THE PAROLEE AND HIS "AFTER-CARE" PROBLEMS:

An exploratory study of conditions encountered by men on parole which impede the process of rehabilitation, with some applications to after-care agencies, British Columbia, 1961.

by

GRANT PHILIP SPIRO

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK in the School of Social Work

Accepted as conforming to the standard required for the degree of Master of Social Work

School of Social Work

1961

The University of British Columbia
In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Social Work

The University of British Columbia, Vancouver 8, Canada.

Date April 28, 1961
ABSTRACT

This thesis is concerned with the problems of men discharged from prison on parole. The objective is to describe the broad contours of the subject and then to identify within these limits those problems of the parolee which appear most likely to affect his chances of successful rehabilitation. The major defects in our present system of parole are reviewed and some suggestions are offered for further research.

This study is primarily exploratory in nature, as no attempt has been made to submit precisely formulated hypotheses to exact verification procedures. Ten major problems thought to be common to all parolees, their causes and their many ramifications are discussed. Extensive reference is made to previously published analyses of this subject. To supplement this discussion, various leaders in the field of after-care and several parolees were interviewed to provide further information for the analysis and illustration of the ten problem areas explored.

The evidence gathered indicates that of the ten problem areas discussed, the problems of reintegration into the family and the community pose the greatest difficulty to the parolee and the after-care agencies; and that the other problems discussed serve in the main only to complicate these two critical areas. The study indicates that the key to solving these problems hinges on the parolee's mental picture of himself, which has been warped by his prison experiences. The study shows also that, contrary to public belief, rehabilitation generally starts only when the parolee is released, and not during incarceration. The value of parole lies in the fact that, through realistic and warm support, the parole supervisor can help the parolee to gain a better image of himself, and thereby assist him to meet the frustrations of social living in such a way as to allow and encourage emotional growth.

The study shows a need for more realistic programs of education and training, as well as realistic pre-release programs for the inmate. Such programs would reduce the obstacles of rejoining the family and the community and help to reduce the tendency toward dependency shown by most parolees. Moreover, the study indicates that the success and the effectiveness of parole rests to a large extent on the attitude of the public. Without public good will corrections programs will never be able to succeed. This means that the objectives and results of good after-care programs must constantly be kept before the public in order to build their confidence in, understanding of, and support for these programs.
The study shows the great need for further research in this field. Yet in the field of corrections and rehabilitation in Canada very little research has in fact been done. Some needed lines of research are indicated.
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CHAPTER I

THE NATURE AND CONDITIONS OF PAROLE

"Many men on their release carry their prison about with them into the air, and hide it as a secret disgrace in their hearts. Society takes upon itself the right to inflict punishment on the individual, but it also has the supreme vice of shallowness and fails to realize what it has done. When the man's punishment is over it leaves him to himself; it abandons him at the very moment when its highest duty towards him begins."

Oscar Wilde, de Profundis.

Both parole and after-care have a long history in Canada. Although progress has been painfully slow, partially owing to public and political apathy and executive inefficiency, some progress has been achieved in this field. Until recently the emphasis had been placed on punishment and custody, but the trend now is toward rehabilitation of the prisoner. While this, of course, is a step in the right direction, the lack of adequate facilities, unrealistic programs and untrained workers have resulted in the marquetry that exists today.

After-Care in Canada--Yesterday and Today

In the early history of corrections in Canada little attention was given to the offender once he was discharged from the institution. In 1835 Canada's first penitentiary was opened, and the following year the Rules and Regulations for the institution were established:

The shortest section had to do with "Discharge of Convicts", and reads as follows... a discharged
convict shall be clad in a decent suit of clothes, selected from the clothing taken from new convicts. He shall then be supplied with money according to the distance of the district where he was tried and sentenced, but not exceeding the sum specified in the law (one pound). As the time when the convict is about to be discharged is favorable for eliciting truth, with a view to obtaining facts which may be useful, the Chaplain will endeavour to obtain from him a short history of his life, his parentage, education, temptations, and the various steps by which he was led into a course of vice and crime, and commit the same to writing, for the information of the inspectors; after which, the convict shall be discharged with a suitable admonition and advice.

This was consistent with the retributive theory of custody and punishment so long dominant in our country.

The first Canadian recognition of the need for after-care for discharged prisoners appears to be found in 1849 when a commission was established to investigate the conduct, management and discipline of the provincial penitentiary at Kingston. When this report was issued it contained the following:

It must be confessed that the success of any system of prison discipline will be strongly affected by the treatment which the convict receives on his discharge from confinement. A convict may leave his cell penitent and determined to reform, but if he is met with harshness and refused employment, and his good resolutions treated with scorn, despair will soon overtake him, poverty and the force of circumstances will too often drive him back to the haunts of crime... Much has been done in the United States by prison societies, who receive the penitent transgressor on his discharge, and aide him and strenthen him in his struggle with the frowns of the world; the tide of public sympathy has been, by their labours, turned towards the helpless out-

cast, and great good has undoubtedly been effected. A more noble work could not engage the efforts of the Christian or Philanthropist. We trust that such a society will, ere long, exist in our own country.

Despite this observation, the challenge was not taken up until around 1867 when a Sunday School was started in the Toronto jail. The teachers were mainly Methodists or Anglicans:

... who emphasized the doctrine of personal salvation, and quite naturally they turned their attention to those who they believed, were most in need of hearing the gospel.

In 1874 this same group established the Prisoners' Aid Association of Toronto. Services were expanded to the penitentiary where the workers soon found preaching to the more difficult types of offender was useless and that unless upon release their material needs were given attention, preaching personal salvation was to no avail.

As the years rolled by the Prisoners' Aid Association attracted some of Toronto's leading citizens who became quite active reformers in the association. It was not long before they began to realize there was something wrong with the whole penal system, especially as far as it concerned the treatment given the prisoners. In 1891 the first penal convention was held by the Prisoners' Aid Association and because penal reforms were so strongly advocated, more often than not the Prisoners' Aid Association was referred to as the Penal Reform Association.

2 Ibid., p. 74.
When the original charter for the Prisoners' Aid Association was taken out the title given was Prisoners' Aid Association of Canada which provided in its constitution:

... that the aim would be a nation-wide organization, with branches operating under the head office as to principles and policies, but with full autonomy as to methods and individual work.  

However, this end was never achieved. The only branch formed was in 1897 in London, Ontario, which unfortunately had a short life of approximately two years. In 1892 the Prisoners' Aid Association of Montreal was also formed, but there appears to be no evidence that this event was influenced by the existence of the Toronto Association.

The first effects of the efforts of the Prisoners' Aid Association of Canada were seen in the convention of 1891 where reference was made to the Royal Commission of 1890 to inquire into the Prison and Reformatory System of the Province of Ontario and the appointment of Dr. A. M. Rosebrugh, an outstanding member of the Prisoners' Aid Association, to the commission. Although various recommendations were made (for example, improved and more industrial schools, means to save destitute children from criminal careers, improvement in management of county jails and better classification of inmates), nothing was done with these recommendations. In 1897 however, the Guelph Prison Farm, the first prison without walls in Canada, was opened, bearing the official name of the

4 Ibid., p. 9.
Ontario Reformatory. Within due time it was followed by classified institutions of the same general type and regime, such as Burwash Farm (for more difficult cases), also at Mimico, Fort William and Langstaff (the last municipal farm). For women the Mercer and Concord institutions exist. In the wake of these reformatories the indeterminate sentence and the Ontario parole system were introduced, applying only to reformatories. At any rate the pinnacle of reform seems to have been reached. The Toronto Prisoners' Aid Association slowed its pace and on the death of Dr. Rosebrugh in 1915, dropped completely from the picture.

For the next phase we must turn to Montreal where we find that in 1917, prior to the armistice, there existed the following agencies:
1. The Prisoners' Aid Association of Montreal, dating from 1892.
2. The Honour League of Canada.
3. The Criminal Reform Association.
As can be conjectured there was considerable overlap between these four agencies which resulted in the merger in 1919 of the National Criminal Reform Association and the Honour League of Canada under the name of the Canadian Prisoners Welfare Association. The Montreal Prisoners' Aid Association of 1892 stayed out and the Criminal Reform Association like so many others just dropped completely out of the picture:

Final consolidation of the prison aid effort in Montreal was consummated in September, 1931,
when the original Prisoners' Aid Association of Montreal - dating from 1892 - and the Canadian Prisoners' Welfare Association (Montreal Branch) were merged. The final merger took out a new provincial charter, with the name of Prisoners' Aid and Welfare Association of Montreal. The Canadian Prisoners' Welfare Association continued its national reform activities, plus promotion of local prison aid bodies, until 1935 when the Ottawa charter was ceded to the Canadian Penal Association that was formed at the first Canadian Penal Congress in May of that year.

Although the first after-care agencies and programs started in the east, the program slowly spread west. The outstanding province in the west was British Columbia. In 1929 in Vancouver the Reverend Canon A. H. Sovereign through the Ministerial Association formed a committee to study the problem of after-care in Vancouver. Owing to the intense activity of Canon Sovereign the movement went forward and an agency was formed under the name of the John Howard Society. In May 1931 the organization formed its first board of directors. Two of the outstanding achievements of this organization were to start the British Columbia Borstal Institution of New Haven and the inauguration of adult probation services in the criminal courts of Vancouver.

After-care societies existed in Regina and Winnipeg by the latter part of the 1930's. Since 1946 there has been a sharp increase in the number of after-care agencies in Canada:

John Howard Societies, named after the great prison reformer of the eighteenth century, with salaried full-time workers, are now in operation in Vancouver, Victoria, Edmonton, Calgary, Ottawa, London, Kingston,

---

5 Ibid., p. 19.
Halifax, St. John's, Montreal, Hamilton and Toronto. Other John Howard Societies, with voluntary or part-time personnel, are functioning in Lethbridge, Peace River, Regina, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Thunder Bay, (Port Arthur and Fort William), St. Catherines, St. John, Sydney, Windsor, Sarnia and Moncton. Elizabeth Fry Societies, named after the Quaker prison welfare pioneer, for work among female ex-prisoners are established in Vancouver, Kingston, Ottawa and Toronto. At Winnipeg, there is the Manitoba Welfare Association, with full-time employees. In Montreal, also on a full-time employee basis, are the Societe d'Orientation et de Rehabilitation Sociale and the Catholic Rehabilitation Service. In Quebec City, Le Service de Readaptation, Inc., is in the same well-established category.

While all the above mentioned agencies belong to the Canadian Corrections Association each is nevertheless autonomous. The methods for financing their programs vary from province to province and city to city. Some depend entirely on the local community chest, some on donations from private citizens and businesses and others receive some aid from provincial and municipal governments. Those associated with Féderal Penitentiaries receive grants from the Penitentiaries Branch of the Department of Justice.

Besides these secular agencies there are other organizations that have been active to some extent in the program of after-care. Most notable of these are the Prison Gate Services of the Salvation Army and the Church Army of the Anglican Church of Canada. Other religious orders such as the Unitarians, the Society of Friends and some Roman Catholic agencies have contributed although on a limited scale.

6 Fauteux Report, p. 75.
As we can see, the Canadian after-care programs are in their strongest position since their rather long and painfully slow start:

... due to the co-operation and financial contributions of the federal and some provincial governments, some municipal corporations and interested citizens. The increasing number of these agencies that are included in Community Chest campaigns across Canada is significant. They are accepted and supported by the public as they have never been before in Canada.7

The necessity for realistic after-care programs is quite apparent if one considers that in the period ending March 31, 1955, 2,001 prisoners who had served two years or more were released from the eight Canadian Federal penitentiaries. This does not include the hundreds who would also have been released from our provincial jails and reformatories. Some of course will need no assistance in becoming law-abiding citizens but the majority will need help and guidance in order to be successfully rehabilitated and reintegrated into society.

History of Parole in Canada

Canada's parole legislation was first introduced into parliament in 1898. At this time the legislators chose to call it by the current English term "Ticket of Leave". The act was entitled "An Act to Provide for the Conditional Liberation of Convicts". There has been some confusion in the past whether the term "Ticket of Leave" is synonymous with the term "parole," so at this point I would emphasize that the "Ticket of Leave Act" is a Parole Act because:

7 Loc. cit.
It provides for the conditional liberation of a person under sentence so that he or she may continue to serve his or her sentence at large in the community rather than within the confining walls of the prison.\(^8\)

The Prime Minister of that day in speaking of the new act recognized the difficulties of readjustment for the discharged offender when released into the community:

The object of this bill is to introduce the ticket-of-leave system for convicts. The bill follows, I believe, word for word, the English Act. That Act has been in operation in England for some twenty years or more, perhaps, and I understand, has worked satisfactorily. The bill provides generally that the Governor-in-Council may allow a convict to be set at large on condition of good behavior. The convict so set at large is not free; he can be re-arrested at any time; but he is allowed to be at large, to some extent under the surveillance of the police. Here is a convict, a young man of good character, who may have committed a crime in a moment of passion, or perhaps, have fallen a victim to bad example or the influence of unworthy friends. There is a good report of him while in confinement, and it is supposed that if he were given another chance, he would be a good citizen. Under the bill, power is given to the Governor General to order his liberation - of course, under certain rules to be established in the framing of which we shall be guided by the precedents of England. The matter is experimental, so far as we are concerned, but we are guided by the experience in Great Britain.\(^9\)

The act was passed the following year. From the passing of the act in 1899 to 1958 there had been no substantial amendment to the act.

