs. We are not there to create programs for our purposes; it is the needs of the inmate that direct our programs.

By having two main advisers at national headquarters, one dealing with the penitentiary aspect and the other with the parole aspect, we could retain the independence of thought and yet have a unified service. I hope another result of this would be that we would have more and more parole officers becoming directors of institutions, thereby bringing their knowledge of the outside as well as their knowledge of the needs of the inmates as a result of their period of penitentiary service to the problems of the penitentiaries, and possibly becoming correctional administrators, as is happening now with some of our people. I would think that by the interchange of personnel in this way we could avoid the possibility of the penitentiary staff developing a hard attitude towards life within the penitentiary walls.

To summarize then, you would have a continuing appraisal of inmate needs, a better career plan; a unified direction, a unified policy, one tying into the other; you would have the parole officers and penitentiary people working closely, hopefully from the time of entry into the penitentiary through to release on parole. In other words, we would have a joint planning, joint study and joint decision-making process with respect to the inmates.

Senator Buckwold: Do you really believe that system will work? Do you really feel that a man who is hired basically as a parole officer could become an efficient member of the penitentiary staff? I am not suggesting that the training would necessarily have to be all that different, but the personality of the individual, I should think, becomes a factor in the ability to handle two jobs which are integrated but which have different approaches. Personally, I would want to be convinced that this would work. What would the reaction of the prisoner be in this regard? Do you think that he would co-operate better or be more at ease with someone who may have previously been part of the system but who is now a parole officer?