

Parole Board for Scotland —

Report for 1973

*Presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for Scotland
under Schedule 2, para. 6, Criminal Justice Act, 1967*

*Ordered by The House of Commons to be printed
29th July, 1974*

EDINBURGH
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

22p net

17047
218

Parole Board for Scotland

Report for 1973

*Presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for Scotland
under Schedule 2, para. 6, Criminal Justice Act, 1967*

*Ordered by The House of Commons to be printed
29th July, 1974*

EDINBURGH
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
22p net

Membership of of the Parole Board during 1973

The Very Rev. Dr R. L. SMALL, OBE (retired in December 1973)	<i>Chairman</i> Minister of St Cuthbert's Church, Edinburgh; former Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland; former member of the Scottish Advisory Council for the Treatment of the Offender.
The Very Rev. Father ANTHONY ROSS	<i>Vice-Chairman</i> Roman Catholic Chaplain, University of Edinburgh; former member of the After-Care Council; Chairman of the Edinburgh Cyrenian Trust.
D. A. P. BARRY, OBE appointed Chairman in January 1974)	Company Director; former member of the After-Care Council.
J. E. BURROW (appointed in October 1973)	Director of Social Work, Dunbartonshire; former member of the Local Review Committee at Perth and Barlinnie Prisons.
J. B. W. CHRISTIE (retired in December 1973)	Sheriff, Dundee.
J. COOPER	Headmaster, St Columba of Iona Secondary School, Glasgow.
Dr H. C. FOWLIE (appointed in January 1973)	Consultant Psychiatrist; Group Physician Superintendent, Royal Dundee Liff and Strathmartine Hospitals, Dundee.
Miss E. I. W. HOBKIRK, CBE, TD (retired in June 1973)	Former Governor of Greenock Prison; former Head Warden of Bristol Royal Hospital.
J. MCINTYRE, ISO (appointed in October 1973)	Former Governor, Edinburgh Prison; former Inspector of Prisons.
Dr H. J. B. MILLER	Consultant Psychiatrist; Physician Superintendent, Ailsa Hospital, Ayr.
J. MILNE	Assistant General Secretary, Scottish Trades Union Congress.
Mrs A. M. MORRIS (resigned in June 1973)	Lecturer, Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, University of Edinburgh.
Miss P. PARSLÖB (appointed in July 1973)	Professor of Social Work, University of Aberdeen; editor of the British Journal of Social Work.
W. O. PATTULLO	Sheriff, Glasgow.
Sir JAMES ROBERTSON, CBE	Former Chief Constable of the City of Glasgow.
The Rt. Hon. LORD WHEATLEY	Lord Justice-Clerk.

CHAPTER ONE

The Parole System

1. In presenting its sixth report the Parole Board for Scotland considers it advisable to restate the various aspects of the parole system.
2. Parole is a method by which persons serving a sentence of imprisonment or detention may be released, under specified conditions, to serve part of their sentence under supervision in the community.
3. Section 60(1) of the Criminal Justice Act 1967 provides that a person serving a determinate sentence of imprisonment or of detention in a young offenders institution may be released on parole after having completed at least one-third of his sentence or one year, whichever is the longer period. Since with normal remission a prisoner is released after serving two-thirds of his sentence, this means that parole is limited in practice to those serving sentences of more than 18 months. A person released from custody on parole is placed on licence requiring him to comply with certain conditions. To ensure compliance with the conditions of his licence, the parolee is supervised by a local authority social worker from the area where he will reside. The licence remains in force until the date on which, in the case of an adult, he would have been released in any case had parole not been granted (normally the date on which he would have completed two-thirds of his total sentence); and in the case of a person who was under the age of 21 at the time of sentence, until the date on which his total sentence expires. During the period of the licence he is subject to recall to custody for breach of any of its conditions. The procedure may best be illustrated by example:—An adult person sentenced to be imprisoned for six years can expect to serve four years provided that behaviour while in prison does not lead to loss of remission. Under the parole scheme he becomes eligible for consideration for parole after having served two years (ie one-third of total sentence). If granted parole he would be subject to the conditions of licence for a period of two years (ie until the two-thirds stage of his total sentence). A person who was under 21 at the time of sentence, would, if granted parole in similar circumstances, be subject to the conditions of licence for four years (ie until the date on which his total sentence expires).
4. A sentence under section 57(2) of the Children and Young Persons (Scotland) Act 1937 as amended by the Social Work (Scotland) Act 1968 provides that where a child is convicted on indictment and the court is of the opinion that none of the other methods in which the case may legally be dealt with is suitable, the court may sentence the offender to be detained for such period as may be specified. (A child is a person under the age of 16 or one over 16 but under 18 who is already the subject of a current supervision requirement made by a children's hearing.) A person so sen-

tenced is liable to be detained in such place and under such conditions as the Secretary of State may direct. The placement of these persons may be outwith the prison service establishments, for example in a List D school (formerly known as approved school). These sentences do not attract automatic remission but in terms of section 61 of the Criminal Justice Act 1967 the Secretary of State may release on licence a person so detained, if recommended to do so by the Board, at any time during the sentence. These persons are subject to the conditions of the licence until the date of the expiry of the sentence.