The first hopeful sign that change was in the offing was the appointment of the Archambault Report, published in 1938.


This report did an extensive and comprehensive study outlining the problems clearly and made many realistic and clear-cut recommendations for their solution. However, with the outbreak of World War II this report was lost in the shuffle and as a result the recommendations of this report were never implemented. Following the war the growing concern for the state of our prisons and prisoners slowly gained momentum. Governments on every level gradually realized the importance of after-care programs. The next big step was the appointment of the Fauteux Committee whose report was published in 1956 and which received a large measure of approval from the correctional people. The present federal government took steps within its authority to implement certain recommendations of this report and consequently a new act came into being.

The new Parole Act was passed by the House of Commons, August 18, 1958 and by the Senate on August 21 of the same year. The act came into force, January 1, 1959.

It provides for the creation of a Parole Board of not less than three and not more than five members, to be appointed for a period not exceeding ten years.

The board will have exclusive jurisdiction in granting, refusing, or revoking parole (it is to be known as parole, not as ticket of leave) and there is no appeal from the Board's decision.

The Chairman of the Board will have responsibility for directing the staff serving the Board. Staff will be appointed under the terms of the Civil Service Act, except that staff now serving the Remission Service may be transferred to the Board. Board members will be paid.

Sentences of over two years will be reviewed for parole automatically (details to be determined).
Sentences under two years will be reviewed on application. The Board is not required to grant personal interviews to applicants for parole. There is provision for suspension of parole while the Board decides whether to revoke or not. Conviction for an indictable offense carries automatic forfeiture.

There is provision for serving the remainder of a sentence after the revocation in the area of arrest, rather than in the institution where the parolee was incarcerated prior to parole. The Board has additional jurisdiction to revoke or suspend a sentence of corporal punishment, or a suspension of a driving licence under the Criminal Code.

The Board shall, on direction of the Minister of Justice, make any investigation in connection with a request for the exercise of the royal prerogative of mercy. The responsibilities of the Minister of Justice under Section 666 of the Criminal Code (automatic review of sentences as an habitual criminal) are transferred to the board.10

Common Confusion About Parole

The present study is concerned with the problems that the paroled offender may encounter on his return to society. The paroled prisoner unlike the discharged prisoner is still under restraint, and although he is not completely free, he has spent less time in prison than the offender who is discharged after expiration of his sentence. Whether on parole or discharged, ex-inmates meet certain basic or universal problems. These problems will be dealt with in the following chapter.

What then do I mean by parole? I have chosen the United Nations definition which I feel is a comprehensive and concise statement:

... the conditional release of a selected convicted person before completion of the term of imprisonment to which he has been sentenced. It implies that the person in question continues in the custody of the state or its agent and that he may be reincarcerated in the event of misbehavior. It is a penological measure designed to facilitate the transition of the offender from the highly controlled life of the penal institution to the freedom of community living. It is not intended as a gesture of leniency or forgiveness.11

The main points to observe in this definition are that the offender is still under custody of the state and that the basic purpose is to bridge the gap between the closely ordered life of the prison community and the freedom of normal community living. Some students of criminology feel that parole is not granted as a right but as a privilege and opportunity for it requires the individual to demonstrate his capacity to conform to the behavior patterns and standards established by society. However this is a debatable point. The majority of correctional people feel that parole is a right provided the inmate can meet the requirements of parole. It follows that parole has a dual function, on the one hand the rehabilitation of the offender, and on the other, the protection of society. These goals of parole are inseparable. A successfully rehabilitated offender guarantees protection for society just as the safety of the community requires successful rehabilitation and readjustment of offenders. Further, parole implies supervision and controls or conditions imposed on the parolee. The supervision aspect involves guidance and assist-

ance which set parole apart from the typical police functions. These controls have the same objectives of protecting society and contributing to the successful rehabilitation and reintegration of the parolee into society. Another important factor is that parole should be distinguished from probation or pardon. Probation differs from parole basically in that it is an alternative to incarceration and the court has jurisdiction over the probationer, whereas in parole the court has given up its jurisdiction to the penal institution and parole implies completion of part of the sentence. Pardon is, on the other hand, an act of forgiveness and remission of punishment. It frees the individual from any responsibility to the state with respect to the remaining time of the imposed sentence.

Justification for Parole

Although parole is a recognized procedure in contemporary penology, there are good reasons for believing that the general public have many reservations about parole. It is perhaps necessary, therefore, that some justification of parole should be offered here.

By granting parole we may limit those effects of prison which are injurious to the inmate and ultimately to his family. It is obvious that no institution intentionally exposes inmates to penalties that will threaten their physical or mental health; rather, these penalties should contribute to their rehabilitation. But even if the institution builds its program in accordance with these views, the prison community by its own nature creates
conditions which result in an adverse influence on many prisoners. This is readily recognized when one realizes that segregation of prisoners is a virtual impossibility in most institutions. Hardened criminals, sex deviates, addicts and first offenders, mingle freely. The inexperienced learn from the experienced and must conform to the prison culture for their own safety if not for companionship.

Prolonged incarceration of husbands and fathers creates difficulties in the family situation and often results in a permanent family breakdown. Even if adequate material support is given to dependents, the problem is not entirely alleviated since there are so many imponderable factors that influence the family situation both socially and morally. However, parole, by shortening the period of incarceration, may help to alleviate some of the problems that arise both for the family and the incarcerated offender.

Furthermore, parole is a method by which the prison term may be shortened. It is evident that continued incarceration for many prisoners serves no useful purpose and is liable to produce apathy and hard feelings toward society and the law enforcement agencies. Neither would unconditional release at this time afford protection for society. Parole however, provides the supervision and assistance necessary to help the parolee become integrated into society. Many factors have to do with the timing of conditional release, the most important of these being the social adjustment the inmate has made during
his incarceration and his present attitudes. Parole then, meets both the correctional and humanitarian objectives of shortening original prison terms.

Parole facilitates a realistic application of pre-release programs for the penitentiary, especially in vocational programs. The timing of parole and completion of vocational courses or other training programs is an important problem as often in the past and even now inmates are not able to complete a program because of being paroled too soon; on the other hand, they may finish their course but are unable to use their newly acquired abilities for long periods of time because of continued incarceration. Therefore, long range parole plans and flexible release procedures will enable correctional authorities to have the individual released at the most opportune time with regard to the skills he has acquired and his willingness and readiness to adjust to society. Obviously if a prisoner must languish in jail after learning a new skill it will result in a psychological deterioration as well as loss of manual dexterity in the vocational course he completed and in his attitudes toward rehabilitation programs.

Parole provides an opportunity for a realistic application of rehabilitation programs prior to the expiration of the sentence. It is not difficult to imagine that when the offender is released into society he is exposed to conditions and modes of behavior that he could not become acquainted with
or may have forgotten while in prison. These can be confusing and produce great anxiety for him. Parole helps the discharged offender to make a realistic use of those rules and norms recommended in the institution. It would follow that modern institutions attempt to introduce norms to the prisoner that he had not previously known or observed outside the prison walls. It is not hard to presume that these norms established in the formal unreal society of a prison would have but a slight impact upon the prisoner. Without some means of helping the offender apply these rules realistically in free society, the probability of a return to previous criminal behavior is greatly enhanced.

The prospect of parole encourages the prisoner to maintain the greatest amount of contact with the world outside the prison walls. The most important contacts to the prisoner are personal contacts with prison personnel and visits from loved ones and close friends. Letters from home help keep him informed on what is going on in the outside world and help him psychologically as well. Newspapers, radio, magazines, movies and lectures as well as visits from after-care agencies contribute, keeping him knowledgeable and interested in the free society. It is understandable that if there is no possibility of parole, the prisoner will not have the same stimulus to maintain contacts with society and is more liable to do "easy time"—that is, participating in the prison's program of activities as little as possible and only when it will serve the ends of the prisoner
or get him out of hard or dirty work. It is reasonable to assume that contact with society has the greatest significance and meaning to the offender when he is able to associate it with the possibility of being paroled.

Parole and the possibility of parole provide incentive for the inmate to use the institutional facilities and services to his best advantage. The inmate will participate in the various facilities offered, (for example, recreational, vocational and religious), if there is some encouragement and reward for his efforts. Whether the inmate's response is phlegmatic or enthusiastic will have a great deal to do with his present perception of his future. Parole offers this incentive and furnishes the motivation for him to utilize and avail himself of the offered services.

Furthermore, the prospect of parole may act as an incentive for good conduct while incarcerated. Obviously no inmate is apt to jeopardize his freedom if he has the possibility of being granted parole. However, on the other hand, inmates will conform to prison life without rebellion in a superficial way as their method of meeting the problem of incarceration. I feel that this superficial or simulated conduct pattern will be of little value to the inmate once he has been released. In fact, it is the opinion of many correctional workers that evidence exists that an inmate with a less smooth adjustment is revealing the existence of a well-integrated personality. From my own professional experience I would say that an
incarcerated individual who has no difficulty in adjusting to
the formal and strict prison society has more of a personality
problem than those men who naturally rebel at their loss of
freedom and the stringent rules under which they must live.
Accordingly, it would be foolish to base the granting of
parole merely on good conduct of the inmate and equally, to
give too great an emphasis to its value in securing conformity
to prison rules.

Once the inmate has been released from prison on parole,
we may observe that after-care offers assistance to the
individual and at the same time serves to some degree as a
deterrent because of the possibility of parole revocation.
It is apparent that the supervising agency offers the individual
not only psychological assistance but also direct material help.
Often the support given to the individual is the primary factor
in his post-institutional adjustment. Parole revocation acts
as a safeguard for society, in that the parolee may be returned
to prison if he cannot abide by the rules of society and of
his parole. These limits and restrictions plus the possibility
of being returned to prison often act as powerful influences
on the parolee during his rehabilitation.

Parole supervision and the possibility of revocation
help to protect society during the critical period of time
immediately after the prisoner is released. The limitations
or restrictions of parole are devised not only to help the
parolee to refrain from further criminal behavior but to
protect society by providing realistic safeguards against further criminality. Naturally there are risks involved in parole which entail possible danger to society but to negate parole because of such risks is an invalid argument. It is generally assumed that society is responsible in part for the causation of crime and therefore should be willing to take a calculated risk in the attempt to rehabilitate the offender. Parole affords the opportunity to society to meet its responsibility toward the offender.

Furthermore, I feel it is evident that parole may moderate unduly harsh sentences which have resulted from pressures from aroused public opinion. It is often to be observed that when the press or radio have no world wars or major catastrophes to report, they turn to crime news, and woe betide the offender if he is caught in this purge. Of course, the degree to which the court is swayed by public opinion depends on the criminal law of the country. In Canada public opinion generally does not sway the courts, or at least it is not supposed to. However, we still must deal with the judge's opinions and feelings concerning a particular crime, unbiased as judges generally try to be. One judge may give an extremely harsh sentence while another will give a lighter sentence for the same crime. Although parole's purpose is not to correct the courts' sentencing injustices, it would help minimize unduly harsh sentences.

Parole offers the prison authorities the chance to evaluate the influences of the penal institution on the offender.
Because parole is set up to maintain close contact with the parolee for specific periods of time it allows the penal system to determine to what extent the institution contributes, or as the case may be, fails to contribute, to the adjustment of the inmate once he is released. It also allows the administration to determine whether there is sufficient or insufficient treatment available and to what extent the treatment has contributed to the success of the discharged inmate in society. Before the advent of parole, administration had no means to carry out large scale studies on the effects of prison on the prisoner. However, with the advent of parole, subsequent investigations into this problem have been made possible.

Again, parole has demonstrated clearly that institutional treatment of offenders is not always the most efficient way of dealing with them. It is because of parole and its companion probation that the merits of institutional treatment are being reviewed with a great deal of skepticism. This revaluation of our correctional institutions has resulted in more emphasis on the non-punitive correctional techniques.

Last but not least are the financial aspects of parole. Parole is a less costly form of treatment than institutional treatment. To what degree it is or how large a saving to the public it would represent is difficult to assess. In the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Penitentiaries 1953-54 it states:
...$4.42 was the average daily cost of keeping an inmate in a Federal Penitentiary. The cost of keeping an inmate in an Ontario reformatory has been calculated at $1,760 a year. The cost of parole depends on many factors, including the salary paid to the after-care staff and the number of persons under supervision. A figure of fifty cases has been suggested as a reasonable caseload. If we accept this figure, it means that one parole officer can supervise a number of men who, if they are held in prison, will cost the public over $200 a day to maintain. The cost of parole is on a par with the cost of probation, which, as we said, has been estimated as not exceeding $50 a year, an average, for each probationer. 12

It is obvious that the cost of institutional care far outstrips the costs of parole, which of course supplies another justification for parole.

