

to treatment possibilities, ie psychological, psychiatric or others.

Under existing criteria, the prisoner must return to the institution at night; this requirement, it seems to us, only compounds the difficulties met by the prisoner in his rehabilitation. First, institutions are too remote from urban centres, (transportation is difficult); it is tiring and even depressing for a prisoner to face *at the same time* two highly dissimilar worlds: a closed milieu and an open milieu.

Transition houses (homes) could be better utilized as, by definition, they are a step between the detention world and freedom. These houses should also be at the disposal of parolees experiencing difficulties without them being obliged to return to prison and lose their jobs and their period of good conduct. Except for specific cases, daytime parole should lead to actual release, which is not the case presently.

3) What should be the criteria for obtaining temporary absence? The criteria already defined for obtaining temporary absence seem realistic to us. However, they should be integrated in a specific rehabilitation program.

A better co-ordination between parole services and the penitentiary service would be desirable.

There is a source of conflict from the fact that parole is granted by a body independent from the penitentiary service, whereas temporary absences remain the responsibility of penitentiary directors. It often happens that NPB will recommend temporary absences and will later refuse to parole a prisoner, thus leaving to directors a responsibility that the Board should share. In the context of our objectives, such a situation would disappear.

IX Compulsory supervision

1) How will compulsory supervision affect the regular parole system and other parole programs?

Compulsory supervision could have a negative influence on the regular parole system and other discharge programs, i.e. in disputable cases, the service would perhaps tend to prefer using this type of supervision which is less lengthy and less burdensome in every aspect.

In its conventional sense, compulsory supervision appears to us to be a desirable procedure because it does not leave the prisoner without support at the end of his sentence, and thus ensures continuation of the therapeutic treatment in the familial and social milieu of the released prisoner.

The officer does not become just a censor of supervisor but actually plays his role which is to fully take part in the resocialization of the individual.

It is obvious that this type of supervision will require social workers able to deal with the particular problems of a released prisoner who reintegrates society.

2) Does compulsory supervision make sentence reduction obsolete? On the contrary, they may be considered as an incentive for the prisoner in the sense that he is not inclined to passively serve his sentence and leave decisions to others; thus he is allowed some initiative.

X Parole and special categories of offenders

Classifying offenders is justified only for statistical purposes and for establishing treatment stages. Except for this, it is not justified. An individual indeed changes and leaves the "category" in which he might have been classified at the beginning. Thus in labelling individuals in a too permanent and static way, they are locked into circle which they will have great difficulty to come out of.

Moreover, it is not up to the Board to decide about categories and policies to be followed in this respect, but specifically those responsible for the treatment. Finally, and all the more so, we do not suggest that these "special categories" be made public.

XI Documents to follow later.

(This point not covered specifically by brief)

XIII Documents to follow later.

XIV Assessment of the parole system

—That a study be made of the rate and types of recidivism among parolees during their period of parole controlled freedom.

—That a study be made of the rate and types of recidivism among parolees after their period of parole controlled freedom.

—That in such studies, a very clear distinction be made between parolees chosen by the National Parole Board and those under compulsory parole.

—That the public be educated to understand that the best long-term protection for society is to accept the problem of delinquency as an actual fact which cannot be removed miraculously with repeated stays in detention houses. Sooner or later, the prisoner will reintegrate society and it is preferable that he then be under a certain control, but that does not mean that he is 100% guaranteed against recidivism.

—That the community be made aware of its responsibility in the rehabilitation of those who once were its offenders.

Following brief of April, 1972.

Questions XI and XIII.

Submitted by the psychologists
of the Canadian Penitentiary Service
Quebec region

June, 1972.

XI—Staffing of Parole Services and Use of Private Agencies:

(a) The staff is not in-sufficient number. Present officers have important responsibilities, namely: to assess and supervise prisoners. If assessment is to be useful and enlightened, it requires time. It is obvious that one single interview and a review of file and case history are a rather poor minimum. Several interviews are often needed, and one needs time to check important data in order not to have to base oneself merely on appearances or simply on what the candidate says. Above all, the public safety as well as the good of the prisoner are at stake. It is mainly at this stage that one can reduce the risk of a parole breakdown (and thus of a possible new