

**REPORT OF THE
PAROLE BOARD
FOR 1973**

Presented pursuant to Act Eliz. II 1967 c. 80 schedule 2(6).

*Ordered by The House of Commons to be printed
17th June 1974*

LONDON

HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

31p net

143

16382

Great Britain - ~~REPORT OF THE~~
~~PAROLE BOARD - PART, 1973~~
~~FOR 1973~~

Presented pursuant to Act Eliz. II 1967 c. 80 schedule 2(6).

*Ordered by The House of Commons to be printed
17th June 1974*

LONDON
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

31p net

CONTENTS

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Paragraphs</i>
MEMBERSHIP OF THE BOARD	
FOREWORD	
I. PURPOSES OF PAROLE	
Introduction	1-9
The purposes of parole	10
General	11-12
Advantages	13
The public interest	14-16
Disadvantages	17
II. PAROLE SELECTION AND PROCEDURES	
Paroles in 1973	18-20
Life sentences	21-25
Recommendations not accepted by the Home Secretary... ..	26
Prisoners who opt out	27
The process of selection	28-30
Consideration by the Local Review Committee	31
Consideration by the Parole Board	32-33
Grant of parole without reference to the Board	34
Chances of being paroled	35
III. INFORMATION AND CRITERIA	
General points	36-38
Special points—Reports from Probation Officers	39
Prison reports	40
Medical reports	41
The prisoner's representations	42
Recommendations by Local Review Committees	43
Criteria for selection	44
The risk	45
The prisoner's response	46
The prisoner's needs	47
The offence	48
The decision	49
Reasons for refusal	50
IV. THE PAROLE LICENCE	
The normal licence	51-52
Special conditions	53-58
Duration of licence	59
Effects of supervision	60-61
Failures to observe the licence	62-68
Extracts from reports on parolees	69-74
Recalls and revocation	75
Releases after recall	76

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Paragraphs</i>
V. COMMUNICATION AND LIAISON	
Board meetings	77-79
Visits to prisons	80-81
Visits to probation areas	82
Visits to police forces	83
Lectures and conferences	84-86
Evidence to the Interdepartmental Committee	87
Press and public	88
Overseas visits	89-90
VI. RESEARCH	
Reviews of the parole system	91
Research	92
VII. SECRETARIAT	93-95
VIII. PAROLE IN PERSPECTIVE	96-106
<i>Appendices</i>	<i>Pages</i>
1 Statistics of Parole Recommendations in 1973	28-35
2 Extracts from the Criminal Justice Act 1972 (Section 35) and Schedule 5 to the Act	36-37
3 Overseas Visitors to the Parole Board during 1973	38
4 Parole Research (the work of the Home Office Research Unit)	39

MEMBERSHIP OF THE PAROLE BOARD ON 1 JANUARY 1974

THE Rt. HON LORD HUNT OF LLANVAIR WATERDINE, C.B.E., D.S.O.
(*Chairman*)

THE HON. MR. JUSTICE SHAW (*Vice Chairman*)

THE HON. MRS. S. M. BARING, J.P.

MR. R. H. BEESON, O.B.E.

MR. J. BLISS, Q.P.M.

PROFESSOR G. J. BORRIE

HIS HONOUR JUDGE B. D. BUSH

DR. J. P. CHILD, B.M., M.R.C.P., F.R.C.PSYCH., D.P.M.

MR. A. E. COX

MRS. P. M. DAVID, J.P.

HIS HONOUR JUDGE R. DAVID, Q.C., D.L.

PROFESSOR T. C. M. GIBBENS, M.B.E., M.D., M.R.C.P., F.R.C.PSYCH., D.P.M.

MR. J. BRUCE GLEN

MR. R. HARRIS, O.B.E.

MISS S. A. HIMMEL

LADY HOWE, J.P.

MRS. M. INNES

DR. E. JACOBY, M.D.(BASLE), F.R.C.PSYCH., D.P.M.

MR. H. J. KLARE, C.B.E.

MRS. S. KOMROWER, J.P.

MR. D. LOWSON

MR. J. W. MARSH

DR. N. J. DE V. MATHER, M.A., M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.PSYCH., D.P.M.

DR. J. D. MORTIMER, M.A.

THE HON. MR. JUSTICE O'CONNOR

MR. P. L. OSBORNE

DR. M. A. PARTRIDGE, D.M., F.R.C.P., F.R.C.PSYCH., D.P.M.

SIR LOUIS PETCH, K.C.B.

DR. P. D. SCOTT, M.A., M.D., F.R.C.P., F.R.C.PSYCH., D.P.M.