The difficulties of assessing actual costs of parole are many; for example, how much of the public's funds are spent on supporting the dependents of the criminal, not only in the matter of material help but also in relation to the costs of apprehending children, providing foster homes, and so forth. Further, a man paroled is able to support his family and prevent possible breakdowns due to his long incarceration. If we were to speculate for a moment and presume that a parole officer would be paid $9,000 a year and he could handle a caseload of fifty parolees, then the cost based on his salary would be $180 per year per inmate which obviously is a large saving. However, we have to add normal office costs and material assistance which will be given to the parolee and

will vary from area to area. Another consideration is that the parole officer's caseload is not stationary for a year. He may handle as many as two hundred parolees within a given year. Until uniform accounting and parole procedure are used across Canada the exact cost of a parolee per year will be difficult to assess. However, we do know definitely that costs of parole are less than costs of institutional care.

Nature of the Study

The remainder of the study will be concerned with the problems of the parolee. It is primarily exploratory in nature since no attempt has been made to submit precisely formulated hypotheses to exact verification procedures the aim being rather to describe the broad contours of the subject and to identify within these limits those problems of the parolee which appear to affect his chances of successful rehabilitation most crucially. Chapter Two considers ten gross problems common to parolees, their causes and their many ramifications. To supplement this discussion, various leaders in the field of after-care and several parolees were interviewed. These interviews were aimed at eliciting informed opinions on the problems of the parolee and at providing further information for the analysis and illustration of the ten problem areas explored. This material is dealt with in Chapter Three. In Chapter Four the major defects in our present system of parole are reviewed and suggestions are offered for further research.
CHAPTER II

PROBLEMS OF DISCHARGED OFFENDERS

When an offender is released from prison, and 95 per cent of the men incarcerated are released at some time, they meet with many problems which are extremely difficult to overcome. All discharged prisoners will face these problems whether they have served their sentence in full and are discharged in full, or whether they are paroled under supervision. Often the released prisoner finds that his former employer has no job for him and he has no references a new employer will accept; his wife and family may have long since abandoned him; his property, if he had any, is gone; and in short, he is faced with obstacles that make his readjustment to society extremely difficult. Problems of a discharged offender are numerous and differ in degree and intensity, depending on the community to which he is discharged, the institution from which he is discharged and his own determination and inner strengths. I propose to deal with some of the peculiar obstacles and problems the parolee may face upon his release. These problems I believe apply to all discharged offenders but henceforth I will refer to parolees instead of the broad category of discharged offenders. I have chosen but ten of the most important of the many problems that must be solved before we can expect complete rehabilitation and readjustment of the offender. These problems if not solved, will probably result in the parolee once again returning to his previous patterns of anti-social behavior.
(1) Problems of Employment

The problem of employment is crucial and basic in the rehabilitation and social adjustment of the parolee. It is not hard to imagine the difficulties the parolee will meet in trying to find suitable employment and in holding the job once he finds it. To start with, our penal institutions do not often succeed in fostering good work habits, nor do they at present provide adequate training or emphasize the importance of placing men in work within the institution which will make the most of their abilities and stimulate their interest. We do know that a large percentage of parolees are incapable of qualifying for skilled or semi-skilled jobs owing to their lack of education, so that they must be satisfied with jobs which are less financially attractive and which offer little security or the chance of taking pride in one's accomplishment, that is to say, common laboring jobs.

The current theory is that a parolee must be placed in a job that is satisfying both materially and emotionally, that the job must be one which the parolee has some competence for or a keen interest in. Maurice E. Williams states:

We know from experience that the employed parolee has about three times as good a chance of "making" his parole, other things being equal, as the unemployed one.¹

¹ Williams, Maurice E., "Developing Employment Opportunities for Parolees", Focus, vol. 3 no. 2, (March 1952) p. 47.
However, sound as this point of view may in some senses be, it is in the nature of a counsel of perfection. While no one will deny that to meet the requirements of citizenship a steady income is an important factor, in the case of the parolee it may be more realistic to assume that he will get his emotional gratifications elsewhere. It is asking too much to insist that the job must be emotionally satisfactory since in the first place it is unlikely that the average parolee will be able to obtain the type of employment he feels will meet his emotional needs, and in the second place, no matter what job he gets, he will rarely be completely satisfied with it.

The inference here is of course that someone is going to get him the right job and they will look after him so that he won't have to face any frustrations. This may work while the after-care agency is giving him support, but when they withdraw after a few months he finds himself alone and should he not be able to cope with the pressures, he falls apart. The John Howard Society of British Columbia for example, have found that their most successful work has often been accomplished with the parolee who cannot find employment. Here, with support from the agency, the parolee finds that he can and does have the ability to cope with this frustrating problem, thus increasing his frustration tolerance which in turn helps him to meet other frustrating problems that arise, such as family difficulties, community discrimination and so forth. The important factor here is that there is financial assistance available to meet the basic needs of the family or
individual. If this is available together with the support provided by the after-care agency, the man can meet this challenge and cope with the frustrations in a normal way, thus showing growth.

If the parolee is a well balanced mature individual who just needs a job to be rehabilitated, then there is correspondingly less need for the services of an after-care agency since, sooner or later, he will get a job through his own efforts. But the majority of parolees are not well balanced, mature individuals; rather they are immature individuals who cannot tolerate either the responsibilities of finding and keeping a job or the frustrations of being without one. They require an environment in which they can grow and mature, and placing them in a job that they feel is worthy of their abilities, though perhaps a precondition of that growth, does not by itself guarantee it.

The discharged offender in principle can find employment through the Special Placements Branch of the National Employment Service. But in actuality this service, although attempting to place these men in jobs, is not by any means uniformly successful. Many people feel that this state of affairs is the result of the lack of trained and qualified personnel in the Special Placements Branch and lack of interest in the program of placing parolees. However, this is an erroneous assumption. The National Employment Service, no matter how
well staffed or how deeply interested, can only find jobs; it cannot make them. When there are jobs available they will place the parolee, but they cannot go beyond this.

There is one negative aspect to the Special Placement Branch of the National Employment Service. The procedure in British Columbia is that prior to discharge the parolee is visited by the Special Placements Officer who interviews him and registers him, gives him a card and tells him to report to the National Employment Service office when discharged. Now most inmates know that there won't be a job waiting for them, so when they are released they "blow" the little money they were given upon release and then, after having this fling, report to the National Employment Service. By having this particular arrangement we have created an unrealistic expectation of service which permits the offender to blame someone else for his not getting a job. In short, we are playing into his dependency needs which have already been grossly aggravated during his incarceration. This system encourages dependency, it allows the parolee to place the responsibility of finding a job on someone else and provides him with the ready-made rationalization that "they" did not get him one and that it was not his fault. It is at this point that he needs support not only from his supervisor but his family as well. After-care agencies, specifically the John Howard Society of British Columbia, do attempt to help the discharged offender in finding a job, but must rely mainly on the construction
and lumber industries. Some argue that job placement is not or should not be the responsibility of after-care agencies, and I heartily agree. However, they do have the responsibility of developing a program of public and employer education with the emphasis on the problem of employment.

It should be expected that the parolee will show initiative by attempting to find employment on his own. The obstacles he meets in facing an employer are many. In the first place, it is common experience that when prospective employers have the choice of two men, one with a criminal record and the other without, but both having the same qualifications, they are more likely to choose the man without the criminal record. This choice is definitely related to the existing community employment situation. In times of an abundant labor supply the opportunities of a parolee are greatly reduced.

This raises the question of whether employers tend to discriminate against parolees because of unfortunate past experiences or as a result of prejudiced attitudes. I am of the opinion that although past experience of unreliable parolees is of some importance, it is not as decisive a factor as employer prejudice. We do know that employers who have hired a parolee with unsuccessful results will seldom take another chance even if the next parolee's offence was not even remotely similar to the first parolee's. There is a tendency on the part of employers to apply a form of false logic,
resulting in a blanket categorization of all parolees. "If one parolee goes sour then I won't hire any more". In this connection, John Melecherak states:

...about one-seventh of all the interviewed employers knowingly employed former offenders, and approximately one-half of them found their service satisfactory. This would suggest that past experience could not be responsible for the obstacles to employment of former offenders....

It would then appear that prejudice is the important factor. Some years ago the Random Foundation undertook a study to ascertain the degree of discrimination against discharged offenders:

The study involved 475 prospective employers in most areas of business. Of this number, 312 stated unequivocally that they would not hire an ex-prisoner. All but one of the 312 further stated they would fire a man if they learned of his past after he had secured work with them....

This situation still exists today, the employer's general attitude toward parolees being "Once a criminal always a criminal".

It has been my experience and that of the John Howard Society that most employers have no definite policy on hiring parolees and that the selection is left entirely up to the personnel manager and his impressions, beliefs and biases on the matter. We find in many instances that the personnel manager, especially in companies that deal directly with the

---


public, will not hire a parolee. They claim that if they hire him it may affect their business, as the public will not patronize a store that hires "ex-cons". Or on the other hand they will not hire on the grounds that it would lower the morale of their staff, while if the parolee got into further trouble it would affect all of them as well as cause adverse public opinion. We also find a great deal of "passing the buck" in large industries. The managements state that they would be glad to hire parolees if the unions would accept them; the unions claim they would accept them if the company would hire them. On the surface both protest that they are all for the parolee. But seldom does he get the job.

The better trained, better educated, highly ambitious parolee has even less chance of obtaining a job consistent with his training and ability, as the general feeling is that he cannot be trusted:

...If a man is a skilled worker, contrary to public belief, he will find the going tougher, but not impossible. If, however, he happens to have the misfortune to be a white collar worker, then his chances are really grim. Only a very small minority of employers would be willing to consider him at all, even those firms which employ unskilled workers without any question have thorough screening of their white collar staff, the only position he could hope for would be clerical.4

Another obstacle that has become more prominent in the last decade is the "fidelity or surety bond". This growing practise of employers and companies of bonding their employees is

4 Melecherak, John, op. cit., p. 54.
posing a difficult problem to parolees. Most bonding companies will not bond anyone with a criminal record. If an employer hires a man with a record he does so on his own; the blanket bond that most companies have does not and will not cover an individual with a record, so that the responsibility and the risk are left to the employer. The result is that employers who have their staff bonded tend to shy away from parolees. I suspect also, that in many cases bonding is used as an excuse or way out for not hiring parolees.

Union dues are another obstacle for the parolee to meet. Most unions are not interested in the individual's record and show no discrimination toward parolees in the matter of eligibility for membership. However, in the case of the craft unions, their initiation fees are so high that most parolees could never afford to belong. With most unions however, some arrangement can be made so that the parolee can belong and pay his fees as soon as he is placed in a job. The important factor with unions is the existing employment situation. If they have many of their own men unemployed they are not likely to be willing to accept the parolee. If on the other hand employment conditions are good they will gladly take a parolee. The general attitude of the union personnel is of a positive nature but is related to the general economic conditions of the area and the existing employment situation.
Another problem that I believe from my own experience and observation places untold obstacles in the path of the parolee is the negative and adverse publicity provided by the various mass communication media, and in particular the newspapers. How seldom do we see in their articles the story of the parolee who made good! To sell newspapers material is evidently needed that will arouse the public's indignation. Woe betide the parolee who gets into trouble, even if it has nothing to do with his former offense: the papers will make sure that he is publically whipped and raked over the coals.

We can readily see the handicaps the discharged offender is placed under with regard to securing employment. It is indeed a multifaceted problem, and one that must be solved since there cannot be complete rehabilitation until the basic vocational requirements of the parolee can be met. He is blocked every way he turns and unless he can receive the supportive help so necessary, the result will often be a return to previous criminal behavior and eventual incarceration.

(2) Problems of Re-establishment of the Parolee With the Family

There is a great deal of evidence to indicate that the problems of rehabilitating the married offender successfully center on his being able to reintegrate with his family. It is obvious that marriage is one of the closest of human relationships. The majority of the married offenders that we deal with are immature individuals who have a limited capacity either to
give or to accept love and who have married those partners who can meet their immature dependency or neurotic needs.

In the majority of cases the offender's marriage is already potentially unstable, and when this fact is added to the trauma of separation and the emotional by-products resulting from incarceration we may speculate on the many difficulties faced by the married offender:

The woman whose husband is removed from her by arrest and imprisonment can be affected in many ways. Usually she loses her financial security and is confronted by many practical problems in earning a living and caring for her children. She also loses sexual satisfaction, and her thoughts may concentrate on how long she holds to her abstinence. Gone from her too is the person who had given her a feeling of value. This feeling of desertion may mean to her that she is worthless, since otherwise how would her husband become involved in a crime. Side reactions of bitterness and hate can be projected into the world in general, and she can see everyone as hostile. Hers is a regressive reaction and childish traits reappear. Dependency, frustration, and rebellion may become active. If an aggressive response ensues, it is directed against the absent husband unless the strongest of marital ties existed.

If there are children involved, the separation from the father can result in an improper emotional development, especially if the children are young. The boy needs the father to have male identification; this process is helped considerably if the father is someone whom the boy would like to follow as an example. The boy's problem is further compounded by confusion of authority: that is, he is struggling with a decision he is never able to make, namely whether his father

is right or the law is right. This combined with the removal of the adult male object compounds the child's problem of moving from childhood to mature adulthood.

Furthermore, the daughter needs her father as a model on which she will base her future relationships with men. Obviously the extended separation of the father has negative psychological effects on the children as well as on the mother. Added to these are the external problems, such as razzing and teasing by the children's companions which often result in emotional damage to the children. This stigmatization by their playmates and adults often results in rebellion against and defiance of authority figures.