5. Because of the nature of their sentence, different considerations apply to the release on licence of persons detained in custody on a sentence of life imprisonment or detention during Her Majesty's pleasure (the equivalent in the case of someone convicted of murder who was under the age of 18 years at the time the offence was committed). Under the provisions of section 61 of the Criminal Justice Act 1967 the Secretary of State may release such an inmate only if recommended to do so by the Board and must consult the Lord Justice General and if he is still available, the judge who presided at the trial. Such persons, when released, are subject to the conditions of their licence for the remainder of their lives.

6. An offender released on licence can have this revoked at any time while it is in force and be recalled to custody. This may be done if he fails to comply with the conditions of his licence or if he commits a further offence, and according to the circumstances the revocation can be ordered by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Board, or by the court.

7. Unless the inmate has opted not to be considered for early release on parole a first review of his case is put in hand in advance of the date on which he will become eligible for parole. A dossier of information on the case is laid before the appropriate local review committee. (A local review committee is appointed by the Secretary of State for each penal establishment which normally houses parole-eligible inmates and comprises the Governor of the establishment, an officer of a local authority social work department and at least one "independent" member.) The next step is scrutiny (screening) of the case by the Secretary of State, acting through his officials. The position regarding release on parole is that it requires both a decision on release by the Secretary of State and a recommendation for parole by the Parole Board; from the inception of the Board there has been an understanding (going back to a Parliamentary undertaking in 1967) that only those cases in which the Secretary of State is prepared to contemplate release will be formally referred to the Board, and that if the Board makes the required recommendation for parole, then (exceptional circumstances apart) the Secretary of State will authorise release. The screening process may identify cases recommended by a local review committee in which the Secretary of State would not be prepared to authorise release. Such cases are not formally referred to the Parole Board, but go to the Board for information only, though if the view of the Board is that any such persons might be released, the case will be re-considered by the Secretary of State. The screen may also bring out, in the case of persons not recommended by the local review committee, that they are better

prospects than appeared at first; and such cases may be formally referred to the Board for a recommendation on release. Special arrangements for screening apply in the case of persons convicted of offences involving sex or violence.

8. In the process of selection each case is decided on its merits in the light of all the information contained in the dossier. This records the inmate's social and criminal history before his current sentence, his conduct and response during any previous periods under supervision in the community; his work record and domestic background; the circumstances of his current offence including consideration of any co-accused and observations which may have been made by the sentencing judge; his response to treatment and training in prison during his current sentence and information about his domestic and employment situation on release.

9. The conditions of licence stipulate that the licensee shall report on release to the officer in charge of the social work department in the area where he will be resident and shall place himself under the supervision of whichever officer is nominated for this purpose and keep in touch with that officer in accordance with his instructions. He shall inform his supervising officer if he changes his place of residence or changes or loses his job and he shall be of good behaviour and lead an industrious life. Additional conditions are occasionally made in some cases where, for example, a condition of residence at a particular address may be imposed.

CHAPTER TWO

The Year's Work

1. During 1973 the Board met on 24 occasions to consider cases. Four of these meetings took place during annual visits to Edinburgh, Perth, Penninghame and Peterhead prisons; and one other was held in conjunction with a visit to the State Hospital, Carstairs.

2. The Board has continued to visit annually all penal establishments housing inmates eligible for consideration under the parole scheme: and has used these visits to discuss parole topics with members of Local Review Committees, prison staffs and inmates. In particular, the Board was most impressed with the arrangements for training and treatment of inmates in the Special Unit at Barlinnie Prison.

3. The Board has been called upon to review an increasing number of cases of persons sentenced in terms of section 57(2) of the Children and Young Persons (Scotland) Act 1937. Many of these juvenile offenders are assigned to List 'D' Schools and, accordingly, the Board accepted invitations to visit two such institutions—St Joseph's at Tranent and Ballikinrain near Balfroon—in order to acquire a fuller understanding of the management of this category of detainee.

