

month before the P.E.R. date and sometimes it is not available for the Parole Board panel hearing. The panel is naturally perturbed to find the community assessment not available and may not be informed as to the real reasons and the problems encountered. They may find it necessary to defer their decision which is hard on the parolee. The blame for this situation tends to be focussed by the Parole Board panel, the parole service, the institutional staff and the inmate on the after-care agency without knowing or considering the facts in the specific case.

It should be made clear that, as specified in the agreement between the parole service and the after-care agencies, the referral or the actual supervision of a case may be withdrawn from the agency by the parole service. In cases of unexplainable delay this should be discussed with the agency and such action taken.

The referral information from the parole service is sometimes inadequate in important respects and does not include the police report which has long been requested by the agencies. Reasons for deferment or denial of parole are not communicated in most cases to the agencies. This would be desirable to enrich the discussion with the inmate and his relatives in the community to help them understand the decision and work towards a more favourable understanding of the Parole Board and the function of parole.

The present timing should be advanced about a month to enable the necessary steps in the case preparation to be accomplished in a responsible way. In addition, further flexibility is desirable in fixing the parole date to allow for the completion of courses, the enrollment in new courses or the acceptance of special employment opportunities.

TEMPORARY ABSENCE AND DAY PAROLE

Considerable confusion exists in the present practice of these two programmes and this should be cleared up by a clear statement of their respective objectives and the practical procedures. Temporary absence is authorized under Section 26 of the Penitentiary Act and may be granted by the officer in charge of the institution "for humanitarian reasons or to assist in the rehabilitation of the inmate". This has been construed to permit continuous work or education made possible by the repeated issuing of the Temporary Absence Passes "back to back". While such a programme is very desirable to enlarge the opportunities for the inmate and to test his responses in the community it has resulted in the institutions, in effect, running their own small parole service. We suggest that the continuous use of Temporary Absences be restricted to cases involving compassionate and humanitarian reasons and for short leaves for home visits.

Day Parole is authorized under the Parole Act and is granted by the Parole Board. This frequently causes delays when the institutional head has a job or a course available for an inmate. We suggest that Day Parole be removed from the responsibility of the Parole Board in the first instance and that it be granted with the mutual agreement of the institutional head and the institutional parole head. An exception would be in regard to cases which require Cabinet approval for release. In the event of their failure to agree an appeal for review should be available to the Parole Board. It may be argued that this places the Parole Board in the position of over-ruling the staff representatives but they are doing this now in

decision regarding Full Parole. The supervision of the Day Parolee should be carried out, if in the local community, by the institutional staff, or in a more distant community, as arranged by the parole staff.

There should be no conflict in this suggestion with Full Parole awarded at the time of the Parole Eligibility Release Date. Day Parole is granted in a local community adjacent to the institution for work or education. Full Parole is granted to the inmate's home community or to the community of his chosen final destination which involves an entirely different set of considerations due to the relationships with family, friends and employers. Hence it would appear to be appropriate that an inmate be suitable for Day Parole but not for Full Parole and that in the event of denial of Full Parole he might quite logically be continued on Day Parole during the duration of his work opportunity or educational pursuits pending release at expiry of sentence under Mandatory Supervision.

PAROLE SUPERVISION

The after-care agencies have been providing parole supervision for over twenty years and the expansion of the parole system has rested primarily on the field services provided by these voluntary agencies who now supervise between forty and fifty per cent of parolees and are therefore meeting a major part of the need for parole supervision as well as general after-care in Canada.

This has been accomplished in the past with limited governmental assistance of a financial nature and logic would not seem to suggest changing a parole supervisory system based on a partnership which has proved its merit and which continues to do so. Certainly, as it is now doing, the government should assume a greater part of the burden in the financial responsibility for parole supervision and for after-care services generally.

The expansion of the staff of the parole service to perform the functions it already carries out and such other procedures and authoritative functions as are necessary is most desirable. While the government is morally and legally responsible for the supervision of parolees it should not be assumed that it must do the total job of supervision with its own service but rather that it should utilize all available and competent supervision from the private sector. The cooperative partnership arrangement now in effect with the after-care agencies should continue with great mutual development.

It is important to suggest that parole represents more than the legal terms would suggest that "parole is no more than the fulfillment of a sentence outside the prison walls". Those of us who have been intimately involved in parole supervision are convinced that a great deal more is involved. The entire question of the adjustment of the individual in the community is involved. The question of protection for the community is uppermost. The need for the ex-offender to find a suitable means of meeting his problems instead of turning to anti-social behaviour is involved. The problem of becoming socialized, of developing mature responsibility, of realizing the rights of others, of overcoming anti-social propensities is involved. The relationship of the parolee with his supervisor is of paramount importance. The ability of the supervisor to influence the behaviour of the parolee is critical. A parolee requires much more than surveillance which perpetuates the legal or custodial aspects of the supervisory relationship. The development of a sense