Apart from the psychological effects of separation on the family, what of the effect on the offender? He too faces positive and negative influences in prison which I will deal with in more detail later in this chapter:

His detention forces his personality into regression not only because of the anxiety arising from the new experience, but also because environmentally he is made dependent upon the institution as he was upon his parents. This temporary regression under a repressive institutional regimen can lead to fixed patterns of protest or excessive dependence that may extend beyond his incarceration. Ordinarily he, too, will experience a black-tinted period of mourning which is characterized by self-recrimination and self-pity. It is at this time that his feelings of shame and worthlessness set off a chain of doubt and suspicion about his family relationships and his wife's sexual fidelity. His insecurity is heightened to a certain extent by the needling of his more callous fellow inmates.⁶

⁶ Ibid., p. 65
Our prisons do little to alleviate these feelings of the inmate about his family. Two visits each month are allowed along with limited correspondence. Even where visiting is allowed, facilities are such that a spontaneous mutual responsiveness with real emotional value is impossible.

The marital relationship for the parolee demands much from him which is in direct conflict with the life he has been leading in prison. In prison the keynote was conformity and dependency, but upon release he must become self-sufficient and self-assertive; from a society lacking normal emotional and social exchanges he moves to an environment where his wife will look for such responses. His wife will be looking for and seeking support at the same time that her parolee husband is. If neither is able to offer the other support, affection and encouragement, marital conflict will often arise over some "convenient" side issue. Moreover, his children will seek his love and recognition and will need to test their relationship with him as well as reassure themselves of the stability of the newly resumed parental relationship. His ability to offer the children the love and recognition they want will determine how quickly they will allow him to resume his role as father:

As a father, the offender has been denied any experience closely allied to those of parent-child relationships. With the children seeking to re-establish him as an ego-ideal, he will feel that his delinquency detracts from the model he senses he should be for them. This threat can be overcome if their emotional contact is
rewarding. He will have to penetrate the self-sufficient adjustment pattern that has emerged between mother and children during his absence. This sense of exclusion can be particularly difficult for the man hypersensitive to rejection. The mother who has shown perception in keeping him alive in their minds and emotions has immeasurably aided the father's re-acceptance into the home.  

Furthermore, the parolee may return to the family to find his wife has become, at least on the surface, independent. Her success in meeting the responsibilities of breadwinner, mother and father may have resulted in self-satisfaction previously unknown to her. With the return of the father she may have ambivalent feelings toward him. On the one hand she wants him to assume the role of father and breadwinner, yet on the other hand she may find the relinquishment of these roles difficult because of her success. She will need recognition of her success. If her parolee husband can meet her emotional needs, can demonstrate to her his desire and motivation to succeed, then the wife will be able to relinquish her independence and adjust to the new family relationship which includes her husband.

It is evident that a stable marriage and family life is the basis for successful rehabilitation of the offender and is the most important area involved for the married offender. Whatever the gaps in the institutional services may be, the after-care agencies as a whole have not met the needs of the married parolee. The excuses of lack of staff and excessively heavy case loads are only partly valid. Until we have involved

7 Ibid., p. 68
the entire family in the treatment process so that they are aware of their strengths and weaknesses we shall not be meeting our obligations to the married offender.

(3) **Problems of Re-Establishment in the Community**

Society as a whole does not welcome the discharged offender or parolee back with open arms despite the fact that 95 per cent of the prison population will be returned to society at one time or another. It is apparent that the success of parole to a large extent depends on the community and its attitudes toward parole and crime in general. Many communities are unwilling to accept the responsibility of the parolee and give various reasons for their unwillingness to assume such a risk. Nevertheless I am of the opinion that the problem is basically a lack of understanding of the principles of parole and the hesitancy of the citizen to accept and fulfill his duties as a citizen.

The parolee is faced on his return to the community (and here we are assuming that the parolee was previously from a non-criminal community) with discrimination, non-acceptance and perhaps one of the most vicious of social attitudes, ostracism. The parolee soon discovers that his former friends and acquaintances, with very few exceptions, find excuses for avoiding him as much as possible.

The public reacts to the man with a record with distrust and in many cases, fear. It looks upon discharged offenders
from the archaic traditional viewpoint, seeing them as unclean, immoral and sinful. Most people believe that crime must be punished and that criminal behavior must and will repeat itself since all criminals are born bad. Furthermore, this conception of the criminal is supported by a continuous stream of misinformation through the press, radio, television and the motion pictures. The public's perception of the criminal is in terms of stereotypes:

For example, the public has uncritically accepted Lombroso's earlier conception of the criminal type with the receding forehead, prognathous jaw, dangling arms below the knees and possessing low sensitivity to pain. Many believe that unusual physical characteristics mark the socially variant individual. Do not the movies and the theatre put before our eyes individuals who are at first glance recognizable as villains?

Rehabilitation cannot succeed without the community's acceptance of the parolee. I do not mean they should accept his past deeds; rather that they give the parolee access to those people who are or may become important to him. The incarcerated offender feels that he does not belong to the "square john" community, that he is an outcast. When he is released, public attitudes support and reinforce this feeling, and unless the parolee can receive help in meeting this frustration he will ultimately return to previous criminal behavior.

If the parolee is to be part of the community in a social sense, then he must be accepted by the community.

No community can really "reform" a person without accepting him. He must be given the will and the
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ability to co-operate. These are first considerations. He will not be "reformed" until he acquires a genuine interest in others. He must learn that the only way to face himself is to face the world with his heart tempered and stirred by the social interest. He must learn to give for the social interest....

If the goal in rehabilitation is helping the parolee resume normal living in the community, then the community itself must be ready to help him. He must feel that he is useful to a respectable or significant person or group. He must feel that he has a common interest in the group. If, as so often is the case, the parolee is not given a chance to express and develop his legitimate interests he will turn once again to his illegitimate interests. The community must recognize that the parolee is, in the majority of cases, a socially immature individual and that he needs a great deal of supportive help and understanding to meet the frustrations of normal community living.

The after-care agencies help the parolee feel that he belongs to the community, for the agency is part of the community and supported by the community. In addition, the agency helps the parolee to meet the frustrations of normal community living in such a way that emotional and social growth are possible for the parolee. However, until the public catches up with, as it were, contemporary penological philosophies and understands the why and wherefore of corrections programs,

the implacable wall of public and community attitudes will provide one of the biggest obstacles that the parolee and after-care agencies have to meet.

(4) Problems Created by Incarceration

What effect does prison have on the inmate? This is a difficult question to answer and could well be the subject of extensive study in itself. Incarceration means enforced association with others who feel as he, rejected by society. When he has been sentenced to imprisonment he has, really been sentenced to regimentation, discipline, unemployment, routine and futility. Incarceration, without a doubt, is painful to the inmate both physically and mentally. How a man reacts to institutional life depends on the man and his emotional development. Nevertheless once in prison he is subjected to pressures and stresses that make for what many writers term "prison psychosis": The prisoner is:

...subjected to prolonged material deprivation, lacking heterosexual relationships, and rubbed raw by the irritants of life under compression, the inmate population is pushed in the direction of deviation from rather than adherence to legal norms. 10

Incarceration without doubt has an effect on the mental health of the prisoner and makes the job of rehabilitation that much more difficult.

Perhaps the most painful condition resulting from incarceration is the deprivation of liberty. Not only is

---

his freedom of movement restricted but he has lost all the rights and privileges of a free citizen. Furthermore, incarceration means he is cut off from the emotional relationships of family and friends. True he does have visiting and mailing privileges which to some extent reduce his isolation, but, as many inmates have found, these contacts become fewer as the years pass. This isolation is indeed painful and is aggravated further by the fact that the inmate sees his imprisonment as a rejection by society.

It has often been claimed that many criminals are so identified with the criminal culture that no amount of moral condemnation, rejection or disapproval will have any effect on them. This probably is true for that small number of offenders known as professional criminals, of the kind described by Sutherland.\(^{11}\) However, evidence indicates that for the great majority of prisoners:

Neither the alienation from the ranks of the law-abiding nor involvement in a system of criminal values is sufficient to eliminate the threat to the prisoner's ego posed by society's rejection.\(^{12}\)

There are many signs of the prisoner's degradation, for example the number instead of a name, the typical haircut, the anonymity of the prison uniform and so forth. The status lost by the prisoner basically is the loss of self respect:


In short, the wall which seals off the criminal, the contaminated man, is a constant threat to the prisoner's self-conception, and the threat is continually repeated in the many daily reminders that he must be kept apart from "decent" men. Somehow this rejection or degradation by the free community must be warded off... turned aside, rendered harmless. Somehow the imprisoned criminal must find a device for rejecting his rejectors, if he is to endure psychologically.13

Social and individual liberty is the foundation of our society and is our mode of life. The ability to use it responsibly is acquired gradually during the physical and emotional growth of the individual from birth to adulthood. One effect of losing liberty on the inmate is regression to an earlier stage of development:

This regression is brought about and maintained by the threatening new reality -- a society without liberty. When deprived of liberty the criminal individual, like the infant, becomes unable to depend upon himself to choose and to master his own pleasurable or painful experiences. Like the infant, he comes to consider the external world as good or bad, according to the inner satisfaction or frustration of the moment. This splitting in object relationships leads eventually, for the convict, to the disappearance of the good object relationship.14

In short we make the offender too dependent on the institution; by incarcerating him we make him feel that he does not belong to society, that he is an outcast. Consequently the inmate is left with very little choice but to turn to his fellow inmates in order once again to have an object relationship. It is within this society that the inmate is once again able

14 Ibid., p. 140.
have a sense of belonging, and of self-esteem.

There are a certain number of men in prison who may be classified as "normal" offenders. These are generally first offenders, men with no previous history of criminal tendencies. Unlike the majority of immature offenders the normal offender does not bear any abnormal resentment to society for long periods of time. He tends to idealize the lost external society. He seldom identifies with the criminal society while incarcerated as he is able to keep the image of the good society within himself. Upon release he usually succeeds in reintegrating himself into society even if he encounters obstacles.

On the other hand, when the immature offender is released the mere restoration of liberty does not solve the problem. The bonds established with the criminal society, strengthened by society's rejection of him and the resentment he has because of society's lack of forgiveness, all make the job of rehabilitation an exceedingly difficult operation. No matter how we try to believe that our institutions are institutions of rehabilitation, the fact remains that the inmate deprived of liberty, denied access to heterosexual relationships, robbed of personal autonomy, stripped of worldly possession, sees the institution as punishment pure and simple. With this type of organization institutions cannot turn men from the paths of crime to the path of the law-abiding citizen.

We possess sufficient knowledge at the present time to
realize that the kind of influence prison has on an inmate will be chiefly dependent on the social patterns to which the prisoner has been daily exposed while in prison. Our present method of incarceration is in reality the desertion of the offender when he needs us most. We are fortunate under the existing system when we can prevent the offender from deteriorating further. We cannot lay the blame on our institutions alone. Rather the blame must be placed on society as a whole. All that is needed for change is that there should be willingness for change; but that, unfortunately, is precisely what, with minor exceptions, is missing from the picture.

(5) Devaluation of Self Image

The prison regimen tends to produce deterioration in the already poor conception that the offender has of himself. There is little doubt that the majority of inmates are immature men whose self image was such that they could not function in normal society and had to turn to crime to bolster their sagging self-respect. It is precisely these men we place in prison and whom we punish with the deprivation of liberty. Although this is indeed painful to the inmate, the significant fact is that we devaluate his self image by the very frustrations and deprivations which follow the loss of freedom -- for example, the lack of heterosexual relationships, the isolation from the free society, the withdrawal of material goods and services:

...however painful these frustrations or deprivations may be in the immediate terms of thwarted goals, discomfort, boredom, and
loneliness, they carry a more profound hurt as a set of threats and attacks which are directed against the very foundations of the prisoner's being. 15

The inmate's picture of himself as a person of value grows dimmer and dimmer and he begins to see himself as a nobody, he feels he is useless, and comes to believe that any attempt on his part to be of value in the free society is hopeless.

An offender does not regain a positive self image merely by being released, and herein lies the problem. What the parolee needs most upon release is companionship, someone who is ready to help him, someone who sees him as a man, who accepts him for what he is, who does not condemn him for his past. This is the job of the parole officer, to help the parolee build a healthy self-image of himself, to meet the frustrations and obstacles of living and functioning in a free society. Often these men are learning to live a new life and must be helped the same way as one helps a child, understanding, warmth and emotional and material support. Here too is where after-care agencies fall down. Our caseloads are high, our personnel untrained, funds are limited, and as a result the appropriate time cannot be given to each parolee. The parolee must see his parole supervisor as more than a figure of authority.

(6) Problems of Police Discrimination

Here again is a problem that at least in Canada and particularly in Vancouver does not, from the available evidence,

15 Sykes, Gresham, M., op. cit., p. 79.
appear to be of serious proportions. Often we hear a parolee say that he has been checked by police for no reason at all. The fact is that no police officer, unless he knows the parolee personally, has any idea who is on parole. If he checks an individual it is because he has reason to believe that something is wrong. When he makes his report to the police station, the name is checked and if it is discovered that he is a parolee the name is turned over to the detective who is in charge of parolees. If this happens, the parolee is liable to be taken down to the station to clarify what has happened.