4. The Board's links with its English counterpart have been maintained through various meetings of members and officers of both Boards.

5. In January a Conference held at the Scottish Prison Service Training School, Brightons, Falkirk, was attended by members of the Board, Prisons Headquarter staff, representatives of Local Review Committees, the Approved Schools Association, the Association of Chief Police Officers of Scotland and the Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, University of Edinburgh. In the course of a full survey of the operation of the parole scheme in Scotland, particular attention was focussed on the functions and influence of Local Review Committees, police attitudes towards parole, and the special needs of offenders detained under section 57(2) of the Children and Young Persons (Scotland) Act 1937.

6. In March a Parole Training Course for prison and Headquarter staffs involved in the preparation of cases for parole consideration was held at the Training School. Members of the Board and Local Review Committees contributed to the discussion.

7. The Board welcomed to its meeting on 11 September, Mr Hector Monro, MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State with special responsibility for social work services. The Board expressed to the Minister its increasing concern about the frequently poor quality of parole supervision

caused to a great extent by inadequate staffing and lack of specialised training in social work departments (the Board's views on this subject are more fully dealt with in Chapter Five).

8. In its report for 1972 the Board made special comment about the effects of the mass media on public attitudes: and the Board has pursued its policy of seeking to obtain the co-operation of the media in increasing public understanding of its objectives. Accordingly, it is encouraging to note that the Board's Chairman, Dr Small, was invited to speak to the Scottish Daily Newspapers Society at a business luncheon in November and was able to report that the discussion had helped to banish several key misunderstandings. The Board has proceeded to build on this foundation.

9. In November the Board had the pleasure of a meeting with Dr A. Dickson, Honorary Director of the Community Service Volunteers in England, and Mr J. Watson, his Scottish counterpart. Dr Dickson spoke about the aims of his Organisation and its impressive achievements in assisting with the resettlement of ex-offenders, particularly those in the younger age groups. The Board was most interested in proposals for a similar project in Scotland.

10. In conclusion the Board wishes to record its grateful appreciation of the practical help and co-operation given by all agencies upon whom it has called during the year.

CHAPTER THREE

Figures and Facts

a. *Determinate Sentences*

1. Statistical details of the number of cases considered and the results are given in the Appendix, Table 1.

2. The Local Review Committees examined 594 cases and recommended 225 of these as suitable for parole. All cases assessed by the Committees were screened subsequently by the Scottish Home and Health Department on behalf of the Secretary of State for Scotland and, in the light of additional information not initially available to the Committees, 13 of the recommended cases were considered unsuitable but nevertheless were presented to the Board for information only. By the same process, 65 of the 369 cases not recommended locally were referred to the Board for consideration of a release date: 16 of these were paroled. Of the 212 cases recommended by Local Review Committees and referred to the Board 62 were refused parole.

3. The Board considered 281 cases of which 168 were recommended for early release. 113 cases were not recommended but the Board decided that 16 of these should be reviewed in less than the 12-month maximum interval laid down by statute.

4. Offenders detained under the provisions of the Children and Young Persons (Scotland) Act 1937, section 57(2) do not qualify for automatic remission of sentence but the Secretary of State may release on licence a person so detained only if recommended to do so by the Board. As a matter of routine every such case is seen by the Board, although some may be referred for information only. During the year the Board's caseload included 86 of these; 48 being submitted for consideration of a release date. There were 20 instances where the sentence imposed was less than 18 months, a circumstance which leads the Board to draw attention yet again to the difficulty of establishing an effective measure of supervision when the time available is extremely brief. Indeed, for four people sentenced to three months detention early release could not have been contemplated had the time been taken to refer them to a local review committee. These four cases were therefore submitted directly to the Board without many of the usual formalities: and the Board recommended early release for two of them having concluded that a limited spell of open supervision should at least be attempted. The alternative was release with no support or supervision of any sort.

5. The Board finds it encouraging to note that the proportion of parole eligible prisoners opting out of the consideration process has dropped to the lowest annual level since 1969:—

Year	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
%	21.7	23.9	27.8	33.7	27.4	24.7

6. During the year the Board was obliged to re-examine the cases of seven parolees who had committed serious breaches of their licence conditions, either by committing further offences or by failing to co-operate with their supervisors. As a result of the Board's recommendations three of them were recalled and two others were sent a written warning about their future behaviour. Two of those recalled had previously received warnings from the Board. In addition, the Board recommended the return to supervision of one parolee whom the Secretary of State had deemed it expedient to recall pending consideration by the Board. Two parolees were sentenced to further terms of imprisonment which extended beyond the expiry of the licence.

