

the cost of maintaining a prisoner in a penal institution runs to between \$800 and \$1,200 a year, the economic saving involved is very striking, to say nothing of the effect upon the individual in avoiding the stigma of incarceration and the evil associations that are inevitably encountered in penal institutions. There can be no doubt that an extended use of supervised probation could be a major factor in reducing our prison populations and preventing the repetition of crime. Perhaps the reason why we have lagged behind other progressive countries in the use of supervised probation is because in Canada the cost of providing probation officers falls upon the municipalities -- and it is easier to sentence an offender to a provincial or a federal institution than to provide the individualized service that the proper use of probation requires. But surely that is a shortsighted view which must be capable of correction or adjustment if we are to make real progress in reducing the repetition of crime.

Whatever use may be made by the courts of probation or of the imposition of a fine as penalty, there will undoubtedly continue to be many cases where imprisonment is necessary both for the protection of society and as a deterrent to others who may be disposed to commit crime. Imprisonment involves the loss of liberty and a strictly regimented life where requirements of custody necessitate constant surveillance, and firm discipline that many of those who are imprisoned have lacked in their lives outside. That is the punishment that the Court imposes upon them for their offence. Since 95 per cent of those who are imprisoned sooner or later are released -- and the great majority of sentences are for less than five years -- it becomes a matter of great importance, if society is to obtain any real protection from imprisonment, that the offender should be released with an improved attitude, and with habits, skills and incentives that will assist him to make his way without reverting to crime. The results of the old mass system of purely punitive custody have demonstrated pretty clearly that while that sort of imprisonment may provide temporary protection, it is a most expensive and ineffective method of dealing with offenders if they emerge at the conclusion of their sentences prepared only to commit further crimes.

And so in our federal penitentiaries we are proceeding to put into effect a different philosophy of the purpose of imprisonment. While not overlooking in any way the necessity for safe custody, we are developing a programme that emphasizes the importance of doing all that is possible to rehabilitate the offender, to change the anti-social attitude that got him into prison and to give to those who are prepared to take advantage opportunities for education, trade training and self-improvement that will assist them to make their way upon release without reverting to crime. We are not approaching this problem from any sentimental point of view but because we believe it represents a practical and understandable way of reducing the chances that a prisoner will continue in criminal activities. Even more important than the acquisition of manual skills and better education is the development of an improved outlook on life, of an appreciation on the prisoner's part that if he does exert himself and take advantage of the facilities available there is a real hope for him to succeed when he is released. Now that requires a constructive, purposeful attitude on the part of the staffs who are dealing with him and the development of a "climate", if I may use the word, within the institution that will encourage the inmate to make constructive use of his time and to resist the ever present influence of the minority to whom such a programme has no appeal.