There is some evidence that a large percentage of police discrimination or badgering in the Vancouver area is in the parolee's mind. No parolee is taken to the police station indiscriminately and if he is taken down it is by the special detective in charge of parole. The regular procedure is generally just a telephone call asking him to report if there is some report that he was somewhere he should not have been or if he was checked for his behavior. The John Howard Society's experience corroborates these observations, and it appears likely therefore, that at least on the local scene, this is not one of the parolee's problems.

(7) Problems of Persisting Influence of Past and Present Companions

There is no doubt that the types of people a parolee associates with will determine to a large extent whether he will be successful or gravitate to his previous criminal behavior. Evidence indicates that the parolee is placed under
tremendous pressures that will be overbearing if he does not receive help. He is constantly meeting men whom he has known in prison, some trying to go straight, others still participating in criminal activities. The latter will try to pressure the parolee to join them, offering big money, good times and so forth. The temptation is great for the parolee. He has to some extent been discriminated against by the community and still feels rejected and of little value to anyone. What a temptation to go with those people who want him, who accept him and make him feel that he is valued and needed! However, if the parolee is receiving good supervision, help and understanding, he will be able to withstand these temptations and pressures, especially if through his supervisor his experiences in society have been positive. It is generally the man who has been unsuccessful in any phase of his rehabilitation who will return to former criminal companions.

Each time we send a man to prison, we place him in a society of criminals where he will meet old companions and new companions, binding him tighter to the criminal society. This I believe is the dilemma of corrections. If we want a man to give up his criminal associates, we should surely hesitate to send him to an institution where he is forced to live and associate with them.

A peculiar disadvantage of the criminal is that unlike other people who have been institutionalized (for example
mental patients and alcoholics, who are encouraged to meet as a group) the parolees are forbidden to meet each other in a group. Even if this group is under supervision, the public tend to see any meeting of parolees as dangerous and threatening. The parolee must therefore, find new friends in the normal society. But this is extremely difficult for a man who is insecure and often hypersensitive. The parolee is at a real disadvantage when he cannot associate with other parolees who are trying to go straight as he is. He is forced to reject these associates, while on the other hand he is rejected by many of the people in the community.

Parole can be worse than incarceration. If the man lacks companionship he might as well be back in jail where at least he can have friendship and a feeling of belonging.

(8) Problems of Loss of Civil Rights and Other Handicaps

One of the greatest rehabilitative issues today is the inability of the man with a record to be bonded. This problem has been discussed above, but it is a loss of civil rights that has a strong impact on the parolee. He is limited in the type of employment available to him; white collar work is practically impossible as it is the policy of most companies to bond their employees.

Another issue closely related to the frustrating bonding issue is the "no criminal" clause that many big companies and professions have. The latter would affect only a few parolees since the majority do not have enough schooling to be eligible
for such professions as medicine, law, pharmacy and accounting. However, many large corporations have a "no criminal" clause and refuse to hire any man who has a criminal history. This again reduces the chances of employment for many parolees.

The main problem created by loss of civil rights is centered on the question of employment. Discrimination in this field is intensely frustrating for the parolee who sees such restrictions as illogical and a direct attack on him. Other civil losses such as being unable to enter certain countries as an immigrant affect only the minority.

(9) Problems of Negative Attitudes to Authority

There is little doubt that the majority of parolees have a negative attitude toward authority. Undoubtedly every individual, male or female, has had unpleasant experiences with authority at some time in his life, whether with police, parents, teachers, employers or siblings, authority figures who have abused their authority, who have forced us to do something that we felt was unjust. This aroused feelings of fear, hate, revenge and anger or some other form of hostile attitude in us. If these experiences were repeated often enough we would build up a great deal of hostile resistance to authority. Further we tend to see authority in association with punishment, for it is precisely those with authority who may have punished us most often.
There is a great deal of evidence to indicate that the majority of offenders have negative feelings toward authority. These feelings did not spring up overnight but are based on cumulative past experiences, in most cases going back to early childhood.

These feelings are not reduced by the time the man enters prison, his experience with the police and the courts probably having increased his immature and negative feelings. Once in prison these feelings are aggravated. The prison itself is a symbol of authority, the guards are but part of the bureaucratic administration of authority to be exploited when and wherever possible:

...Indeed, the glaring conclusion is that despite the guns, and the surveillance, the searches and the precautions of the custodians, the actual behavior of the inmate population differs markedly from that which is called for by official commands and decrees. Violence, fraud, theft, aberrant sexual behavior - all are common-place occurrences in the daily round of institutional existence in spite of the fact that the maximum security prison is conceived of by society as the ultimate weapon for the control of the criminal and his deviant actions.\(^\text{16}\)

The actions of the inmates are the result of many things, negative attitudes being but one of them. The important fact here is that our institutions help to support and increase these negative feelings and to diminish an already slender respect for the rule of law.

Once released from prison, these negative attitudes do not subside. The parolee still sees authority figures as

\(^\text{16}\) Sykes, Gresham M., op. cit., p. 76.
dangerous or threatening. The problem then is to help the parolee to realize that authority does not mean punishment, that authority can be positive as well as negative. The parole supervisor must give the parolee a new experience with authority, a positive experience. The immature parolee has carried into his adult life the negative authority conflicts from his youth. The job of the supervisor is to dispel these conflicts by the proper use of authority. The parolee must learn that to live in society he cannot escape restrictions and curtailment of his activities. To live in free society means that he must renounce many of his impulsive satisfactions, if only in exchange for the assurance that others will do the same. Within these restrictions there is room for freedom. The parolee will grow and become adjusted to the extent that he will accept these restrictions and by his own free will will impose these restrictions on himself. To help the parolee overcome the problems of his hostile and negative feelings is one of the most important aspects that must be met if rehabilitation is to be successful.

(10) Problems Created by Parole Conditions

The primary purpose of parole conditions or restrictions is to provide a guide for conduct for the parolee. It follows then that these conditions should be flexible, realistic and enforcible. In short, the conditions should be individualized to the fullest extent possible. Obviously certain conditions will apply to all parolees but in the main the restrictions
should meet the needs of the individual parolee. In effect parole conditions should define parole for the individual and should be based on the individual and his needs.

Often parole conditions result in frustrations for the parolee and on occasion these conditions act against the ultimate goal of rehabilitation. For example, a common restriction is that a parolee must obtain permission before leaving the specified area as designated in his parole conditions. What happens to the parolee when he is offered a job in another geographical area as not infrequently happens? By the time the parolee has contacted the right people and obtained permission, the job has been lost. As often as not, these jobs have time limits on them, in that the person hired must report for work the next day. Time is therefore, an important factor. This type of restriction lessens his opportunity for jobs. However, there are further ramifications. The parolee feels he is being discriminated against by the very fact that he is a parolee and under restrictions that seem to him unrealistic and unjust.

It is understandable that a large number of individuals on parole, because of their earlier experiences should have a great deal of difficulty in accepting a subservient role and asking permission for actions which the ordinary citizen is free to perform. Furthermore, many restrictions have little to do with his crime. He must obtain permission to marry, to buy a car, or to get a financial loan. He must abstain from
intoxicating beverages and so forth. Restrictions of this type add further to the parolee's feeling of hopelessness and depreciated self image, thereby increasing his negative attitude toward authority.

It is obvious that many parole restrictions contradict the objectives of parole by placing unrealistic and relatively inflexible conditions in the parolee's way. Simply stated, the basic parole objective is to help the parolee develop controls from within, but the apparent emphasis of the parole restrictions today is control from without; the parolee sees these as an attempt to run his life. Parole restrictions are to control or inhibit the parolee's physical activities but not emotional growth. As the parolee shows emotional growth the controls should be reduced, and parole restrictions should therefore be flexible. How then can the individual's self image have room to grow when he sees himself treated as a child, where his already excessive tendency toward dependency is strengthened and reinforced and the simplest decisions are dependent on the consent of someone else?

In general the fewer the parole restrictions the better hope there is for establishing a good supervisor-parolee relationship. But having such unrealistic and inflexible restrictions results in an atmosphere that is not conducive for mutual confidence and respect. There is a great deal of evidence to indicate that parole restrictions cause many
frustrating and degrading problems for the parolee. These problems could be overcome more readily than some of the preceding problems by having realistic, flexible restrictions based on the particular needs of the individual. When taken in context of the entire rehabilitation process they do no more than add fuel to the fire.
CHAPTER III

TWO VIEWS: THE AFTER-CARE AGENCY AND THE PAROLEE

How After-Care Agencies See the Problems of the Parolee

The purpose of this chapter is not to prove or validate any hypothesis. Rather it is an exploratory survey to illustrate and make plausible, if possible, those problems of the parolee which were discussed in Chapter II. The material obtained is based on face to face interviews of approximately one hour duration with leaders in the field of after-care in British Columbia as well as a selected number of individuals who are presently serving time on parole. The following persons were interviewed: Mr. M. Davis, Executive Director of The John Howard Society of British Columbia; Mr. R. Smith, Assistant Director of Corrections for the Province of British Columbia; Mr. Kyle Stevenson, the British Columbia Regional Representative for the National Parole Board; Mr. G. McCaw, Executive Director of the Borstal Association of British Columbia; and Brigadier H. Nyrerod, Director of Correctional Services for the Salvation Army of British Columbia.

These experts wholeheartedly agree on the value and benefit of parole in our correctional and rehabilitation programs. However, all stated or implied that no matter how progressive or modern our penal institutions may become, they still represent an artificial environment. How successful our rehabilitation program may be depends to a great extent
on what happens to the man after his release from our institutions. There is no simple panacea for rehabilitation. The problem is multifaceted and will depend on such factors as the quantity and quality of supervision available to the offender, situational factors and the motivation and personality of the parolee.

It is interesting to note that everyone of these experts when discussing the possibilities of successful rehabilitation stated in one form or another that while parole success is dependent on many factors, the most important factors were the parolee's personality development and the situation into which the parolee is released. This would at first glance appear to indicate that we are dealing with two categories of problems; on the one hand those problems created by situational factors, and on the other hand problems emanating from the individual's predispositions of personality. It would be an error to assume that these problems are mutually exclusive in the sense that the existence of the one problem will make the other irrelevant, for in reality this is not the case. If we could picture an axis where at one extreme we have those offenders who are relatively free of personality problems (for example the accidental offender) to the other extreme of serious personality disorder (for example the sex-deviant or compulsive forger) we can clearly see that these problems are actually a continuum ranging from the one extreme to the other. And Our understanding will be further enhanced if we
picture the situational factors as a co-axis, thus creating the two dimensions of the parolee's prospects of success.

By situational problems I refer to those problems that develop out of the parolee's general environment and over which the parolee has little or no control. For example, problems which develop because the parolee was unable to secure employment, or the problems resulting from the transition he must make from the protected and controlled environment of the penal institution to free society. It is quite apparent that often the parolee, no matter how well motivated, is dependent on how the so-called free community will react to him, and that while this is something which will test his resources of character, it is not something which will yield merely to force of character.

In the second case, that of the individual with a predisposed personality who has a marked leaning toward criminal activity, unfavourable situations will result in the aggravation of his problem. For example, the immature mother-fixated personality who commits a crime and goes to prison will become even more socially inadequate as a result of unfavourable circumstances on release. This personality in fact often develops serious paranoidal manifestations. Obviously, in the event that there is a predisposed personality, then these situational problems may well produce further deterioration in the already immature, pathological individual.
Nor should we forget that the prison experience itself may already have contributed to this outcome.

There is some evidence to indicate that the situational problems have more importance with the first or incidental offender, while the recidivist's problems are merely aggravated by the situational problems that arise either in the institution or in the community. The emphasis must be on his personality problem and helping him overcome these problems and to bear the frustrating situational difficulties that may arise.

The employment of parolees is considered by all the experts as one of the most important factors that must be dealt with by parolee and supervisor alike. However, the majority feel that problems resulting from the employment situation should be kept in perspective, and aver that the employment problem is often over-emphasized. All are of the opinion that employment may or may not be a major problem depending upon the individual and the present circumstances of the parolee. Mr. Smith is of the opinion that while a short period of unemployment with financial assistance will not be harmful, if joblessness extends over a long period of time, it may well be doubted whether successful rehabilitation can take place since in our present society employment means to the parolee precisely the independence he is trying to achieve. Employment is necessary before rehabilitation can be completely realized because it gives a feeling of worth
and accomplishment to the parolee. On the other hand, Mr. Davis feels that, in the light of his experience, employment does not mean successful rehabilitation and often the most successful parolee is the one who has been able to meet the frustrations of not being able to secure employment and refrain from returning to further criminal activity. This indicates emotional growth on the parolee's part. Further, if the problem of employment is the only problem that the parolee has, then it is unlikely that he will need help other than with finding employment. This in itself does not justify aftercare for in reality this individual would need no more help than any other individual who is unemployed.

Furthermore there is a great deal of evidence to indicate that even if there was the possibility of full employment for all parolees, this in itself would not reduce to any great extent the rate of parole failure. I would conclude from the majority of opinions that employment is not the panacea of rehabilitation. It is an important factor in assisting the parolee to build a strong self image by helping him feel he is accomplishing something by having money in his pocket that belongs to him and was not obtained through charity. The value of parole lies in the fact that it offers emotional support and to a certain degree, physical aid to the parolee until such time as the individual can obtain employment. Further, once the parolee is working, parole should help him overcome some of the frustrations that he is liable to encounter
such as prejudice and ostracism by his fellow workers.

