

offense, with all the costs involved for the government, the victims and the delinquent himself) and, on the other hand, it is also at that stage that we can reduce the risk of a decision based more on arbitrary factors than on facts (for example, lack of data or failure to check them may result in the Commission rejecting an application because they are thus compelled to make a judgment based on data with little validity).

As for supervision, it varies from one parolee to the other. One thing is sure: it requires, in the beginning, frequent meetings (for example between the first three to six months), all the more so as it is during this period that chances of recidivism are the most acute. It is obvious that if the supervisor merely "supervises", in the sense of "having a look", he does not meet public safety requirements. The parolee needs help and support when he leaves; preventing recidivism, or at least delaying it, implies that the supervisor commits himself to the work; the parolee indeed is not living in the abstract, and he often must struggle to avoid recidivism. The supervisor must intervene in this struggle, otherwise the risk exists that the vicious circle will return almost immediately. Thus, the parole officer must have enough time to travel and to find ways of concretely helping parolees.

It is therefore unconceivable to think that the present number of officers for each district is sufficient to efficiently meet such requirements, even at an acceptable minimum level. An increase in the number of officers would in fact save a lot of money to the government, reduce the risk of honest citizens becoming new victims too rapidly, and reduce the risk of the parolee entering again into a circle of despair out of whose tightening grip he will eventually try to wrest himself, to the detriment of the public interest and public funds.

(b) Finally, we think that there should be a few psychologists attached to large districts (that is: Montreal, Laval, St-Jérôme, Granby). First of all, this is due to the fact that institutional psychologists are often overworked and are very reluctant to supply psychological evaluations asked for by the Commissioners, especially for cases they do not know (and they are numerous). When we think that an *adequate* evaluation of ordinary simple cases calls for two or three days work, it is understandable that institutional psychologists strongly object to supply such evaluations. They have the choice between supplying a valid evaluation at the expense of the heavy requirements of their daily task or supplying a very weak evaluation which would not be useful of the Commissioners.

Furthermore, under the parole system, there are cases where the psychologist could play a very efficient role when the parolee faces difficulties. By difficulties we mean critical situations, whether they be of a personal, marital or family nature. Certain offences are committed as a means of solving personal, marital or family conflicts. To prevent a delinquent solution and allow a more socially acceptable solution calls for the application of more specialized measures. We believe that it is precisely while on parole that these conflicts can be really worked out and not in the institutions. The work must absolutely be started in the institution, but it can only be tested and used in a live and direct situation, for example, with the husband or the wife, or the family outside the institution.

Therefore, we propose to add to the staff of the parole service a few psychologists in each large district. These psychologists would ensure: (1) part of the evaluation applications requested by the Commissioners; (2) therapy assistance in cases of offences that are delinquent solutions to marital or family conflicts (marriage counselling and family counselling); (3) continuation of individual therapy work started in the institutions which requires the direct contact of the inmate with the daily realities of free society.

XIII—Reactions of society to the parole system:

(a) It is a very broad subject and we would not know how to answer it properly. However, we would like to make a few comments and suggestions.

We note that people are often ignorant of what goes on in institutions and at the parole level. We also note that certain unscrupulous newspapers publish articles which are often dishonest under the guise of informing people about "what is going on there". It is obvious those newspapers are in search of sensational news to please readers who are prepared to believe anything. However, some important Montreal newspapers have published long articles whose accuracy and honesty are indisputable. But the latter are not frequent. It is more common to read titles like: "Another person on parole... has done this or that" followed by explicit or implicit emotive judgements.

We think it is normal that people should know what becomes of young offenders. But once this is done, the trouble is far from being over. If the public knew everything, it could choose to be repressive and act against the rehabilitation measures implemented in the last few years. However a public debate could arise in the open and have positive effects on the penitentiary and parole system. It is obvious the picture of the young offender drawn by public opinion is a very emotive and moralizing one (the young offender is always "bad"; he is given a house, a job, food, while there is unemployment, etc.) We are well aware of the fact that there is some degree of fairness in such responses in that it is normal for a society to want to assist its servants and ward off those who disparage it. But as long as we maintain this position, we shall not be able to reverse the current and help transform detractors into servants. And, in this kind of debate, all the chances to win are not on the side of logic.

Moreover, faced with the danger that a public debate would mean for society itself and for its delinquents, it would be more useful to maintain regular contacts with some of the most important newspapers, and to give them sound information, about present conditions in penal institutions and about the parole system, with the emphasis being put on what the prisoner does, what his opportunities are as well as on existing reform plans. The purpose of all this would be to protect society and assist it in the long range, by helping its detractors become useful members of the community. So, for instance, some new directives concerning the penitentiaries or the parole system should be published in the media, together with explanations about the situation which was created by the old guidelines and the objectives of the new ones.

Furthermore, as the public is not aware of the difficulties and of the positive efforts made daily with the delinquents, nor of our purposes as a whole, it would be useful to open up the institutions and let the inmates communi-