7. The Board also reconsidered the cases of five persons who had been sentenced under the section 57(2) of the Children and Young Persons (Scotland) Act 1937 and released on parole under section 61 of the Criminal Justice Act 1967. One was recalled to complete his sentence in custody and three others were cautioned by letter about their conduct. One was sentenced to a period of borstal training which would not have been completed before the expiry of the licence.

8. In addition the Board recommended recall for 16 young offenders who were subject to supervision during the final third of sentence under section 60(3)(b) of the Criminal Justice Act 1967, and had been reported for failing to comply with the terms of their licences. Three young offenders thus recalled were again released under further supervision. Eight others who were not recalled received written warnings about their behaviour. Two young offenders on licence were recalled by the Court under section 62(8) of the Act.

b. *Life Sentence and HMP Cases*

9. The procedures for considering the release of persons serving life imprisonment or detained during Her Majesty's pleasure have remained unchanged since the Board's last report. Table 2 in the Appendix shows details of the Board's case load during 1973 and the preceding five years.

10. The Board examined the cases of 20 prisoners serving such sentences, referred to it for consideration of a release date. For 16 of these the Board recommended release dates, to be preceded by up to two years of individually planned rehabilitative training which will normally include periods in the open prison and on outside employment under the Training for Freedom scheme. The other four prisoners, including one ex-licencee recalled in 1972, were not recommended although in one instance the Board asked to review the situation after six months. 15 other life sentence prisoners were assessed by the Secretary of State as unsuitable for release and were therefore presented to the Board for information only. Two life sentence prisoners, undergoing special training in anticipation of release in 1974 and 1975 respectively, committed serious breaches of prison rules and were returned to close custody. Each of them forfeited his release date pending a further period of assessment.

11. In 1973 five life sentence prisoners and one HMP detainee were released on licence. This raises the total of those released since the introduction of the parole scheme to 22, two of whom have been recalled.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

1. The Board is aware that one of its prime considerations in recommending early release must be the safety and protection of the public. Even the very small number of offences committed by parolees during the supervision period represents failure. It is foolish to expect that all parolees will remain clear of criminal or anti-social behaviour when the vast majority of longer term inmates of penal institutions have previous convictions and are liable to offend again, particularly when subjected to pressures outside. The Board accepts the possibility of failures but believes that they must be seen in the context of the very many more who have successfully completed a period of supervision. Of the 707 men and women who have been released on parole, 653 have either completed their period of parole satisfactorily or are at present undergoing that period of supervision so far without criticism or complaint.

2. A very serious view is taken of breaches of parole licence and the Board does not hesitate to recall a parolee when such a course seems appropriate. Factors taken into account in considering recall are:—

- (1) the nature of the subsequent offence and the sentence which it has incurred;
- (2) the supervising officer's report on the overall response of the parolee to supervision; and
- (3) whether or not the parolee is in steady employment.

Normally, if a fresh custodial sentence has been incurred, the parolee is recalled for part or the whole of the remainder of his first sentence. Those who receive a non-custodial sentence, if not recalled, are normally sent a severe warning letter. Where a supervising officer reports that a client is making no effort to comply with licence conditions, whilst still keeping clear of offences, the Board normally orders recall or sends a warning letter.

3. There is shown below the number of parolees referred to the Board for consideration for recall, those recalled, those sent warning letters and those otherwise dealt with since the inception of the parole scheme in 1968.

Year	Total Cases Referred	No. Recalled	Warning letters issued	Other disposals
1968	—	—	—	—
1969	—	—	—	—
1970	5	4	—	1
1971	14	7	7	—
1972	12	8	2	2
1973	7	3	2	2
Totals	38	22	11	5

4. In addition, the Board is required to consider young offenders who are automatically released after completing two thirds of their sentence in terms of section 60(3)(b) of the Criminal Justice Act 1967, and who are in breach of licence conditions. The number of such persons has been as follows:—

Year	Total Cases Referred	No. Recalled	Warning letters issued	Other disposals
1968	3	3	—	—
1969	25	19	—	6
1970	11	10	—	1
1971	17	14	—	3
1972	34	31	3	—
1973	25	16	8	1
Totals	115	93	11	11

5. A further category involved are those sentenced under the Children and Young Persons (Scotland) Act 1937, who can be released before the end of sentence only on the recommendations of the Board and whose supervision expires at the end of sentence:—

Year	Total Cases Referred	No. Recalled	Warning letters issued	Other disposals
1968	—	—	—	—
1969	4	4	—	—
1970	1	1	—	—
1971	—	—	—	—
1972	3	2	1	—
1973	5	1	3	1
Totals	13	8	4	1

NOTE:

In the foregoing tables the figures shown under the heading "Other disposals" denote cases where no disciplinary action was taken because, for example, a new sentence subsumed the licence period; or a minimal part of the licence period remained; or the breach of licence was considered by the Board to be of such a nature as not to require recall.

