

You see, the problem is that if we are to make a truly valid assessment, that is, to have pertinent information regarding someone, either from the offender who tends to lie or to manipulate us, we have to verify a few things; one may not rely upon the good faith of an offender, least we run the risk at a given time, of being imparted information of doubtful validity.

Hence, the parole officer is frequently taken up with a group of offenders whom he must see, sometimes carries out,—I don't know,—one interview, two interviews, he tries to see the fellow, he tries to examine his past, he tries to look into the prisoner's future plans upon his release, and then, at a given time, he introduces the case to the commissioners. What occurs is that the commissioners are stuck with a strange problem consisting of taking enormous risks at given times. This gives rise to the same problem as formerly existed, that is, at given times, it results in the awarding of certain arbitrary decisions. The commissioner shows up, and, on the faith of available information, he will say: well, I cannot really see how that one may be released. I am not too clear about it. I feel that releasing him would involve too great a risk. Is it the delinquent's fault? I feel that one cannot answer this question. One may say, at least, that one knows that the information at hand is not sufficiently elaborate nor checked out. One may at least say that. I feel that on that score, the number of personnel ought to be increased in order to enable it to arrive at a worthwhile assessment.

Secondly, there is also the predominant problem termed: surveillance. Should the parole officer be truly involved in surveillance, not from the viewpoint of meeting the prisoner for an hour once a month, so as to ask him, if things are all right—but rather—to work with him, particularly during the first six months, during the three to six month period following his release. Those are the most critical moments regarding tendency to relapse. A relapse may be prevented. It may perhaps be delayed should we, at a given time, be truly enabled to look after the offender at the time of his release—such that—more parole officers are required for that. This is obvious to us, in any case, and it seems to us that we are performing with a minimum number of personnel. The problem is serious regarding parole. I feel that, in terms of social liability, for one to make a decision from a totality of information that appears to us, you see, that seems to be but positively accentuated—the prisoner behaves well, and so on—but, just what is the true nature of the facts? Well, we do not know since we have not had time to investigate.

I feel that the question of social responsibility arises—that which brings us once more to what I mentioned earlier—to slips—that is, fellows that are released who should never have been, while others whom we feel ought to remain within institutions, but who, in the end, are released.

In short, we suggest an alternate approach. We propose that psychologists become an integral part of the parole service. You will say that we are arguing our own case. Possibly. But, let me tell you why. Very often, parole officers send us letters at the institution. On the average, we are approximately two psychologists for every 400 prisoners. We lack the time to follow all those people. It's physically impossible. We are told that frequently, psychologists are there for problem cases. Within an institu-

tion, certain cases have never been problem cases. The parole officer, upon examining the offender's evaluation, the commissioner, upon reading the evaluation, wonders: it seems to me that a psychological report might be necessary—things are unclear in this matter. At a given time, it sometimes occurs—certain institutions having an information request file—and they are two only who handle all the problems of the institution. Psychologists are frequently reticent to render such evaluations due to lack of time. One has the choice of making a true evaluation—involving a minimum of two or three work days—should one really wish to discuss and to understand, to probe in the least, and sometimes to drive our man into a corner, since it is then necessary in order to shed light, since, then, other daily tasks within the institution become neglected, and we are not prepared to do that. We have a choice between leaving aside daily chores, that are quite substantial—so as to forward a very important report—or in the opposite—to expedite the request application after having seen the offender but once, and thus forwarding a report that, in the end, proves of no value to the commissioner. Such a course of action serves no purpose whatsoever, and we are forever subjected to the same story. Hitherto, we have not been able to agree in order to elucidate the problem. It has not been possible.

Secondly, during parole surveillance, wherever the offender is on parole, what happens? As I mentioned earlier, at a given time there arises family crises, marital crises. The boys discover some solutions on their own; should an offender,—he has been married for one, two, or three years, and things do not go well with his wife; he returns to his wife after a given length of time, and the same situation recurs. Hence, this results in a resurgence of tension, and it is clear that what emerges from his history—is that all along, he really wanted to get away from home. This may seem odd, but in some respects, that's what delinquents are. They discover such typical solutions, and in order to remove themselves from marital tension, family tension—they commit breaches of the law. Such breaches oftentimes prove to be a very hostile form of protest. They then become incarcerated within institutions. So long as they are inside the institution, things go well. Such cases must be handled at the very moment of crisis; furthermore, I believe that specialists are required to work with such offenders upon their release. This is the daily routine that he must envisage—he must learn to control himself, and to adapt to this situation. Such daily routine, however, is not as yet part of the institution. Hence, this explains why institutions will require more highly specialized people in the realm of social relations, in order to find solutions to conflicts—whether this consists of total solutions, or partial only—in such a way that our fellow, the former prisoner, will at least meet with a solution. His requirements consist of solutions that are more acceptable from a social viewpoint. Should he experience poor relationships with his wife, then he ought to consider other solutions, such as separation or divorce—but not to try to escape the problem by committing robbery, nor by giving vent to an emotional crisis. These boys tell us: I felt depressed, things had soured with my wife. Such is not always the case—quite true—but certain cases prove to be so. To liberate an offender without providing him with this special help, means to run the risk that the same situation might recur—should no final solution have been made available.