All of the after-care experts I interviewed believe that the parolee himself often creates in his own mind many of the problems he encounters. Every man released from prison feels he is branded visibly as a criminal. This of course varies in degree with each individual. The degree or intensity is not the important factor, rather it is that they have this feeling and that it is more intense immediately after release from prison. For example, a parolee may get on a bus and hear some people laughing at the back. Immediately he is on the defensive and feels they are laughing at him. There are many examples of this type of thinking on the part of the recently discharged prisoner but the above example will suffice.

Mr. Davis refers to this phenomenon as "post-release paranoia", or in simpler terms, a feeling of difference. The parolee feels that everyone is looking at him, that he is not really part of the community. This feeling does not happen spontaneously upon release but is the accumulation of many factors including his experience with police, the courts and the staff of the penal institution. This feeling of difference results in the parolee becoming hostile to authority. The parolee feels that if he doesn't get a job, it is not because there is no position open, but rather because he is an "ex-con". If he is laid off, it is not because there is no further work available; rather someone has told the boss that he is an "ex-con".
Much of this hostility and embitterment is focused on the police, and to a certain extent the police reinforce the parolee's suspicions because of their authoritarian manner. New recruits who have not learned how to handle their authority role properly are the main offenders. For example, if a police officer stops a citizen for some minor traffic offense the citizen may be hostile but usually on account of being stopped rather than the manner in which he was treated. However, the parolee, who already feels that he is discriminated against, sees such routine check-ups as a personal affront and feels he is being stopped not for the offense but because he is a parolee. The authoritative manner used enhances this feeling and often helps to strengthen the post-institutional "paranoia".

This feeling of being branded and of being unique is an extremely important problem as it is directly related to the parolee's concept of self and will seriously influence the success of his rehabilitation. As we can see, this "post-release paranoia" will be related to some extent to the degree of success the parolee will have in readjusting to the community and his family.

There is no question in the minds of the after-care experts that the biggest or key problem is the reintegration of the parolee into the community. The success of the rehabilitation process may almost be defined as the degree of reintegration into the community that the parolee is able to accomplish.
Mr. Stevenson and Mr. McCaw are of the opinion that many of the problems the parolee encounters are the result of his over-sensitivity and that in fact a great number of the problems do not exist except in the parolee's mind. However, neither Mr. McCaw nor Mr. Stevenson feels that all the problems encountered are due merely to hyper-sensitivity but that this hyper-sensitivity may aggravate and complicate relatively simple problems. All experts are agreed, however, that the prison experience creates emotional problems that are exceedingly difficult for the parolee to overcome without extensive help.

Mr. Davis asserts that the problem of social relationships is an exceedingly difficult one for the parolee. The parolee has definite guilt feelings as a result of being arrested, taken to court and convicted and presented in the newspapers as a vile and unwanted individual. The result of such treatment tends to induce in the criminal a feeling of being an outcast. The prison experience further aggravates this problem.

When released the parolee is placed in a situation that he no longer knows how to cope with. In prison the social situations tend to lose the superficial veneer of civilization. For example, in prison the inmates when groping for conversation seldom talk about the weather, but in our social situations, when we find it difficult to find a topic to speak of, we often turn to a discussion about weather. The parolee, after his prison experience, finds such conversations exceedingly difficult, resulting in his feeling out of place and not belong-
In short he feels like a drunk at a tea party. Moreover this feeling of not belonging is strengthened when the conversation turns to "what I did last week or last month or last year". The parolee is unable to contribute to this and the free society that he is to draw his social references from is in reality foreign to him. He feels that he is talking at them but that he is unable to communicate with them.

The evidence indicates that the hinge of the parolee's capacity for social reintegration is his own mental picture of himself. The value of parole lies in the fact that through realistic and warm support the parole supervisor can help the parolee to gain a better self image of himself by supporting and assisting him to meet the frustrations of social living in such a way that will allow for emotional growth of the parolee. Mr. Davis further points out that after-care agencies in themselves help the parolee to feel the community is interested in him as the agency is part of and supported by the community.

All the experts agree that until the community is educated and is willing to accept the parolee the problem of social reintegration will continue to be extremely difficult. That some program of public education is needed is beyond doubt. Moreover, a program of gradual release of the offender into the community would be valuable. Again, institutional programs where the inmate is allowed to have more contact with the
community while in prison would be beneficial and would help to break down the traditional feelings of mutual suspiciousness and antagonism between the public and the offender.

According to the interviewed experts another extremely important and key problem, similar to that of reintegration into the community arises in the re-establishment of the parolee in his family. But all were careful to stress the fact that this problem can be placed in a false perspective. Re-establishment of a young offender in a family which was probably the cause of his criminal activities would be pointless. Mr. Smith made the point that re-establishment in the family depends on the age of the individual. For younger offenders re-establishment in the family is more important and meaningful. To the older single offender this problem does not seem as important. Rehabilitation should not only include treatment for the offender but for the family as well.

Mr. Davis brought out the point that to the married offender, resuming his place in his family is a primary concern, while rejection by the family can be traumatic for him and have many negative results. There are many sides to the resettlement of the married offender. Often on the wife's part there is a feeling of resentment because she was abandoned by her husband and left to face the problems arising within the community alone. On the other hand the parolee is apt to feel resentment because he feels his wife does not completely
comprehend what he went through during his incarceration. Moreover, because of the offender's deprivation of heterosexual relationships while in prison, he frequently imagines his wife's infidelity. When he is released this problem does not disappear, even if these fantasies are unfounded. The parolee has an insatiable appetite for proof that these fantasies were not based on fact. This constant testing and distrust tends to serve as a barrier between man and wife.

In addition to the above problems all the experts mentioned a problem in taking up the threads of family life again which arises from the fact that there is an element of strangeness on the part of both partners who - after what is often a lengthy separation - practically have to get to know one another again. This strangeness results on the parolee's part because of his having lived in the protected and limited environment of the institution which has made him generally more dependent, while on the other hand the wife has become more independent because of having had to do without him. This combination tends again to cause the parolee to make enormous demands for assurance that he is still needed, while the wife tends to cling to the independency she has gained while she was without him. This often results in her denying the parolee the assurance he is seeking and consequently he feels rejected and unwanted.

As can be seen, the experts in the field of after-care whom I interviewed are of the opinion that the two most
serious problems to overcome are the reorientation into the community and reintegration into the family. Various opinions were expressed as to other problems the parolee may encounter, such as loss of civil rights, discrimination by police, and so forth, but on the whole they still felt that the major problems were reintegration into the community and family. Brigadier H. Nyrmorod brought up one feature of after-care that bears mentioning. It is his opinion that one aspect of parole often overlooked by many after-care agencies is the spiritual element in rehabilitation. The brigadier believes that complete rehabilitation cannot take place without spiritual change on the part of the parolee. This opinion gains a great deal of weight when one calls to mind Alcoholics Anonymous and their success, which—as is well known—is based on an appeal to a sort of religious faith. Both corrections workers and Alcoholics Anonymous deal with basically the same sort of immature individual, while many criminals are alcoholics or heavy drinkers. If one can be helped by "spiritual therapy" it may possibly have some more central place in the field of corrections than it presently does.

Another problem mentioned by those interviewed that can cause a great deal of trouble to the parolee is past and present criminal companions and their possible effects on the parolee. The majority feel that if the parolee is not making a satisfactory adjustment in the family, community and employment, there is a tendency for him to seek out his old group, a move which
ultimately leads to trouble. However, if a satisfactory adjustment is being made it is unlikely he will be inclined to go back to criminal society. Mr. Smith felt that parolees, because of their overdependency, tend to lean heavily on support from others, and that if these people are criminal types, he hasn't much of a chance to be rehabilitated. However, this does not mean that a group approach to the problem could not be attempted, provided it can be watched and supervised properly. Nevertheless the majority feel that constant contact with criminal types can only lead ultimately to the individual once again becoming involved in criminal activity.

All agree that our penal institutions tend to aggravate the already present problems from which the individual suffers. Under our present system, no matter how progressive it may become, these problems will be aggravated by incarceration and its associated experiences. However, they feel that parole is a step in the right direction as it removes the prisoner from the institution and places him in society under a steadying hand. The value of parole is that it helps the man to help himself to overcome his problems and frustrations in life and to develop within himself the capacity to "take it" without venting his frustrations on society. This, then, basically and simply stated, is the focus of rehabilitation and parole provides the environment and the help necessary for rehabilitation to take place.
All experts pointed out that lack of money to instigate programs and research, lack of qualified and trained workers, heavy caseloads (which ultimately mean that parole is often no more than a form of surveillance) are the basic problems as far as the administrative aspects of parole are concerned. But all are of the opinion that a new dawn is approaching in the field of after-care and that in the near future these problems will be partially or entirely eliminated through the seeming increase of interest shown by the various levels of government and by the general public.

How the Parolee Sees his Problems

Again, this section of the study is of an exploratory nature. The parolees interviewed cannot be considered a good research sample in that only eight parolees were interviewed. Furthermore, this sample is biased in the sense that the individuals selected by the John Howard Society and Salvation Army were parolees who were willing and anxious to discuss their problems as they saw them. Interviews were of approximately one and a half hour in duration. The purpose was to obtain the opinion of those individuals who were closest to the roots of the problem of the parolee, principally the individual on parole. A further purpose was to ascertain whether there were any sharp differences of opinion and experience between the after-care personnel and the parolees themselves. Interviews were informal in mood and seven questions were asked.
(1) How did you feel toward parole while in prison?
(2) Do you feel that society has rejected or been unfair to you?
(3) What problems as a parolee cause you the most concern?
(4) When released what mental picture of yourself did you have?
(5) Do the majority of your friends have criminal backgrounds?
(6) What do you expect from your parole officer?
(7) Do you feel that parole is of any value?

Question 1. How did you feel toward parole while in prison?

The decision to apply for parole or to be discharged at termination of sentence appears to be a serious and painful decision for most parolees to make. It is disquieting to realize that the majority of inmates know very little about parole and that they are seldom informed what parole is or what it entails. Of the eight parolees interviewed all stated that although parole meant getting out of the institution, they did not look forward to parole because they felt they would be unable to cope with the restrictions associated with parole, and if they were unsuccessful, they would be returned to prison.

One parolee said: "Many men if they had a chance to get parole wouldn't take it if they had a short time to do as they don't know if they could handle it and the thought of being returned to prison would be too much for them", another parolee stated: "Parole is a big decision -- if you intend to go back into crime it of course is not a good thing, still if
you are intending to go straight you must consider it carefully as there is the chance you can be sent back to prison for some mistake that a normal citizen could make without fear.

All parolees interviewed stated in one manner or another that parole to a man in prison means but one thing - "to get out of the can". Moreover, not only is applying for parole a major and testing decision in itself, but waiting for an answer is also extremely frustrating since it takes a couple of months before the prisoner knows one way or the other. It is like sitting on a fence - "you're not in and you're not out". Two parolees were first offenders and stated that when they were incarcerated the first time it was a real jolt - "You get to hate everything and everybody, you just cannot get used to it, and parole or the possibility of parole is the one redeeming thing to look forward to". Perhaps the inmates' feeling toward parole could be best shown by an excerpt from a letter received by a parole supervisor:

...Mr. M. told me that you wanted me to write to you regarding parole. The thought of parole or even going out of here when my time is up scares me. I'm afraid of going out. I'm afraid of not staying out. I'm afraid of being afraid to go out.... I spent a few hours the other nite studying my reasons for not getting busy on this parole. The only thing that emerged with any clarity was the fact that I'm deliberately stalling until you leave, then I won't feel guilty about not doing anything -- you've been trained in this sort of thing, I guess you know some four dollar word to describe my condition. Institutionalized? (There's a three dollar word anyway).... I've been wondering if I'm capable of forcing myself to adhere to the rules of the flock till it becomes habit. I suspect I am more goat than sheep. No offense meant to you, you're probably a well adjusted
goat, or if you'd rather, a slightly maladjusted sheep.... I'm still maintaining my constant vigil against rehabilitation, but I'm beginning to feel like Don Quixote. It obviously needs to be attacked from another angle.

**Question 2. Do you feel that society has rejected or been unfair to you?**

All the parolees emphasized that when a man is sentenced to prison he feels that society has rejected him -- "If they didn't want me, to hell with them" is the general attitude. The first offenders stated that after the initial period of shock they didn't really hate society; they knew what they had done wrong and must pay the consequences. However, as time passes the prisoners begin to hate everything and everyone and especially the people who put them there. They feel that society does not want them and determine therefore to act and associate with those who are willing to accept them. All stated that the longer they were incarcerated the more they felt society did not want them and was rejecting them.

**Question 3. What problems as a parolee cause you the most concern?**

This question elicited many divergent personal opinions, depending on the individual and his particular needs and emotional maturity. However, there appear to be three areas which all parolees mentioned and which, in their opinion, all parolees will have difficulty with: (1) employment and money (2) fear, and (3) companionship.