6. Finally, prisoners serving life sentences or to be detained during Her Majesty's pleasure are, when released, on licence for life. The Board attempts to keep a vigilant watch on their progress. It receives reports on such persons at regular intervals and may recommend variation in conditions of licence or the period between such reports. It may also, when appropriate, recall and has in fact done so on one occasion. It is, however, obvious that the effectiveness of the Board's vigilance is dependent on the quality of the supervision available. The number of such persons with whom the Board was concerned to the end of 1973 was 49.

7. The figures available in connection with recall may seem to indicate degrees of failure or success. The Board is aware, however, that these terms are purely relative. Even if a parolee is not known to have committed further offences this does not necessarily mean that he has committed

none in fact. On the other hand those who have responded to warning letters might be regarded as partial successes. There is no really satisfactory yardstick available even after 6 years of the parole system. Any attempt to take stock of the effect of the Board's work must therefore be tentative at least until more research has been undertaken and concluded.

8. The Board has been encouraged in its work by the response of many prisoners and of prison staff. It has emphasised in previous reports that the concept of parole must be seen as part of a whole system of treatment and resettlement of offenders. Accordingly, tribute must be paid to the prison authorities for the efforts which they make to rehabilitate offenders and to prepare them for release. Many of the prisoners are quite immature when they arrive in prison and some of the improvements which training and treatment have produced have been impressive. Young men and women have been trained to a state of proficiency in various trades—some to City and Guilds certificate standard—giving the offenders the opportunity, possibly for the first time in their adolescent or adult lives, of taking up interesting and gainful employment on release. Much of the progress has been brought about by the dedication of instructors in prison, between whom and the offenders a good relationship has developed, and this has been an important factor in bringing the offenders to maturity.

9. In the academic field, some young prisoners have progressed to Higher Grade in such subjects as English and Arithmetic. While on parole some have continued courses of study or technical training begun when in prison and have achieved notable success. Such efforts and achievements by prisoners, possibly encouraged by the hope of parole, represent a much higher standard of response than mere conformity to prison rules and regulations or a passive acceptance of the training regime without any effort by the prisoner himself. Sometimes, after adopting unco-operative and anti-authority attitudes, prisoners have accepted the guidance and advice given by the prison staff and have developed to the standards described.

10. The Board has been heartened by improvements effected in the attitudes of many of the applicants whose cases it has considered. It is equally heartened by the fact revealed in many of the final reports from social workers, responsible for supervising these parolees, that the improvement shown in prison has been sustained in the world outside at least during the period of the licence. There is nevertheless an understandable wish on the part of the public for some illustration of what parole may actually help to bring about. The Board therefore offers below a few extracts from reports by supervisors which will be found relevant to the points made elsewhere. Names and any other details which might lead to identification of places or persons have been altered or omitted; in every other respect the passages are in their original form. The position achieved by someone as a result of hard work and good support from others can only too easily be destroyed by publicity which, however well meant, draws attention to the past which he sincerely regrets and wishes to put behind him as far as possible.

- A "Response has been excellent since S has co-operated in every possible way. He found employment within a very short time of release and was reinstated by his old firm. Four months ago he managed to secure a house and this has allowed him to bring his family together as one unit. Previously the children were residing with grandparents. He seems to be concentrating on his family's welfare and living the life of a good citizen."
- B "Reported regularly and always appeared co-operative and friendly. Did not impress as being intelligent enough to make real use of a supervisory relationship. Has held several labouring jobs. At expiry of supervision was employed as a labourer in Glasgow."
- C "Throughout the period of parole (one year, nine months) C communicated with his social worker as required and demonstrated by his application to his work, his marriage and his buying of a flat that he appreciated parole and wanted to justify the confidence placed in him—for the benefit of the parole system and others who might follow him—as well as for his own good. This constitutes a final report on his parole."
- D "Reacted very well to supervision, kept appointments regularly and in addition called at the office if he had any specific problem to discuss. He was most responsive and had no difficulty in relating in a one-to-one situation and appeared willing to discuss personal problems in depth. Supervision sessions became less frequent due to his excellent progress but contact was kept with him after the supervision order had been rescinded . . . D worked extremely hard after leaving school and appeared to realise the error of his ways which had resulted in his period in a List D establishment and would appear to be making every effort to stay out of trouble. He has worked in full employment since being released and it is felt that his period of institutional training has given him a discipline and a therapy which have proved to be beneficial and lasting."
- E "This man's parole period has been completed most satisfactorily. He is a man who needs plenty of work and little interference. He has, in his own way, tried to make amends to his wife and family and they, for their part, have been glad to put the offence and sentence behind them. He enjoys music with his son and enjoys a quiet beer with his wife. I have been pleasantly surprised that 'small town gossip' did not obtrude and he has been completely accepted by the community."
- F "During supervision M has co-operated with his supervising officer. He has voluntarily made contact with this Department on numerous occasions to notify various changes of address concerned with his work and various other matters. In addition both he and his wife have participated in the supervising process and have maintained interest and concern that their marriage should succeed. M's training whilst in prison would seem to have maintained and enhanced his previous good working record."