MR. P. P. SHERVINGTON, O.B.E.

MR. A. F. WILCOX, C.B.E., Q.P.M.

THE HON. MR. JUSTICE WILLIS

MR. A. WORTHY, O.B.E.

MR. A. YATES, K.P.M.

MR. H. L. J. GONSALVES—*Secretary*

Membership of the Parole Board during 1973

THE Rt. HON LORD HUNT of Llan-
vaair Waterdine, C.B.E., D.S.O. Chairman.

THE HON. MR. JUSTICE SHAW ... Vice Chairman; Judge of the High Court of
Justice, Queen's Bench Division.

THE HON. MRS. S. M. BARING, Member of the Hampshire Probation and
J.P. After-Care Committee.

THE HON. MR. JUSTICE BEAN, Judge of the High Court of Justice, Queen's
O.B.E. (died November 1973) Bench Division.

MR. R. H. BEESON, O.B.E. ... Deputy Principal Probation Inspector,
Home Office, until his retirement in 1970.

MISS E. M. BLACKFORD (retired Headmistress of a comprehensive school in
in June 1973) West London.

MR. J. BLISS, Q.P.M. (appointed National co-ordinator of Regional Crime
in October 1973) Squads until his retirement from the
Metropolitan Police in 1973.

PROFESSOR G. J. BORRIE ... Professor of English Law; Director of the
Institute of Judicial Administration, Uni-
versity of Birmingham.

MR. J. BRADLEY, M.Ed., Dip. Lecturer in Educational Psychology, Uni-
Psych. (Oxon), A.B.P.S. (re- versity of Leicester.
tired in April 1973)

HIS HONOUR JUDGE B. D. BUSH... Circuit Judge.

MR. R. CALDERWOOD, Ll.B. (re- Town Clerk of Manchester.
signed in March 1973)

DR. J. P. CHILD, B.M., M.R.C.P., Consultant Psychiatrist.
F.R.C.Psych., D.P.M. (ap-
pointed in August 1973)

MR. A. E. COX Practising solicitor; Recorder.

MRS. P. M. DAVID, J.P. (appointed Chairman of Pontefract Magistrates Court;
in March 1973) Chairman of Pontefract Probation and
After-Care Committee; Member of West
Yorkshire Police Authority.

HIS HONOUR JUDGE R. DAVID, Circuit Judge; Member of the Cheshire
Q.C., D.L. Probation and After-Care Committee.

MR. S. R. ESHELBY, M.B.E. Principal Probation Officer, Essex, until his
(retired in June 1973) retirement in 1969.

PROFESSOR T. C. M. GIBBENS, Professor of Forensic Psychiatry, Institute of
M.B.E., M.D., M.R.C.P., Psychiatry, University of London.
F.R.C.Psych., D.P.M.

MR. J. BRUCE GLEN Businessman; Formerly Chairman of Local Review Committee, Gartree Prison.

MR. R. HARRIS, O.B.E. ... Governor of Wakefield Prison until his retirement from the Prison Service in 1970; Chairman of Devon Prisoners' Aid Society; Member of the Devon and Exeter Probation and After-Care Committee.

MISS S. A. HIMMEL (appointed in July 1973) Assistant Principal Probation Officer, Middlesex Probation and After-Care Service.

DR. R. HOOD (retired in February 1973) Assistant Director of Research, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge.

LADY HOWE, J.P. Chairman of Camberwell Juvenile Court; Member of Lord Chancellor's Legal Aid Advisory Committee.

MRS. M. INNES Voluntary worker with Birmingham Probation and After-Care Service.

DR. E. JACOBY, M.D. (Basle), F.R.C.Psych., D.P.M. Consultant Psychiatrist.

MR. H. J. KLARE, C.B.E. ... Member of the Gloucestershire Probation and After-Care Committee and of the Board of Visitors of Long Lartin Prison; Formerly Head of the Division of Penal and Criminological Questions, Council of Europe.

MRS. S. KOMROWER, J.P. ... Member of "William House" After-Care Hostel Committee; Formerly a member of Visiting Committee, Manchester Prison; Secretary of Manchester Criminological Society.

MR. D. LOWSON (appointed in September 1973) Lecturer in Sociology, University of Liverpool.

MR. J. W. MARSH Principal Probation Officer, South East Lancashire Probation and After-Care Service.

DR. N. J. de V. MATHER, M.A., M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.Psych., D.P.M. Consultant Psychiatrist, Manchester Regional Hospital Board and Dobroyd Castle School; Member of the Home Office panel of Psychiatrists; Lecturer in Forensic Psychiatry, University of Manchester.

