

much lesser number of individuals to deal with and assist.

(d) *The Criminal Records Act*

We do not have enough information on this item to be in a position to make proposals. However, there is a related problem upon which we would like to emphasize: that is the malevolent and hate publicity in some newspapers as regards criminals. Such publicity is made more against the person of the offender than against his offence. We propose that the law forbid newspapers to attack the person of the offender and oblige them to limit themselves to judgments on the offence itself. There are scabrous acts but no scabrous people. Such confusion in newspapers between the act and the person greatly reinforces the distress of offenders who are personally facing the same problem and at the same time it reinforces emotional rejection of them by honest citizens. Such repeated publicity seems to us as shamelessly adding fuel to a stone by fire and greatly impairs, by dint of sensationalism, the rehabilitation of the individual.

III *Sharing of Responsibilities in parole matters*

—That provincial authorities have their own parole service.

—That the Governor in Council continue to take decisions only in the case of convicts whose criminal offence itself is related to some political reason.

—That provisions in the Act concerning corporal punishment be amended to remove it from the list of possible punishments. If such removal is impossible, we propose that the National Parole Board retain its power of having it suspended when the case warrants it, in the same way as when someone is prohibited from driving.

—That the Chairman of NPB be assisted by an executive board and by consultants for matters concerning pardon, the organization and co-ordination of local parole services, and research; these people would be responsible for taking the decision.

IV *Membership of the Parole Board*

(a) *On the decision-making process*

1. That the decision of granting parole be no longer the responsibility of the members of the Board. At the present time, such decision is taken by persons remote from individuals about whom they have to make a decision.

2. That the decision to grant parole be taken jointly by people responsible for the individual in the institution and people who would be responsible for him were he to be released. Thus, people making the decision would be very directly involved in case of rejection or acceptance.

3. That the role of the members of the Board be restricted to that of adviser and verifier of decisions made in the institutions.

(b) *On assistance clinics*

1. That parole officers prepare or see to the preparation of the milieu where the individual will be received when returning to society.

2. That these officers do some planning for released prisoners in terms of work or possibly studies.

3. That officers work as much in relation to the milieu of the released prisoner (family) as with the released prisoner.

4. That relations between police and parole services be intensified.

V *The National Parole Service*

(a) What should be the role of the National Parole Service and its regional officers? The role of this service should be to help prisoners to return to society for the benefit of society. It should also more actively take part in the drafting of treatment programs to be carried in institutions.

(b) To what extent, if the case occurs, should National Parole Service and federal penitentiary personnel integrate their activities as regards treatment and education programs for prisoners in institutions and parole programs?

All these services should integrate their activities and work in close co-operation in order to make maximum use of all resources available to prisoners and in order also that there be continuity in the treatment. It is necessary for treatment to begin in an institution and to be continued outside by persons having already established a relationship of assistance with the prisoner.

VI *Application for Parole—Eligibility to Parole*

If the institutions are not yet organized as treatment centres such as we have suggested, we propose that:

—applications for investigations be made one year before the eligibility date in the case of life sentences.

—The prisoner's appearance be abolished, as his case will be discussed by persons directly knowing the prisoner, and as the decision will be made by these same persons.

—that greater use be made of the Act as regards exceptional cases in order that decisions by local commissions become more therapeutical.

VII *"Hearings" and decisions concerning parole*

In the reform that we propose, hearings by sections of the Board will no longer be relevant as parole will be decided by treatment teams (in co-operation with the parole officer and the local member of the board). We see such decisions as being taken after a case discussion, the prisoner not being present. However, it is necessary to maintain a higher authority in the local parole section in order that a prisoner may appeal if he feels wronged by the decision taken by the treatment team.

As regards suspensions, forfeitures and repeals, and should semi-open houses were established, we would like to see a parolee enjoying temporary residence if this is to be helpful to him; this implies that his permit will not be suspended and that he will not be returned to an institution for temporary detention.

VII *Daytime parole under the Parole Act and temporary absence under the Prisons and Reformatories Act*

1) Programs above-mentioned do not need to be integration if integration is already taking place through the treatment team of an institution.

2) If the institution does not provide treatment, under the definition given in the Parole Manual, parole is then somewhat restrictive. These criteria should leave room