G "Response to supervision has been quite outstanding. He has at all times given his fullest co-operation and it has been a pleasure dealing with him. His parents and family appear to be prepared to support him; this is vital as he has commenced a full time course at college. He remained unemployed during the supervision period but this was not due to lack of personal effort. Passes at 'A' level were confirmed in English, Geography and Economics."

H "Within ten days he had searched out and found himself employment and at present has settled into this work extremely well. The matrimonial problems that were anticipated have not arisen in the same degree that were expected and there appears at present to be greater co-operation and understanding between husband and wife. Family relationships in general have shown a marked improvement and I feel that over all he is making every attempt to form a new pattern of life. During contact he was open, frank and friendly and seems to realise the serious situation that he left and every effort is undoubtedly going to be made by him in the future."

I "Seemed to respond extremely well and there appears to have been no friction whatsoever during the supervision period. He was very punctual when interviews were arranged and responsive to any advice and guidance given. He gained employment with a local contractor shortly after his release from the Young Offenders Institution and was employed with this firm until becoming redundant due to strike action on the site. Shortly after losing this employment he was engaged by the Corporation in a post in which he is still employed. Although the particular training he received in the Young Offenders Institution has not been used by him, it is felt that the discipline and helpful attitude of the instructors which he has mentioned several times enabled him to stay in permanent employment when he was released, as he had formed the habit of regular work and effort . . . It is felt that if for any reason he lost his present employment he would try to gain alternative work as soon as possible as he appreciates the danger of his having more opportunity to get into trouble if he has nothing specific to do. In summary, I feel he has matured greatly and is a much more responsible person since his discharge from the Young Offenders Institution."

These few extracts, taken at random from records, refer to men from different parts of the country; varying in age; in the nature of the offences for which they were convicted; and in social background. There is nothing unusual about the extracts themselves; it is precisely because they are typical of what can be achieved that they are presented here.

CHAPTER FIVE

Supervision

1. In every annual report since the start of the Scottish parole system in 1968 the Board has emphasised the importance of supervision. It is so central to the successful resettling of prisoners into society that the Board has no hesitation in again drawing attention to the need for adequate and proper supervision.

2. Supervision is not only to help an individual released from prison to resettle into the family and community but also to help offenders, or parents of offenders particularly, to assume their responsibilities. It means building up strong family units able to withstand pressures and to provide an adequate and stable base from which members of the family may contribute positively to community life.

3. The word supervision may not convey the wide range of support, service and control which prisoners may need when released from prison. Regrettably in some areas it means only that the prisoner is required to report to the Social Work Office, or telephone in, once a month. This is not what the Board has in mind when it places a prisoner on parole. What is desirable is that each prisoner should come out into what may be termed a social network which will provide not only a living place and employment but will meet the parolee's need for friendship and support. Some parolees will come out to a supportive environment and all the supervising social worker need do is to see a parolee sufficiently frequently to establish a relationship which can be used if he needs advice, emotional support or control which his own family and friends are temporarily failing to provide. Other parolees have an inadequate or non-existent social network and for them the social worker must make good the gaps or even create a whole new situation in which to live. It will assist him to do this if he appreciates the rehabilitation measures already attempted during the custodial part of the sentence and if he has been actively involved in them.

4. Supervision should start with contact inside the prison or at the very latest at the prison gate when the parolee is released. When few personal or social resources are available the supervising social worker will need to spend several whole days with the parolee, accompanying him through the intricacies of applying for Social Security, finding a job and settling into a hostel or lodgings. Those released from prison feel like foreigners in a strange land for a while and a guide is essential at first.