DR. J. D. MORTIMER, M.A. (appointed in July 1973) Principal, Thames Valley College, Twickenham.

THE HON. MR. JUSTICE O'CONNOR Judge of the High Court of Justice, Queen's Bench Division.

MR. P. L. OSBORNE (appointed in May 1973) Businessman, South Wales; Formerly a member of the Local Review Committee, Swansea Prison.

DR. M. A. PARTRIDGE, D.M. F. R. C. P., F. R. C. Psych., D.P.M. (retired from the Board in December 1971 and was re-appointed in November 1973) Consultant Psychiatrist.

SIR LOUIS PETCH, K.C.B. (appointed in October 1973) Chairman designate; Previously Chairman of H.M. Board of Customs and Excise.

DR. H. R. ROLLIN, M.D., M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.Psych., D.P.M. (retired in July 1973) Consultant Psychiatrist, Horton Hospital, Epsom, Surrey.

DR. G. ROSE (retired in August 1973) Reader in Social Administration, University of Manchester.

DR. P. D. SCOTT, M.A., M.D., F. R. C. P., F. R. C. Psych., D.P.M. (appointed in January 1973) Consultant Psychiatrist, The Maudsley Hospital, Denmark Hill, London, SE5.

MR. P. P. SHERVINGTON, O.B.E. Deputy Principal Probation Officer, Inner London Probation and After-Care Service.

MR. H. A. SKINNER, Q.C. (retired in March 1973) Recorder of Leicester.

MR. A. F. WILCOX, C.B.E., Q.P.M. Chief Constable of Hertfordshire until his retirement in 1969.

MR. A. WORTHY, O.B.E. ... Principal Probation Officer, Birmingham Probation and After-Care Service.

MR. A. YATES, K.P.M. (appointed in April 1973) Secretary of Wood Street Mission, Manchester; Previously Chief Superintendent, Manchester City Police.

FOREWORD

When the Parole Board came into existence in 1967, the Criminal Justice Act had provided for its structure, its functions and its administration; but as it was destitute of prior experience, it needed to be given impulse and inspiration as well as direction. Fortunately, Lord Hunt was available to undertake, as the first Chairman of the Board, the task of infusing the parole system with those qualities and making it work as a practical social institution. He has just left us after carrying the burden for almost two years beyond the prescribed tenure of five years. He leaves behind a profound gratitude for his inspiring leadership. The impact of his courageous guidance, his true humanity and his objective justness is as inestimable as it will be enduring. There remains with us an abiding loyalty to his high principle and a sense of deep personal affection. We take this opportunity to salute him and to wish him well in his future undertakings.

In November 1973, the Board sustained a grievous loss by the death of the Hon. Mr. Justice Bean. He was among its most valued and cherished members and his wise and compassionate counsels are greatly missed.

SEBAG SHAW

Vice Chairman

REPORT OF THE PAROLE BOARD FOR 1973

To the Rt. Hon. Roy Jenkins, MP, Secretary of State for the Home Department

CHAPTER I—PURPOSES OF PAROLE

Introduction

1. Parole is the early and conditional release of selected prisoners serving determinate sentences of over eighteen months, either after completing twelve months in prison or one third of their sentence, whichever is the longer period. For example a prisoner serving three years or less becomes eligible to be considered for parole after one year. If, however, he has a six year sentence he does not become so eligible until two years are up, and so on. The final one third of a sentence is normally remitted but some remission may be lost for serious misconduct in prison. Most prisoners are discharged after serving two thirds of their sentence without statutory supervision. Earlier release on parole provides such supervision as well as support in the community. But because of the existence of remission, the opportunity for parole arises only during the middle third of the sentence.

2. Different conditions apply to Young Prisoners sentenced before the age of 21 and those who are given Extended Sentences or life sentences. All of these are subject to supervision on leaving prison. In the case of Young Prisoners or those serving an Extended Sentence, this supervision may continue after a period of parole. Prisoners serving life sentences remain on licence for the whole of their lives and are therefore subject to recall at any time should the circumstances warrant it.

3. Parole is not home leave, nor is it working outside prison in the final part of a sentence on the pre-release employment scheme. The successful completion of a period of home leave or pre-release employment scheme may be prior conditions for granting parole.

4. Parole is not a right. It is an administrative modification, at the discretion of the Home Secretary, of the manner in which the sentence set by the court is served. The individual concerned continues his sentence but in the community outside prison and subject to certain conditions.

5. The Criminal Justice Act 1967 requires that all eligible prisoners who do not opt out of the parole scheme be considered in good time for release at the parole eligibility date. Thereafter reviews normally take place at annual intervals.

