

patterns exist in the more progressive correctional systems in Europe.

In 1967, the Management Consultants firm of P. S. Ross & Partners recommended, after investigation, a number of changes in the basic organizational design for the Solicitor General Department.

Referring to the long range organization of the Department, the objectives were as follows:

"To establish the National Parole Board as an independent quasi-judicial and advisory body.

To provide for the organizational integration of correctional programs at headquarters.

To continue the development of the regional and program units."

The Report suggested that the major changes of the reorganization would take place at the headquarters level of the Correctional Services. The Parole Service would no longer report to the Chairman of the National Parole Board, but to a new Director of Corrections.

Ross, in making its recommendation for an integrated organization for correctional programs within the Department, found particularly interesting an extract from a lecture given in Toronto by Professor Norval R. Morris, Director of the Centre for Studies in Criminal Justice, University of Chicago Law School, as follows:

"... If the view of the evolution of prison I have offered is broadly correct, certain inexorable organization consequences flow from it for correctional services. The link between institutional and non-institutional correctional processes grows closer and requires over-all planning... It is hard to plan wisely for such continuous institutional and post-institutional correctional processes... unless there is the closest of ties between those responsible for these services."

"... There should be a Director of Corrections... with responsibility for the treatment of all convicted offenders..."

"... Perhaps it is an overstatement to urge that this is the only possible administrative structure capable of achieving these uncontested ideals of continuity of treatment. It is often alleged that close liaison between collaborating independent agencies can achieve this result; some years of close observation of correctional practice in Australia, the United Kingdom, the United States and several Asian countries where such friendly cooperation between separate departments is claimed has led me to a contrary view."

In recognition of the principle of integration and coordination of individualized treatment and training programs for inmates, the Canadian Penitentiary Service and the Parole Service have been actively involved in developing practical applications of the principle since July, 1970. The first such exercise took place in Alberta when we entered into agreement with the Parole Service whereby parole officers of the Edmonton and Calgary Offices in Alberta interview all persons sentenced by the Courts of that province to two years or more. Using predetermined criteria, the parole officer decides the initial placement of the convicted person as to whether he should be directed to the maximum security penitentiary at Prince Albert or the medium security institution at Drumheller. This early involve-

ment by the parole officer provides both the Penitentiary Service and the Parole Service with accurate detailed information which is helpful in planning a suitable training program in the institution and in long-range planning for possible release on parole. The Parole Service officer completes part one of the cumulative summary while institutional classification officers subsequently complete part 2A, for the information of the Parole Service. The awareness of the inmate of the early involvement of the Parole Service in discussing and planning with the institutional authorities and the inmate himself, a program based upon his needs, implies a commitment on the part of the inmate if he wishes to be successful in obtaining parole. This kind of three-way involvement, by its very nature, embodies informal monitoring features available to the three parties. The highly satisfactory results of this initial project have led to the decision to extend the procedure to the Atlantic Provinces and to Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Planning meetings have already been held in these regions.

Discussions have also taken place with the Parole Service, in relation to Day Parole and Temporary Absence. Day Parole is granted under the authority of the Parole Act while Temporary Absence is granted under the authority of the Penitentiary Act. In the past, each Service has exercised its prerogative independently under the appropriate legislation. Efforts to have the collective judgement of appropriate members of both Services prevail when the absence is likely to be part of a community program extending beyond fifteen days, should result in a more effective application of the correctional principle involved in the development of community based programs. To enhance and ensure further cooperation, it would be helpful if a parole officer could be posted in each institution.

Temporary Absences have increased sharply since 1969 when 6,278 were granted to 1971 when 30,299 were granted; over 50 per cent of this number is for employment and education purposes. The failure rate while on Temporary Absence is running at less than 1 per cent. 81 per cent of those on extended Temporary Absence are employed in the community. 65 per cent of this number had applied for parole and 20 per cent were granted parole. This information is based on a relatively small, but nonetheless representative sample of Temporary Absences.

Concern has frequently been expressed in relation to the high prison population in Canada. The Canadian Committee on Corrections recommended that every effort should be made to reduce the prison population and recommended the use of alternatives to prison in the administration of sentencing policy. Increased use of probation facilities and the use of parole have been emphasized. In the field of probation, Parliament has, by way of the Omnibus Bill of 1968-69, given effect to recommendations concerning probation. In the field of parole, also, several of the Committee's recommendations have been implemented. Bill C-218, dealing with arrest and bail has also helped in this regard.

The Treatment and Training Programs currently being developed in the institutions operated by the Canadian Penitentiary Service place heavy emphasis on the utilization of professional staff in staff development programs and in supervision of lay staff who are being increasingly involved in and given responsibility for elements of