5. Wives and children may have learned to do without the prisoner and, despite their longing for his return, he may be felt to be an intruder as well as being welcomed when he arrives home. The social worker must engage the family in understanding the problems of re-entry both for the parolee

and for themselves. There may be relatives who cannot believe that the ex-prisoner has matured and changed and their expectations that he will prove a failure once again may contrive to bring about such a failure. Such situations require family discussions led by a supervisor skilled in the understanding and use of family relationships.

6. Accommodation is hard to find for many parolees. The Board regrets that so little has been developed either by local authorities or by voluntary agencies to meet this need and considers that more funds should be made available for this purpose. What is required is a range of facilities, which includes small hostels of the mixed type mentioned in the Board's Report of 1972 as well as specially selected landlords. For some parolees facilities should include a setting involving a more communal life where living and working take place with the same group of people; for others who want a more independent way of life bed-sitting rooms or flatlets may be required. The Board is not aware of any social work departments in Scotland which have developed such a range of facilities, but without them some prisoners cannot be expected to survive and some otherwise suitable for parole may have to forego release. The Board suggests that the types of facility found in Sweden (see the Board's Report for 1970, Appendix 2) could be developed in Scotland.

7. The Board has been impressed by the efforts made by some supervisors in finding work for parolees. Employment is a major factor for a prisoner on parole and it is not enough simply to direct a man to the Department of Employment or to tell him to read the employment vacancies advertised in the press. The Board realises that parolees are particularly vulnerable to national employment trends and to pressures related to the taking and keeping of a job: it still hopes that the Trades Unions may become more involved with the employment problems of parolees as well as of prisoners. It hopes to see social work departments developing contacts with employers and also themselves offering employment to parolees, for example, as trainees in their own establishments.

8. Accommodation and work are important parts of a parolee's social network, but so too is the use of leisure time. Many parolees have past patterns of heavy drinking often amounting to alcoholism. These people need help in developing drinking habits less dangerous to themselves and society. Similarly many aggressive young offenders need help in channelling their aggression constructively. The supervising officer must be concerned to introduce parolees to clubs of all kinds, to arrange for them to attend classes and to engage in sports. Such activities may build on interests developed in prison and offer the parolee a chance to make friends in a less deviant social group. For some parolees the most important thing the supervising officer can do is to provide them with an opportunity to help other people. Social workers should know from their personal experience how in helping others they may also help themselves and yet they seldom seem to engage parolees as volunteers in, for example, helping the aged or handicapped.

9. The kind of supervision the Board wants for those on parole requires a skilled caring social worker who must have the time and the energy to think and to act with and for the parolee. A social worker must be available virtually on demand when a crisis develops and must be able to visit the parolee where he lives as well as meet him in the office. This is impossible with a heavy case load and the demand arising therefrom. But the job cannot be left to the individual social worker. Each social work department must recognise the importance of care and supervision for those discharged from prison and develop resources accordingly. These should include the use of volunteers who are still almost entirely ignored in Scotland although they have a great deal to offer.

10. We have been describing what supervision should mean and in some areas the reality accords with this description. The Board is grateful to the social workers who with patience, care and imagination have helped those on parole. There are cases, however, where not only does supervision not match up to the Board's requirement, it sometimes does not appear to exist at all. The Board has received reports which show that some parolees were not seen personally by a social worker, or indeed had no social worker allocated to them for months at a time. Such reports were most often received from Glasgow. The Board realises the appalling social problems facing Glasgow and does not blame its over-pressed Social Work Department. It names Glasgow, however, as the outstanding example illustrating the problems which the public generally must acknowledge and face. If the community wishes adequate social services it must be prepared to pay for them.

11. Supervision after release is only part of what is required namely continuity of care for prisoners and their families. This should begin at the latest with an interview in the court immediately after conviction and followed by a visit to the prisoner's family. It should continue throughout the sentence and on into the period of resettlement in society. The Board hopes that such continuity may become accepted practice now that, since November 1973, the social work departments have assumed responsibility for prison welfare. Before November all prison welfare work in Scotland was being undertaken by 9 prison welfare officers. The Board recognises that they could not provide more than minimal 'first aid' with immediate welfare problems. It hopes that under the new arrangement social workers may be looking to the prisoner's release from the day of his sentence, as the prisoner himself does, and working not only with him but with his family as well.

12. Ultimately the success or failure of the parole system depends on community support: support not only for individual parolees, but support by the public for resources for social work departments. Discharged prisoners are not a group who attract much sympathy and in an integrated social work service there is a risk that their needs will go unmet while resources are used for other more obviously deserving groups. Such a policy is short-

sighted, for even if society is unwilling to do much for prisoners themselves, their wives and children, mothers and fathers are involved with them.

