

the personality problems is made. Assistance is given to overcome difficulties of adaption, methods and means of solving crisis situations are shown. Support is given and ways suggested to assist parolees to accept frustration and cope with personal problems without resorting to anti-social action.

#### *Control or Surveillance*

The parolee knows that he has been released conditionally, that he has to follow rules and regulations. He is periodically reminded of what is expected of him and the consequences that will likely follow should he not live up to the conditions of his certificate of parole. In the majority of cases, the parolees are required to report regularly to the local police department. In some cases, where it is not deemed necessary or might even be detrimental, this condition is not imposed. When supervising parolees, it is, of course, not possible to follow them twenty-four hours a day. They must learn to be on their own eventually since, in the great majority of cases, parole lasts only a few months and, sooner or later, these persons will not be supervised and will have to make their own decisions and resist the temptations that they may have later on of committing other crimes.

If possible, parolees are visited at work, provided their employers are aware of the fact that they are on parole. Contacts are kept with the families or with other persons interested in them.

If, after trying everything possible to help a parolee, he does not respond, refuses to co-operate or will not observe the conditions of parole, the district representative has the authority to suspend the certificate of parole and issue warrants of apprehension and committal to have the parolee returned to prison. District representatives have the authority to lift such suspensions of parole and order release of the suspended parolee within fourteen days. Otherwise, the case must be reviewed by the Board and either the suspension is lifted by the Board and the parolee is given another chance, after having been warned, or the parole is revoked. In 1970, 312 paroles were revoked because it was found those persons were not following the conditions of their paroles and it was feared that they would commit further crimes.

Finally, if a parolee is found guilty of an indictable offence while on parole, this results in an automatic forfeiture of the parole and this person is returned to custody to serve the remanet of his sentence, i.e., the portion of his sentence which remained at the time he was released on parole plus any new sentence. In 1970 we had approximately 922 forfeitures.

When parolees are supervised by other agencies, the Parole Service retains the same important responsibilities and authority in these cases. Reports relating to the actions and progress of parolees are forwarded to our offices by their supervisors. These reports are evaluated and analyzed. If there are problems, these are discussed with the supervisors and appropriate decisions are taken. Corrective action may include official warnings or disciplinary interviews by the district representative or even suspension of the parole. The district representative also retains the authority to grant or withhold permission for

the parolee to travel to other districts, enter into contracts, or make other important changes in his way of life.

#### VI—PAROLE EXPERIENCE IN CANADA

The Parole Board feels that it may take justifiable pride in its accomplishments to date. In the first 151 months of our operation, we granted parole to 37,710 inmates and during that time we have had to return to prison about 5,000, of which some 3,000 committed indictable offences and forfeited their parole, and 2,000 had parole revoked because they failed the conditions of their parole or committed some minor offence. This means that on the average, for the first 12 years and 9 months of our operation, 87% of persons on parole completed their parole satisfactorily without reverting to crime.

In 1963-64 the Board granted only about 1,800 paroles. At that time the average failure rate was about 10% and we were paroling only 29% of those who applied. Since that time we have been able to recruit more staff and, since the failure rate was so low, we deliberately increased the use of parole. In 1970 we paroled 5,800, or 67% of those who applied. Naturally since there was such a substantial increase in parole, the failure rate also increased, so that at the present time it is running at about 25%.

This record compares very favourably with results in a number of jurisdictions in the United States. Research records of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, published in December 1970, report on a review of 8 different parole boards. A study which included 1,766 parolees recorded no forfeitures or revocations in the case of 1,146, for an average failure rate of 35%. In a study which included 24 parole boards, it was established that failure rates were as high as 58%.

In 1970 the United States federal Parole Board, which is responsible for adult parole in U.S. federal prisons, granted parole to 45% of those who applied. The recorded failure rate for persons on parole during 1970 was 28.5%. In the same year the National Parole Board in Canada granted parole to 67% of those who applied and recorded a failure rate of only 17%, including revocations and forfeitures.

We recognize that it is extremely difficult to make precise comparisons because all of the factors used as a basis for statistical studies are not always identical. From studies which have been conducted and discussions with representatives of parole boards in Britain and the United States, we are confident that the record of Canada's parole system compares favourably with that of systems in those countries.

#### *Economic Considerations*

We believe that parole is not only an effective means of helping and rehabilitating prisoners and making them useful productive citizens, but it also achieves a very considerable saving of expense to the taxpayer.

It costs anywhere from \$7,000 to \$10,000 to keep a man in prison for one year, and this does not take into account the cost of maintaining his family on welfare, which could be another \$2,000 or \$3,000 a year. If he is on parole, and