

ex-inmate is often the most valuable index of his cooperation and potential success. The giving of "hand-outs" unrelated to the broader casework approach may often do more harm than good.

Many of these men have lived highly transient lives and a number of them wish to break off all relationship with the penal past at the earliest opportunity. Many who have made pre-release plans involving stipulated residence or employment suddenly want to vary their circumstances by the widest and wildest ideas.

One interview at least every week at the start of the parole is suggested as the basic minimum for the exercise of acceptable supervision. In actual fact there will usually be more interviews than this and as many should be arranged as is necessary in each case. It is essential to ensure that supervision of the parolee is no cursory matter. The parolee should be obligated to make his first report within three days of reaching his destination.

As the relationship progresses and the parolee finds increasing integration in home, job and community it is wise and desirable to "taper off" the number of required interviews to the maintaining of essential contact between parolee and the supervisory worker. Provision should be made for the reduction of parole conditions and eventually for the official termination of long-term paroles or those in special cases where the adjustment of the ex-inmate is obviously excellent and it is unlikely that the parolee may resort to crime.

PAROLE CONDITIONS

The purpose of parole conditions is to set the framework within which the relationship between the parole supervisor and the parolee will develop, to provide realistic guidelines for the parolee, to clarify for him the expectations of the contractual relationship, to remind him of the responsibilities he has undertaken upon signing the parole agreement and to hold him accountable for his behaviour. The parole conditions should be explained to the parolee and he should be given time to consider them before he signs the agreement assuming the responsibilities of the contractual relationship.

The current conditions do not appear to be unnecessarily rigid provided opportunity is afforded the supervisor to exercise discretion and discuss the practical application of the conditions. If specific conditions are anticipated it would be helpful to those carrying out the community assessment and institutional inquiry to be informed so as to assess the probable effect of their imposition. It is desirable to have some objective factors which can be discussed with the parolee in regard to his behaviour and which can be interpreted in ways which he can understand without depending on subjective judgements as to his total reactive behaviour pattern.

While these conditions appear reasonable in that the parolee would otherwise be in prison they are certainly far more restrictive than the way of life of an ordinary citizen. These conditions should be interpreted as guidelines for conduct and when violated should be used by the supervisor as part of a learning process rather than as a basis for arbitrary action. The parolee, being human, will make mistakes and should not be expected to learn or practice immediately the appropriate socially acceptable behaviour.

There appears to be a general feeling that the "abstinence" clause is used too frequently under Clause 8 of the Parole Agreement and that it would be better to handle the problem of the use of alcohol

under Clause 7 which is discretionary and, by agreement of the supervisor, would permit social drinking which is in general vogue in contemporary social relationships. The "abstinence" condition tends to set up a barrier between the parolee and his supervisor since the parolee knows he may reveal breaches of this condition only on pain of revocation. This prevents constructive use of this behaviour within the supervisory relationship. Hence the "abstinence" condition should be imposed only in cases where the discretionary use of the powers under Clause 7 have proved ineffectual.

Provision should be made for the review of conditions with the objective of their relaxation as the parolee gives evidence of satisfactory adjustment and thus can be encouraged in his developing citizenship. Procedures for the termination of conditions should be made and also for the termination of parole when it has become obvious that the parolee has achieved a satisfactory degree of adjustment in the community. Termination should also apply to offenders paroled on preventive detention or life sentences. A way should be found of avoiding the constant jeopardy, under which they are forced to live, of return to prison for violation with the old sentence still hanging over their heads in addition to the new sentence which may be for a relatively minor offence.

CASELOAD

The question of caseload depends on a number of factors relating to the ability and experience of the parole officer, the nature of the caseload, and the expectations on him as to content of supervision which may be a very intensive treatment relationship or of a perfunctory reporting nature.

An average of twenty interviews a week appears to be a reasonable assignment of time by a worker to direct service in relationship to the other components of his responsibility. The minimal supervision that could possibly be accepted would be one interview per man per month and this for well-stabilized parolees. A current all stages caseload of forty cases would mean a minimum of forty interviews per month. A normal load assignment of twenty interviews per week would provide eighty interviews per month. This would leave forty interviews available over and above the minimum number of forty to apply additionally to beginning parolees or difficult cases. Hence a caseload of forty parolees in varying stages of their parole and degrees of supervision should be the maximum full time caseload.

REVOCATION AND SUSPENSION

Revocation is a Parole Board decision but it should be preceded by suspension unless clear violations have occurred regarding which warnings have been issued and ignored by the parolee. If there is a clear danger to the community, revocation might be justified without the first step of suspension which is seen as both a treatment and a control device. Suspension has the advantage of taking the parolee off the street and showing him that the matter is considered serious; but allows for a close examination of attitudes and circumstances and for release once again based on a new treatment plan. This calls for close coordination and definition of roles between the supervisor and the parole service officer who has the power of suspension. Swift action may be needed to lift the suspension quickly so that the parolee, who is working and discharg-