R. LEONARD SMALL, *Chairman*
ANTHONY ROSS
D. A. P. BARRY
J. B. W. CHRISTIE
E. I. W. HOBKIRK
ALLISON M. MORRIS
JOHN COOPER
JAS. A. ROBERTSON
WM. O. PATTULLO
WHEATLEY
HARRY B. MILLER
JAMES MILNE
HECTOR C. FOWLIE
J. MCINTYRE
PHYLIDA PARSLÖE
JAS. E. BURROW

G. PEARSON, *Secretary*
12 June 1974

PAROLE BOARD FOR SCOTLAND,
BROOMHOUSE DRIVE,
EDINBURGH, EH11 3UY.

Appreciation

The Board records its special appreciation of the services rendered by three of its members, Miss E. I. W. Hobkirk, Mrs A. M. Morris and Sheriff J. B. W. Christie, who retired during 1973. Their highly qualified knowledge and experience formed a valuable contribution to the Board's deliberations, for which the Board is most grateful.

The Very Rev. Dr R. L. SMALL, OBE, *Chairman* (retired December 1973)

When a new and controversial project is about to be launched it is vitally important that someone should head it who is highly respected and acceptable to the public. It was fitting therefore that the first Chairman of the Parole Board for Scotland should be the Very Rev. Dr Leonard Small, already well known nationally as a former Moderator of the Church of Scotland, as an excellent preacher and broadcaster, and as someone familiar with the problems of prisoners through his membership of the Scottish Advisory Council for Treatment of the Offender.

The responsibility laid upon the first Chairman of the Board was heavy not only in relation to the public but also in relation to the members of the Board itself and all those engaged in the history and treatment of offenders. It was recognised that a parole system could only be effective if developed in the context of a penal system itself appreciated and supported by the general public. The introduction of parole, with the risks which this necessarily involved, meant that fundamental issues would be forced upon public attention and would arouse from time to time deep emotion. The Parole Board, and especially its Chairman, would be called upon to answer to the public for its decisions.

The Board was fortunate in having a Chairman who did his own homework on each case with a thoroughness which set a high standard for everyone else but without ever attempting to superimpose his own views on those of his colleagues.

He saw how necessary it was that all members of the Board should be encouraged to contribute fully and freely to every case discussion in the light of their own experience and wide ranging disciplines. Although there were various changes in the composition of the Board during the six years of Dr Small's chairmanship, it never ceased to be a team working in harmony yet with the utmost frankness in all its discussions. This fortunate situation was due in no small measure to the wise guidance of Dr Small.

Both at meetings of the Board and in conferences, interviews, prison visits and meetings with the Press, Dr Small's knowledge of the subject combined with patience, good humour, compassion, fairness and obvious humility was invaluable. It is with warm gratitude that members of the Board wish to record their profound appreciation of all that he has done since the work of the Board began. Only when the history of parole in Scotland comes to be written will it be fully realised how great the contribution of its first Chairman has been.

APPENDIX

ANALYSIS OF REFERRALS TO AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE PAROLE BOARD FOR SCOTLAND DURING THE PERIOD 1.1.68 TO 31.12.73

Table 1—Fixed Term Sentences

	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
Completed eligible cases	795	655	740	693	775	789
Prisoners not wishing to be considered	173	157	206	234	216	195
Cases recommended by Local Review Committees	126	133	150	169	209	225
Cases not recommended by Local Review Committees	496	365	384	290	350	369
Cases recommended by Local Review Committees and referred to the Parole Board	99	129	147	164	207	212
Cases not recommended by Local Review Committees but referred to the Parole Board	24	41	67	74	56	65
Total cases referred to Parole Board	123	170	214	238	263	277+4*
Cases recommended for parole	55	105	137	138	139	166+2*
Cases recommended for early review	13	26	29	37	25	16
Cases not recommended	55	39	48	63	99	95+2*
Percentage recommended by Parole Board out of total cases referred	44.7	61.7	64	58	52.8	59.5

*short term C & YP cases for which there was insufficient time to refer to the LRC.

Table 2—Life and HMP Sentences

	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
Cases referred to Parole Board for consideration of early release	4	8	3	6	15	20
Cases recommended for parole	3	7	3	5	13	16
Cases recommended for early review	—	—	—	1	—	1
Cases not recommended	1	1	—	—	2	3
Cases referred to Board for information only	—	1	10	12	19	15

END