All the parolees claimed that employment was one of their biggest problems; that without employment they had no money to
buy the material goods necessary for a decent life; that they were driven to sponging off friends or family. They felt that as long as they were unemployed they could not be independent. Further problems that arose with attempting to obtain work seemed to create even greater tension. Whether to tell the employer and their fellow employees about their record was an extremely difficult decision. Most of the parolees felt that if the employer asked them he should be told of their past, but with fellow workers it was best if they knew nothing about the past. One parolee emphasized "A job is very important. It's not actually the work, it's to have money to afford those things you were deprived of during your prison term. It's not really the job, it's how much money it brings is the important thing, a guy is always tempted about money, when you get out of prison you've got nothing and you are envious of those who have".

Fear of social situations, according to the parolees interviewed, was another major area of concern. One parolee said "Fear was my biggest problem. I was afraid of everything, I was afraid of anything. I was afraid of people and myself and I guess, most of all I was afraid of ridicule". This fear appears to be present in all the parolees interviewed. This feeling of inadequacy that the parolee has is a crucial problem, and until the parolee believes that he is "somebody", when he feels that people accept him for what he is now and not what he was, these fears will continue to be a major wall
between the parolee and rehabilitation. Another parolee asserts "In prison you get to the point that you feel that everything is hopeless, that you have no value -- when you are paroled a guy has got to be able to prove to himself and to the community that he is needed, you cannot quite see where you will be needed in society. You feel completely inadequate. I've been lucky. I've got two years experience. I've got new friends and I have found people can like me for myself. I guess this has helped me the most".

The third area that seems to cause trouble for the parolee and this is a unanimous opinion of the parolees interviewed, is they cannot see why they should not have contact with fellow inmates struggling with the same problems as they. Moreover, as one parolee claims "When you have been in intimate contact with a number of men over many years while in prison, when you know everything about each other, how in the hell can you say to him, 'I can't be seen associating with you as you are an undesirable character'?" It seems to be the general consensus that if a man is going to go straight, contact with criminal companions is not going to alter things, especially if he is getting good supervision and help. Another parolee declared "What a guy needs is someone to talk to, somebody to listen to you who is interested in you not because it is his job but because you are a human being. It would give you a new perspective. A guy needs a buddy and companion real bad who will be around whenever he is needed". This need for companionship
was quite apparent when I was interviewing the parolees, especially the parolees who had no family to return to upon their release from prison.

The above problems were common to all the parolees interviewed but most of them also mentioned a number of others. One area of concern is that the parolee can see no reason to report to more than one parole supervisor. Although they state that they feel nothing toward the police, the majority feel that reporting to the police every week is degrading and upsetting even though the police treat them very well. Reporting to the police serves little value as far as rehabilitation is concerned, and this is quite apparent in the very way the parolee speaks of police supervision.

Another subject that was brought up by the only homeless parolee interviewed was that a single man, when released from prison, often has no home to go to. What is needed, according to this parolee, is some system of hostels throughout the country where the parolee can reside until he can "make it on his own". These homes should be located across Canada for it is this parolee's opinion also that to have any chance at rehabilitation the parolee must get away from the area where he committed his crime. To quote one of the parolees interviewed, "Once the parolee has got a start and is backed up with real understanding and help, he will go straight".
Question 4. When released what mental picture of yourself did you have?

The answers to this question, although given in various ways, may be summarized as follows. The parolee's self image is negative. He feels he is of little value to himself or to the community. He has no spiritual or material value, and is branded and unwanted. One parolee remarked, "When I came out of prison I felt very small. You come from a low class of society (jail) and are expected to immediately start living in a higher class of society (free community). You don't know what lonesome is until you have to try, you get so frustrated you just want to sit down and cry like a baby". It is apparent that these men are like lost men, not knowing which way to go nor how even to start. Most parolees declared that any flattering notion they may have of themselves is soon lost in prison. They had to accept the prison society for their own physical and mental protection.

Question 5. Do the majority of your friends have criminal backgrounds?

The majority of the parolees interviewed stated that they have friends who have criminal backgrounds but have managed to go straight. However, most newly acquired friends have no criminal records. From the general talk it appears that most parolees have difficulties in staying away from men who knew them in prison. As one parolee said, "I bump into so many guys I knew in prison. You know him well especially if he was a cell mate and you naturally want to talk to him and
have a cup of coffee but that is about all. If he is still involved in crime, seeing him and the way he is just makes you all the more sure that you don't want to go back to that kind of life. All the parolees feel that this is a real problem and no matter what city they may go to, sooner or later they are going to meet some fellow who was in prison with them. Further, five of the parolees interviewed suggested that supervised group meetings of men faced with the same kind of problems would probably be of help as they could discuss the troubles they were having and how they were trying to handle them. Also, although not mentioned, but definitely implied, was the fact that by this method the parolee would feel that he belonged to a group that understood him and his problems and which was trying, like himself, to overcome these difficulties. Knowing that these men were having the same difficulties and problems would be a method of helping to boost his morale.

All the parolees feel that any consistent contact with friends still active in crime would be disastrous for any parolee trying to go straight. The temptations of big money and the pressures brought on the man would be just too much for him to cope with and would result in him getting mixed up in some "deal" no matter how good his intentions or for that matter his parole supervision were.
question 6. What do you expect from your parole officer?

The parolees interviewed were all of one opinion in this matter. All felt that what they wanted from a parole officer most was that he be a buddy who was willing to help at any time. Someone who will listen and treat them like normal human beings. One parolee states "A parole officer must be willing to help you at any time. After all, you are learning a new life, most of us don't even know how to do the simple things of everyday life. This is threatening and without a buddy who can help you get over these rough spots you are beaten before you start". The parolees recognized that under the existing system parole officers cannot fulfill this role because of the heavy caseloads and shortages of parole officers. Nevertheless all felt that there should be some program to supplement the parole officer. One example was a "big brother" type of organization along the lines of the British Columbia Borstal Big Brother organization, or again, as one parolee feels, "Why can't people in the community set up a program which will allow an individual in the community to take a parolee under their wing and help him to learn how to live a new life? They expect us to give up some way of life but don't give us anything to take its place. They hold up parole as a reward but when you get out, you haven't got a thing".

It is quite apparent that the parolees I interviewed felt that the parole officer has to be a friend as well as an
authority figure. One parolee stated "Parole officers should be more like a friend and less like a dutch uncle. Advice is fine but what you need is understanding and guidance". Moreover a number of parolees implied that having to report to more than one parole supervisor was confusing.

Question 7. Do you feel that parole is of any value?

All the parolees but one professed that parole was of some value to them. The one parolee who felt parole was of little or not any value to him was an older parolee and this had been his first offense. He stated that he would not go back into crime whether he had a parole supervisor or not. He had made a mistake and had paid for it and that was all there was to it. The majority of parolees affirmed that one definite value parole has is to get them out of prison and away from the prison atmosphere. All mentioned that parole had helped them by providing support and help which save them the strength to keep trying. One parolee declared, "Parole forced me to accept for the first time in my life the responsibilities of society. You have got to have help to cope with the change from crime to a law-abiding citizen and parole helps to provide the support you need". An interesting point brought out was that the parolees believe that parole is especially valuable for first offenders. It not only gets them away from where they met men who could be future criminal associates, but also, instead of letting the
prisoner come out "cold turkey", where he can go and do as he pleases, provides supervision and help which in most cases is sufficient to ensure that the first offender will never return to crime.

Another interesting opinion brought out in the interviews was that parole should be granted to certain selected offenders immediately after sentencing, rather than allowing them to go to prison in an atmosphere of hopelessness and despair and learn all there is to know about deviant behavior. The present system of automatic imprisonment often makes it all the harder for a man to return to society as a law-abiding citizen. Moreover if a man is paroled he should have more money than the usual twenty dollars that he is released with since most men upon release "blow" this money on a night out on the town and then are broke. The parolees feel that if there were some funds available after their spree it would help them not only to feel like an independent person but in many cases help buy the clothes and equipment they need to get a job. Too often the parolee is in the predicament of not being able to afford to go to work. A man with no money in his pocket loses a lot of self respect.

Another fact brought out in these interviews, although only mentioned by three parolees, was that seven out of the eight had very little formal education. The average level of schooling was between Grades VIII and X and it cannot be said that the institutions provide in any significant degree
the means for a man to obtain further formal education. All the parolees but one admitted that they were not adequately trained for jobs above the level of semi-skilled labour, and this certainly held them back when trying to get work.

There were other opinions and problems expressed in the interviews but as they affected the respective men in a personal manner or were founded on individual situations and circumstances and were not of a common nature to more than one man, I felt it unnecessary to bring them into my summary. I have endeavored therefore, to summarize as concisely as possible the problems which appeared to have general application and relevance.
CHAPTER IV

WHAT IS WRONG WITH OUR REHABILITATION PROGRAM?

The Prison System

Evidence indicates that the use of prisons as a punishment has failed in deterring crime and thus far has done little toward reforming the criminal. In fact one might readily deduce that prisons do more to train and condition criminals for crime than rehabilitate them. There is no question that in the majority of cases prison results in neurosis, psychosis, perversion, moral and physical degeneration, frustration and aggression.

It is evident that prison is an "unnatural" environment and prisoners' experiences in the institution strengthen their already deviant behavior patterns. In prison there is no room for normal expression. The inmate is told "When," "How" and "Where," -- in fact he leads an infantile existence. His self respect is destroyed. He is stripped of all responsibility except to conform to the custodial pattern. Of course, it still remains true that the effect of prison will depend on the individual personality, but to expect the principal effect of imprisonment to be rehabilitation is both vain and foolish. The fact remains that for the majority of inmates, no matter how strong or stable they may be, the experience will have an effect on their mental health.
The opinions of the after-care leaders and parolees support this gloomy view. Unfortunately no research has been conclusive in showing what precise effects prison does have on individuals; in fact solid information in this area is marked by its absence. Nevertheless, it is becoming more and more apparent to correctional and rehabilitation leaders in Canada that prison is not the answer to our crime problem. Mr. Fulton, the Minister of Justice, has himself given public utterance to the now familiar tag that our aim should be to treat the offender rather than the offense. If this then is the goal we must consider most carefully and realistically the question: "What is the purpose of prison?" Do we send individuals to prison for or as punishment, or for treatment and rehabilitation? We cannot continue to tolerate the inconsistent and warring answers that are given to these questions at the present time. It is a paradox to send a man to prison as punishment and expect to reform him. To reform means to improve, but we cannot improve a man by punishing him if punishment is conceived merely as causing injury to him. And though we cannot reform by kindness, we still can be humanitarian and decent in our treatment of those types of personalities who in reality suffer from a disease whose symptom is their criminality.

Re-education is essential for the criminal, yet re-education under the best of conditions is difficult. Under
our existing system it is virtually impossible. Our only conclusion as to the value of prison is that it removes unwanted individuals from society for a specific period of time, and to this extent our prisons have indeed been successful. Our present system does not pose a pretty picture and this is probably the reason the public refuses to view the picture in its true light. They prefer to disbelieve that this monstrosity we have created exists, and in this disbelief they find comfort for their apathy. It is a truism that the state of our prisons is the state of our society's attitude to the offender. Until the public realizes that prisoners are people, sick people, and that they will return to the community sooner or later, then and only then will it do something to change these conditions. The onus for informing and educating the public rests with the correctional and rehabilitation people and until they are prepared to accept the challenge and responsibility of such a charge we must become resigned to the existing system.

I do not advocate the abolition of penal institutions. It would be frivolous to believe that we as a society have reached the point where this is possible. We will need prisons for a long time to come for the protection of society and the confinement of prisoners if only because there are some individuals who cannot be helped with our present knowledge and skills. I do recommend however, that wherever possible
we attempt to develop humane alternatives to incarceration which at the same time will offer adequate protection to society, and thus halt the growth of the useless system we have now.

One solution would be the establishment of small institutions to meet the needs of special types of offenders. For example, institutions for sex deviants, institutions for mentally retarded and handicapped offenders, institutions for first offenders, forestry and farm camps for adults and youths, and so forth. If we must continue to institutionalize offenders then we must be prepared to have institutions to meet their particular needs. The aim of these smaller institutions would be to provide concentrated and intensive help to the individual in order to return him to society as quickly as possible.

Another innovation I believe would be of value, although viewed by many as radical, would be that inmates be gainfully employed and paid full salary while in prison. From the money paid to the prisoner, his room and board would be deducted, as also any sundry expenses. If the inmate were married, a portion would be sent home to help support his family. Unemployment deductions could be made so that when released he would still have an income. This type of program would be bitterly opposed by unions and, to some extent, management, but I feel some plan could be arranged that would be acceptable
to both. This type of program would go a long way in breaking down the over-dependency created in prison. In addition it would help the offender to keep or develop a healthy self image as he would still feel he had responsibilities. Under our present system he is completely stripped of responsibility. It would also give him a chance to make reparation to the victim of his offence.

The Parole System

It is becoming obvious that most offenders are not prepared for parole. Although the theory is that an offender should be released from prison at the point when he has the most chance to succeed, there is little evidence to indicate when this rather vague point of time occurs. The criteria to determine when the offender is psychologically ready to be discharged are even more difficult to identify.