6. Local Review Committees were established at all the prisons holding prisoners eligible for parole. These Committees consist of a senior member of the prison staff, members of the Board of Visitors, of the Probation and After-Care-Service and of representatives of the public. Parole Boards, one for England and Wales and another for Scotland, were set up to which the Home Secretary or the Secretary of State for Scotland could at his discretion refer cases after review by the local committees. Parliament decided that the final responsibility for release on licence should rest with the appropriate Secretary of State.

7. The Board for England and Wales is composed of thirty three members. It includes judges, psychiatrists, probation officers, criminologists and lay persons, some with special experience of offenders.

8. Prisoners released on parole are subject to the supervision of a probation officer and must comply with conditions laid down in the licence for their release. Failure to comply with any condition may result in a revocation of the licence and recall to prison, or a warning letter from the Home Secretary. The normal procedure is for the Home Office Parole Unit to refer a report from the supervising officer to the Parole Board, who may recommend either of the above actions. In an emergency, however, the Home Office has the authority to recall an individual immediately and then to refer the case to the Board. In all cases, the Board will consider any representations made by the prisoner and may order the release of the prisoner or confirm the revocation of his licence.

9. Alternatively, a parole licence may be revoked by a higher court under Section 62(7) of the Criminal Justice Act 1967 when a person has been convicted of a further offence while on parole.

The purposes of parole

10. These were originally set out in the White Paper "The Adult Offender" published in 1965. The following paragraphs seek to amplify the ideas of the White Paper, in the light of experience since the scheme started in 1968.

General

11. The main point of the parole system is that it provides an opportunity for the early release on licence of certain prisoners, taking into account all the relevant information including that which becomes available subsequent to the imposition of the sentence. It is not part of the Parole Board's function to review the propriety of the sentence itself.

12. It is now accepted that imprisonment is often an expedient of last resort. It is expensive and wasteful of human resources and alternatives to imprisonment are being increasingly provided for minor offenders. There may be no feasible alternative to imprisonment for the protection of the public against persons convicted of serious crimes. But it is consistent with the trend towards the minimum use of imprisonment to consider periodically during a prisoner's sentence whether the interests of both the community and the prisoner himself require his continued detention, or whether more good may be done by releasing him on licence and under the supervision and care of a probation officer until the date on which he would in most cases be discharged from prison.

Advantages

13. The benefits which parole can bring both the community and prisoners are as follows:—

- (a) the possibility of parole provides an encouragement for prisoners and may induce them to make the best use of training facilities provided;
- (b) parole fits in logically with those purposes and methods of prison treatment which seek to prepare a prisoner for resettlement into the community and to lead a law abiding life on discharge. The prison

authorities provide various opportunities for progressive freedom from constraint, e.g. employment outside prisons, open prisons, pre-release hostels and home leave;

- (c) statutory supervision and support by a probation officer may lessen the danger of a return to crime and help the prisoner settle into a home and employment. It may also remind him that he is still liable to recall;
- (d) in the case of prisoners serving very long sentences parole can help to prevent their becoming so institutionalised as to render them incapable of leading a normal life in the community;
- (e) the need for prison staff to report on the suitability of prisoners for parole helps them to focus their attention on individual offenders, their response to treatment and the need to make realistic and acceptable plans for life on release;
- (f) parole can give a prisoner hope and confidence especially if he has seldom experienced trust and has not thought of himself as trust-worthy.

The public interest

14. The purposes of parole must be reconciled with the function of imprisonment in protecting the public. It is obvious that if society segregates an individual who has preyed on others or has been a danger to them, he cannot pursue his criminal activities. Moreover, detention itself may deter him from committing further offences and serve as a warning to others.

15. The public interest must be the most important consideration in selection for parole. A total absence of risk could never be a condition of selection, since few or none would then be granted parole; but public opinion would object, and rightly, if the parole system were so administered as to undermine the intentions of the courts and the sanctions of the criminal law. The grant of parole must not be based or appear to be based on foolish optimism and misplaced clemency.

16. There is no means of guaranteeing that the right decision is taken in every case. A parole decision is based on an assessment of the likely consequences of granting parole or of leaving a prisoner to finish his sentence in custody. No one can be sure of the future response of an individual to a variety of unknown circumstances. In relation to a determinate sentence, the question is not whether to release but when. The problem is to weigh the potential advantage of parole against the potential risk to the public, remembering that early release is conditional, accompanied by the supervision and support of a probation officer and subject to recall if things go wrong while discharge from prison without parole usually means the unconditional release of a prisoner who may have no work, no home or no support.

