

Parole of all other inmates over a two year sentence would then remain the responsibility of the Parole Board. This would include inmates sentenced to preventive detention, life imprisonment and special cases. But in this way the paroling of the shorter-term inmates, where timing of programme activities in the institution becomes important and must be very flexible, would be more related to the institutional programme. The work load of the Board, which is indisputably very heavy, would be materially reduced.

This might appear to weight the decision-making more heavily in regard to institutional factors and might lead to an institutionalization of the process. The impact from the community through the parole service officer would be most important in counteracting such a possibility. It is important to distinguish between institutional adaptation and the progress of inner change by the inmate as revealed in his interpersonal relationships and the achievement of programme objectives. These should lead to consideration of his potential ability to function in the community rather than in the institution. Considerable weight should be given to the community assessment which indicates the support available in the community to aid his parole performance.

It is sometimes charged that the Board does not release inmates who have little in the way of resources in the community as revealed by the community assessment. In such cases the attitude has been to parole the inmate placing reliance on the parole supervision of a sponsoring agency. The after-care agencies and the voluntary residential houses have made a point of offering assistance to such men. This liberal attitude of the Parole board in such cases disproves the charge that only the more financially secure middle-class inmate is being paroled. These represent a minority of the parole caseload. Most other parolees are more anonymous in their neighbourhoods which are in any event more tolerant of their values and their criminal record. They can usually find work of a labouring or semi-skilled nature more easily than the white collar parolee who seeks professional or commercial employment and encounters a great deal of prejudice.

The Parole Board is engaged in one of the most difficult tasks in predicting human behaviour. The uncertainty of doing this in regard to often unknown and untried situations in the community involves prediction as to the transition from prison adaptation which is in itself unnatural to community adaptation which is fraught with pressures and tensions and temptations. If in some way an inmate could give visible signs of his inner readiness beyond verbal protestation the task would be easier.

The Parole Board are dealing in the main with the most difficult type of person in our society. Many of them are defined as character disorders or psychopaths who are described as follows in an article—*Conscience in the Psychopath* by P. Greenacre in the *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* of July 1945 at page 495: "Behaviour is marked by impulsiveness and marked irresponsibility, intense but labile emotional states, and generally quixotic and superficial love relationships. . . . not deliberate offenders; they lie and steal impulsively, especially under pressure. They sign bad cheques or impulsively forge another's name, marry on the spur of the moment, and as often impulsively run away from a marriage or a job. . . . live in the moment, with great intensity, acting without plan and seemingly without concern for the consequences. . . . lack of practical appreciation of time and the inability to learn from

experience stand out as cardinal symptoms. . . . Usually poor tolerance of pain. Alcoholism, drug addiction polymorphous sexual perversions may be associated secondary symptoms. Homosexual tendencies appear in a high percentage of cases, and there appears to be a special predisposition to homosexuality inherent in the very structure of the personality."

But in the interests of society the inmate should be released on parole when he appears most ready to face his community. This will inevitably result in a higher forfeiture and revocation rate. The more inmates paroled the greater will be the failure rate but so also will be the number of successes which are never published or publicly discussed as they lack the news value of a sensational failure. The increase in the crime rates cannot be charged to parole as the forfeitures on parole are a completely insignificant figure in the total of convictions for indictable offences. It is the reporting of a few bizarre cases involving parolees that creates the popular belief that many parolees are engaged in continuing criminal activity. The reports of parolee earnings indicate that an overwhelming proportion are engaged seriously in becoming economically productive citizens. There is small comfort in having a high success rate for a low parole release rate.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE PAROLE BOARD

The parole service is regionalized by penitentiary areas for the Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario, Prairie and Pacific areas. They are responsible for pre-release work in their areas and the arranging of supervision for ordinary parole and day parole. Their administrative relationship is to the Headquarters staff in Ottawa which exercises a coordinating function on cases prior to decisions by the Parole Board so that a relatively common policy can be maintained. If the suggestion made above regarding decision-making were followed the parole service would, jointly with the institutional staff, be responsible for the parole granting of men sentenced to two years and for day parole. They have a further role in regard to the relationship with the after-care agencies and community organizations generally.

The Parole Board should also be regionalized into Sectional Boards of three members including its own sub-chairman; but under the coordination of the Chairman of the whole Board in Ottawa. In Ontario and Quebec, because of the larger number of inmates involved, there should be two Sectional Boards in each Province with the Quebec sections composed of French-speaking members. Each of these should be, like the other regions, composed of a sub-chairman and two members. The personnel of these Sectional Boards could be largely drawn from the present Parole Board members in Ottawa, augmented as necessary. The Ontario Sections should be resident in Kingston and the Quebec Sections resident in Montreal. This would leave only the Chairman in Ottawa to exercise supervision of all the regional Sections. As necessary he could draw on members of the nearby Ontario and Quebec Sections to deal with such other matters as the remission of corporal punishment, the restrictions on driving or any other special matters requiring a corporate Board decision. These Sectional Boards should be related to the regional offices of the parole service for the necessary support services and for consultation and recommendation as to cases in their decision-making function.