The parolees interviewed help to illustrate this fact. They are discharged on parole feeling inadequate and frightened. They have feelings of rejection, of being unwanted and branded. Their estimate of their personal worth is low. Contrary to public belief, it is at this point that the individual starts treatment and not while he was in prison. Here also we find one of the chief difficulties of parole. The parolee is an individual who has been mentally and morally warped by his prison experience. This makes the job of rehabilitation more difficult and accounts for many of the failures that take place.
Furthermore, those offenders who are released on parole are the offenders who have been chosen as the most likely to succeed and, all things being equal, would probably have gone straight in any case with the minimum of support and help. I suspect that this, as much as anything else, helps to account for the high degree of success parole has been able to maintain. However, this still leaves the offender who has not been selected as a good risk for parole. Obviously this individual has the more serious emotional and personality disturbance to overcome. It naturally follows that he would benefit most from the supervision and emotional support parole could offer. Nevertheless this individual seldom receives parole. He is generally discharged in full at the completion of his sentence or is placed on parole for relatively short periods of time which would not provide adequate time for proper parole supervision. He is left to attempt to adjust to the community on his own.

Our present system of selecting parolees is inefficient and unrealistic. The National Parole Board is so far removed from the actual parolee and his problems that it might as well be non-existent. They never see the parolee or speak to him and must rely on their regional representatives' reports and various agency reports in order to make their final decision. Their power is absolute. This might appear on the surface to be a reasonably sound method of selecting an individual for parole but when one considers the volume of applicants whose
cases must be reviewed by merely one board in a country the size of Canada, one can readily see there is neither sufficient time nor manpower allotted to give each case fair and honest consideration. That the Parole Board should pretend to come to a reasonable decision without ever having personally talked to the man is little short of hypocrisy. It could only be compared to window dressing, as this is precisely what it amounts to. It would be more practical and realistic to have parole boards established in each province which would interview the parolees themselves and then, aided by the various agency reports, make their decision. Furthermore, the parole board should be composed of trained men and women who are aware of and understand the problems that will confront the parolee. In addition, the parole board should be composed of members who will devote full time to parole work and be sufficiently well paid as to attract men and women of high character and ability.

Another glaring gap in our parole system which is clearly indicated by the after-care leaders interviewed and illustrated vividly by our eight parolees is the lack of pre-parole institutions to help prepare the parolee for his return to society in a gradual and controlled manner rather than subject him to the traumatic experience of moving from prison to the community in one step. These institutions would allow the prisoner to work in the community and live outside the prison
walls in small establishments for periods ranging from six to twelve months before release.

Moreover, the lack of formal education, as well as skilled training, on the part of the parolees is evident and is clearly supported by the interviews that are reported in Chapter III.

Formal educational institutions should be part of the overall parole program as well as the prison program. This type of institution would be available for those prisoners who have the intellectual capacity to benefit from a full-time course. Moreover, such an institution would allow for the concentration of teachers and allow for the transfer of those inmates who could benefit from an intensive course. Again realistic apprentice training programs should be established to prepare the parolee for satisfactory and remunerative employment. This type of program could be worked out in conjunction with representatives of labor and management. To say that little can be done for the parolee in the employment field because of the existing economic and labor situation, although true in part, is negative and evasive. We must continue to plan and prepare for the future. If we are not prepared to do this then we can never hope to improve the parolee's position in the labor market, especially in our society where the emphasis is on continued specialization and technology.
To speak of the lack of funds and the lack of professionally trained personnel in parole may be anti-climactic at this point. Nevertheless it is a serious problem in our parole system that has far-reaching affects on the parolee. It would not be difficult to visualize the effects on the parolee of an incompetent parole officer. A parole officer must have appropriate professional qualifications. He must have the ability to understand and carry out the work of treatment in the light of current psychological and sociological theory. In brief, he must have professional training in order to deal with the highly complex problems of the parolee and help him overcome these problems. Mediocrity and incompetence, no matter how well meaning the parole officer may be, have no place in a parole system.

Closely allied with this is the matter of salaries. Salaries must be sufficient to attract the people of the highest calibre. Further, there must be economic provision made to hire the necessary number of workers to do the job effectively and efficiently. There is no doubt that parole without proper and adequate supervision is a mockery of parole principles.

The initial capital outlay to provide for attractive salaries, proper facilities and programs with which to attract qualified personnel and to inaugurate a proper rehabilitation
program would be extremely high. However, over the long run it would result in tremendous savings as compared with the present system.

Until all levels of government and the public in general are willing to provide the monies needed to do an adequate job, we will continue to multiply our problems. It is my personal view that it would be an error to believe that it is up to the public and government to make the first move. The move must come from the rehabilitation people themselves. They must be prepared to prove to all that parole has value, that it is worthwhile. And they must be able to produce the facts, properly supported by research, to convince the public that their work has a vital place in correctional services.

Another obstacle in our present system is the necessity that the parolee must not only report to his parole supervisor but also to the local police as often as the officer in charge sees fit. This requirement is extremely difficult for the parolee emotionally and also creates a great deal of inconvenience for him. Further this requirement does little toward rehabilitation and merely serves as a method for the police to keep track of discharged offenders. There are no realistic grounds for continued surveillance by the police once the parolee has registered with them. It would be more practical and less traumatic if the police were out of the picture completely and if any reports they might require on the parolee be
obtained from the parole supervisor by the simple expedient of a telephone call. The present system is an example of the archaic attitude of the law enforcement agencies toward parole.

Many of the problems of the parolee could be alleviated if there was a realistic pre-release program. The obstacles of reintegration into community and family could be greatly reduced if a program could be devised so as to allow for maximum contact with the family and the community while the offender is still in prison. Family conjugal visits of the kind found in certain South American countries might well prove useful too. As the man is nearing his release on parole, supervised home visits would help to solve the problem of strangeness that exists between the partners after long periods of incarceration. Moreover this would reduce the tendency toward dependency on the part of the parolee as he would be alerted to his responsibilities to his family and the community.

Small pre-release institutions as recommended earlier in this study, would help immeasurably in assisting the parolee to rehabilitate successfully. This type of institution would be designed primarily for individuals who have no family to return to. Nevertheless it would provide for contact with the community and gradual release into society.

Housing facilities for parolees who have no home to go to would have definite value in making them feel that they really
belong to society. These facilities could be modelled after the small number of British hostels which perform a similar function. These homes could be located in the major cities across Canada and provide board and room at reasonable rates on a "pay-as-you-are-able" basis until such time as the parolee can obtain employment and afford his own upkeep. As the majority of parolees would prefer to pay their own way it is unlikely that these facilities would be abused.

Another obstacle that faces the parolee immediately on release from the institution is the lack of sufficient funds. The opinions of the interviewed parolees and after-care leaders make it clear that this is often an important factor. This problem could be solved in various ways. The most practical way is to pay unemployment insurance for the offender while he is in the institution so that upon release he could collect benefits until he was gainfully employed. Part of this money could be obtained from the small amount of money that the offender is paid for his work. An alternative would be the creation of a parolee credit bank on which he could borrow up to a certain amount which he would have to pay back with interest in a stipulated but flexible period of time. This could be set up on the lines of the popular credit unions. The parolee is too often in a position where he cannot afford to go to work and his supervising agency cannot provide financial assistance for him. The above suggestion would at least help to control the problem of lack of funds that faces the parolee.
on his release. To be sure, some individuals would abuse this privilege. But I feel the possibilities are greater that more would benefit from it and would be less inclined to find it necessary to return to crime for a livelihood.

The Public Attitude

It is an undisputed fact that the success and the effectiveness of parole rests to a large extent on the attitude of the public. This claim is clearly supported and illustrated in the summaries of interviews with after-care personnel and parolees. Reintegration into the community and into the family as well as the various situational problems that occur as a result of the parolee's attempts to reform are directly related to society's attitude toward crime and the offender. In fact the public is remarkably uninformed as to the problems of crime prevention and rehabilitation. The majority of citizens do not realize or attempt to contemplate the difficulties encountered by the parolee. It is exceedingly difficult for the average citizen to visualize how confused and insecure the parolee is. He cannot comprehend the parolee's seeming inability to make decisions and perform the simplest tasks successfully. He cannot understand that this is often the result of extended absence from the community and is not aware of the detrimental effects such an absence can have on a man while incarcerated.

There are many ways to educate and stimulate public attitudes to the problem of rehabilitation. However, I am
convinced myself that the onus of public relations lies on the correctional and rehabilitation personnel. This requires a continuous and intensive public relations program. After-care authorities should utilize the mass communications media. Good after-care and rehabilitative processes should be presented in newsworthy fashion. This does not mean that we should cover up our failures or weaknesses for, on the contrary, a policy of frankness should be adhered to. In addition to using the mass communication channels, a program of public speaking should be followed which would reach groups and organizations of every kind and interpret the objectives and advantages of after—care programs to these groups.

Every after-care agency should periodically publish and distribute a report of its work to the public either in the form of pamphlets or brochures. These publications would tell trenchantly the various phases of rehabilitation and the problems involved. Further, a concentrated effort of interpretation should be made to those other institutions which are either related to or concerned with the overall correctional field (courts, legislative committees, law enforcement agencies). It is up to its advocates to interpret rehabilitation and after-care to these various groups who, because of lack of information, may often not understand the value of after-care to offenders. I believe that these objectives would help to make the public aware of and interested in the problems of rehabilitation. Before we can expect rehabilitation to achieve the desired
goals we must convince the taxpayer who will ultimately have to support the program. Without public goodwill we will never be able to succeed. This means that the objectives and results of good after-care programs must constantly be kept before the public in order to build their confidence in, understanding of and support for our program.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I believe that our goal of wanting a man who enters prison to leave our hands as a law-abiding member of the community is a realistic one. However, as can be readily ascertained, the job of rehabilitation is a tough, realistic one which will require every bit of knowledge and skill we can bring to it.

There is no question that success in parole is dependent on many facts of which we are fully aware and over which we have entirely adequate powers of control. We tend to fool ourselves with the belief that our failure to change behavior is due mainly either to ignorance or to circumstances which we are powerless to avert or alter, -- of which one example would be the allegedly untreatable condition of the so-called psychopath.

One obvious fact that we have often overlooked is that after-care and parole seldom can rise above the level of the institutions to which we commit the offender and from which
we ultimately release him. Unfortunately our penal institutions have little or none of the elements which have a positive influence on the prisoner. Our institutions do not provide opportunities for the offender to equip himself with skills and establish his own self respect.

Of course, there is no doubt that we are making progress in this area, as is clearly indicated by the trend away from maximum security to minimum custody institutions and the development of training programs for institutional personnel. But despite these improvements there is no room for complacency. We have failed in the provision of realistic work programs. Diagnostic and treatment personnel are sadly lacking in the majority of institutions. Without professionally trained personnel there is little chance of helping the offender during incarceration resolve some of the problems he will face upon discharge. The dismaying thing is that although we have considerable knowledge of the ways our prisons can do a better rehabilitative job, we have not translated our knowledge into practically effective programs.

It is obvious that the job of rehabilitation is not an easy one. It is discouraging and often perplexing. We suffer from many gaps in our knowledge, in our facilities and in public support. We have sold ourselves a bill of goods but we are still haunted by doubts as to its real value, with the result that we cannot sell others on the value of parole and
after-care. Research in this area in Canada is marked by its absence. Parole terminology is vague and nebulous and should be simplified and clarified. Every after-care agency should maintain realistic statistics which would lend themselves to exact compilation and analysis. The challenge of crime control and rehabilitation has been given to us; the responsibility is up to us to accept. It is our basic responsibility to find the answers and in particular to answer the one simple question, Can we afford to fail?

Suggested Future Research Topics

It is a revealing experience when reading the literature of parole and after-care to discover how many facts are only opinions and are not supported by research. In the field of corrections and rehabilitation the possibilities for research topics are evidently unlimited, and we know roughly what types and areas of research would be of value. Yet in this field very little research has been done, especially as regards the methodology of parole supervision. I believe that this is due primarily to the fact that we have not as yet standardized our statistics or our basic methods for collecting facts. Until some move is made in this direction research in this field will never acquire real momentum. From this present study certain research topics have suggested themselves which I believe should engage our early and close attention.

1. Carefully controlled studies are required of the actual
effects of prison on the offender's morale and self image as compared with other offenders who have not had prison experience and are on probation.

2. These should be supplemented with studies of the various effects of guilt, shame, and a damaged self concept on the parolee who returns to his family in contrast to the parolee who has no one to turn to and no place to go.

3. Some assessment should be undertaken of the effects of the various visitors (wife, girlfriend, friends) on the offender, with special reference to the existing prison visiting facilities.

4. It would be strategically useful for parole authorities to know what attitudes successful parolees have toward the offense for which they have served a prison term. Do they look upon their crime with contempt, do they attempt to suppress all thoughts of it, or do they view it with pride?

5. Finally I should like to recommend the establishment of a pilot project in a small community where we should be able to mobilize all the social services and institutions and co-ordinate them in a program of prevention and after-care. From the evaluation of such a project it would be relatively easy to determine whether prevention and after-care are of value or not and more particularly (since the long range benefits of parole are scarcely in dispute at this point)
it would assist us in the identification of those factors, both personal and situational, which militate against or contribute to the discharged prisoner's success in finding his place among free and responsible men.
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