ence, I feel that, most of the time, not in all cases, they might wish at any given time, to be granted a reprieve of some kind with reference to a given difficult situation—perhaps one month or one and a half months, without losing their job, without being returned to institutions thereby incurring a loss of points related to accumulated good behaviour—good behaviour time allotted them on the basis of their proper conduct—which they presently forfeit upon reincarceration. Such provisions might prevent a relapse into crime—ridiculous relapses—such as punching someone. Here, a parolee might be involved with his own family members—even his wife; happenings occur, and during a critical moment he is liable to do something regrettable. Should provisions be made to remove him from the source of conflict and to provide opportunities for discussion during a reasonably long period during which he might be told: Listen, you will not return to your family except without being granted leave, at given times, during one or two months. And then, he might be told: agreed. You may leave since the crisis is over. I feel that this would be far more practical than the method presently employed, that is, plain reincarceration in maximum security institutions. He is simply returned there.

Daytime parole as provided by the Parole Act and temporary leave of absence by virtue of the Penitentiaries and Reformatories Act: in conformance to the basic thought of our report, I feel that should the parole service and penal institutions be integrated into the rehabilitation process, there would be no need to separate the services, that is, there would then be no necessity for stipulating who will make the decision regarding daytime parole, or who will make the decisions related to temporary leaves of absence—given a mixed committee—there would then be no problem—decisions would be jointly made, involving the institution and parole representatives.

Compulsory surveillance: the question arising here involves the manner in which compulsory surveillance will influence the standard parole procedures and other parole programmes.

It is felt that compulsory surveillance may have a negative influence, that is, under standard parole procedures—in difficult cases, unclear ones—oftentimes one might preferably make use of compulsory surveillance where the detainee is not freed until he has almost completely served his time, that is the time allotted him in the institution, and the time remaining to complete his sentence will be under compulsory surveillance. Hence, what occurs is that he will be obliged,—the decision we are to make will be: it is best to subject him to compulsory surveillance, since in that case, the competent authorities shall have lesser responsibility than were he freed on parole. Hence, this is our only objection. I admit that it is not very important, but it is nevertheless part of the picture.

Presently, as per its classic definition, compulsory surveillance nevertheless appears to us as a desirable procedure. A desirable procedure since it does not leave the freed prisoner, during his unexpired sentence, without recourse or without support of any kind; at all events, he may have recourse to a parole officer. Contrariwise, during previous unexpired sentences, when compulsory surveillance had not been provided, this resulted in that he was literally thrown out in the street. He left with $50.00, oftentimes with broken family ties—he could no longer depend upon his family. Under these circumstances, a relapse is always imminent. He must provide himself with clothes. He must find an apartment. He must eat. He must seek work. Do you feel that he can thrive for long under such circumstances, without, at a given time, once more reconsidering the good old approach consisting simply of dishonestly appropriating money for himself.

Does compulsory surveillance render the reduction of a sentence—obsolete? In some way, no, it does not render a sentence reduction obsolete. In view of the fact that the prisoner accumulates good behaviour time, that he is allotted three days per month for good behaviour, such compulsory surveillance may prove to be just the right stimulant for him—however, having been granted what we have just proposed, the fellow will be freed whenever he is ready—hence, this presently requires a different approach whereby a prisoner does not merely waste his time creating problems within the institution. You see, the notorious Geoffroy case,—he was a fellow who had displayed good behaviour within the institution, but who, in the end, slipped away. It is not necessarily the sole rehabilitation criterion—that a prisoner abide by rules and regulations—that he respect authority—that he is quite sociable; since, you see, certain delinquents take advantage of these provisions, and once freed, they simply relapse into crime. Hence, it is our wish that the sentence reduction—in the final analysis, allotting them one-fourth of the sentence, allotting them three days per month—from our viewpoint, this now appears obsolete, that is, the prisoner's effort toward improvement should be the true yardstick for resolving his case.

With reference to special categories of delinquents, for example, we refer particularly to murderers, armed robberies, and particularly sexual delinquants. I feel that in the legal scheme, should it be practical to say that he is a sexual offender, I feel that, on a factual basis, from the treatment viewpoint, it does not change anything, it particularly being that research being carried out with reference to sexual delinquants generally result in putting everybody in the same boat. Conclusions are arrived at concerning many things that seldom correspond to preditions made—that the sexual offender is the one who relapses very quickly—since he has been so branded. I feel that this is false. It is untrue. So that at a given time, a delinquant is penalized because we have pinned a label upon his back, and that, people who are generally remote from the prisoners will view this as, hum! He's a type of delinquant—it is said that such offenders are dangerous. It depends upon the individual. No two are alike.

Furthermore, any desire on our part to do research depends upon statistical data. Should 35 out of 50 be judged as dangerous, there nevertheless remains 15 that are not. That's the crucial point—this labelling hazard. They may nevertheless be included among research subjects, but I feel that, from the treatment view point, and also from the previous viewpoint, that it is possible to parole them—I mean, they cannot be freed since, right away, they are sexual offenders. Well, it's unfair. The crucial issue consists of knowing just who the individual offender is who is about to be freed. That's what counts.

There yet remains,—we had not sent question number 11 and question number 13 with the original report, and this we have with us this morning. These points treat upon the organization of personnel affected to the parole board.