

paroled should correspondingly increase. The hard-core group, which has been a major problem, should be restricted, segregated and eventually matured or otherwise worked out of the system without again developing to anything like the degree that has pertained in the past. They would, in any event, fall under the category of "conditional freedom" and still be subject to its sanctions.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF FAILURE RATES

Obviously as the use of parole increases, revocation and forfeiture rates may be expected to rise. Despite some recent incidents, which have created public concern, in our view the public and the correctional services are prepared to accept this and to look realistically at this probability. The real usefulness and test of parole will come when we are paroling a majority of the inmate population. This will take time and various developmental steps to ensure maximum effectiveness.

A report in *The Globe and Mail* of March 9th, 1972 that parole rules are to be tightened due to an increase in the violation rate of 50%, should receive some comment. It appears that more emphasis is to be placed on the control aspects of parole than on its treatment aspects in the restoration of the inmate to his community through parole as part of the total correctional process. Both society and the inmates have an interest in such a policy decision since the true protection of society lies in the return of the inmate to the community a changed individual being given the maximum support and assistance which can be provided by parole.

As the programming for the inmate in the institution becomes based more on an individual prescription for his achievement the expectation of parole becomes implicit in such a course of activity. Parole is part of correctional treatment and as such there should be a change in the method of its evaluation from discussion of a failure rate of fifteen per cent to a treatment success rate of eighty-five per cent. If the Parole Board continues to measure the effectiveness of its decision making on the basis of a failure rate, the general public and the media must be expected to think also in such negative terms.

The so called failure rate is, in fact, a reflection that the treatment process, when extended into the community by parole, is functioning as it should in that under testing some parolees will once again resort to illegal behaviour or will have been revealed, under effective supervision, to require a further institutional treatment experience. This indicates that the field services are performing their function with a high degree of effectiveness which with increased staff and improved training and experience may well be contributing to the higher violation rate.

It should be remembered that this so-called failure rate includes both forfeitures for the commission of another indictable offence and revocations for inability to accept the controls and treatment inherent in the supervisory process. These two factors have been usually about equally represented in the failure rate. Hence with a failure rate of fifteen per cent only about seven or eight per cent have been returned to prison as a result of the commission of another offence. This represents a remarkably low number of parolees.

It is obvious that as more inmates are paroled the opportunity for failure to occur increases. But while the failure rate may increase, there is also an increase in the absolute number of parolees who prove successful. This is a social gain which should be stressed. In any event it is improper to judge return to prison as failure since many individuals may need a further period of institutionalization to consolidate very real learnings in social behaviour that they have made either under parole supervision or voluntary after-care. On a subsequent release they often are able to make a satisfactory adjustment to community living and legal expectation. Hence re-institutionalization should be treated as relapse is treated in the medical management of a patient which sometimes necessitates rehospitalization.

Testimony has been presented to you indicating that few inmates are dangerous to the public and that too many offenders are being imprisoned. For the same authorities to reduce the granting of parole to the majority of inmates who they say are not dangerous seems contradictory. An analysis of forfeitures would probably show that the majority were for relatively minor offences against property and not involving violence.

The alternative to parole is now Mandatory Supervision which will involve the same conditions of supervision in the community as parole. But the inmate is given no choice about accepting this programme. When he reaches the end of his sentence, less his remission, he is released under mandatory supervision and must accept the conditions whether or not he so chooses. This will probably result in him being less likely to view it as part of a treatment process than as a control mechanism and the content of the supervisory relationship is likely to be materially reduced. Hence it is at best a more rudimentary form of post release treatment than parole in which the inmate makes application to be released earlier than under mandatory supervision and for this privilege agrees to accept the supervision of the field services.

If parole is reduced more inmates will perforce be released under mandatory supervision. If they are returned to prison their failure will not be charged against the Parole Board or parole service since there was no selection or decision-making involved. But it is surely small comfort to all concerned and particularly to society at large to have a low failure rate on parole due to the paroling of a relatively small number of inmates and shifting the failure rate to mandatory supervision with a high failure rate.

In an editorial on March 13th, 1972 the *Globe and Mail* takes issue with a specific case but comments on the decision by the Parole Board to tighten its standards for the granting of parole following a fifty per cent increase in parole violations during the past year. In commenting on this decision they wrote—"Given our jail system, and given human nature, a certain amount of recidivism can be expected. Parole is a procedure which has much to recommend it and we would not suggest its limitation merely because some people are certain to abuse it." We agree with this statement which strongly supports the position we have taken regarding this aspect of parole policy.

An increasing number of inmates should be paroled as improvements are made in the treatment programmes in the institutions and in the development and effectiveness of the parole field services. It is essential then for all concerned to think in terms