Disadvantages

17. The possibility of paroling a prisoner who then reoffends, particularly if the new crime is at all serious, is clearly one of the dangers inherent in parole. But there are also problems in refusing parole. The introduction of the possibility of parole has not been, from the point of view of most

prisoners, an unmixed blessing. Whilst it has undoubtedly aroused hopes, it has also caused anxiety and uncertainty about the end of imprisonment, and the refusal to grant parole naturally produces disappointment. These difficulties cannot be ignored and need to be borne in mind before the Board reaches its decisions.

CHAPTER II—PAROLE SELECTION AND PROCEDURES

Paroles in 1973

18. During the year the Board considered the cases of 4,421 prisoners serving determinate sentences (for life sentence cases see paragraph 21). This is 29 cases fewer than in 1972, since they exclude those cases dealt with under the procedure described in paragraph 34 and about which some statistics are summarised in paragraph 19. Out of the 4,421 cases considered by the Board, 2,531 prisoners or 57.25 per cent of cases were recommended for parole.

19. In addition 813 prisoners were paroled on the recommendation of the Local Review Committees only and without reference to the Board under the procedure described in paragraph 34. This makes a grand total of 3,344 prisoners serving fixed sentences who were recommended for parole in 1973, compared with 2,926 prisoners recommended for parole in 1972. The number of those paroled has therefore increased by 418 or 14.29 per cent as compared with 1972.

20. 10,614 cases were dealt with during 1973. 768 prisoners declined to be considered, leaving the Local Review Committees 9,846 cases to be considered. Of these 5,914 were not recommended; and 3,932 were favourably considered by the Local Review Committees. Of the 4,421 cases eventually referred to the Board, 1,302 had been considered unsuitable for parole by the Local Review Committees; and of the 2,531 who were actually paroled, 284 had not been recommended by the Local Review Committees.

Life sentences

21. The Board considered the cases of 206 prisoners serving life sentences; of these 120 were considered unsuitable for release and 62 were recommended as suitable for release on licence at a date about a year ahead, subject to good behaviour in the meantime. Also 1 prisoner whose life licence had been revoked was recommended for immediate release (further details are given in the table at paragraph 24). The Home Secretary was unable to accept 5 recommendations. The 63 cases recommended for release included 47 convicted of murder; 8 of manslaughter; 2 of arson; 1 of rape; 1 of causing an explosion and causing bodily harm by an explosion; 1 of wounding with intent; 1 of wounding with intent, attempted buggery and common assault; 1 of wounding with intent to murder; and 1 of unlawful intercourse, indecent assault on a child. Of the 63 cases recommended for release, 18 were under the age of 21 years when the offence was committed.

22. Life sentence cases are normally reviewed after seven years and thereafter at appropriate intervals. Before 1973 responsibility for deciding

at what time the first formal review of a "life" sentence should be made lay with the Home Office. Discussions took place during 1972 as a result of which the Home Secretary agreed that the Board should play a part in determining this important question and he so informed Parliament on 21 June 1973.

23. This procedure is now working satisfactorily and a joint sub-committee of Board members and officials recommends when a life sentence prisoner's case should be referred to the Local Review Committee.

24. Those serving life sentences who were recommended for release in 1973 will have served for the following periods:—

Number of complete years served ...	2	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	15	16
Number of prisoners ...	1	3	3	8	14	11	6	2	2	1	1

In addition to these 52 cases, 5 cases recommended by the Parole Board were subsequently refused by the Home Secretary. There were also 6 recall cases recommended for further release, who will have been detained for 1½ years, 1 month, 8 years, 2 years, 1 year and 2 years respectively since their recall. This means that altogether they will have been detained for 11 years, 7 years, 17 years, 10 years, 9 years and 6 years respectively in total.

25. The table below shows that there was an increase in the number of life sentence cases referred to the Board during 1973 compared with the previous year:—

	1973	1972
Cases referred to the Board ...	206	143
Cases recommended for release ...	62	54
Cases not recommended for release ...	120	78
Recalls: licence based on Board's recommendation ...	2	2
licensed before Board became operative ...	2	1
released immediately on consideration of prisoner's representations ...	1	—
Cases referred for variation and cancellation of conditions, review of release date etc. ...	19	8

Recommendations not accepted by the Home Secretary

26. In 1973 the Home Secretary was unable to accept the following recommendations for release on licence: 16 prisoners serving determinate sentences and 5 prisoners serving indeterminate sentences. The reasons for differing from the Board's views included policy concerning the nature and gravity of the offence and the perception of risk to the public.

Prisoners who opt out

27. 768 prisoners refused to be considered for parole or 7 per cent. of the number eligible. 5.47 per cent of prisoners eligible for parole refused to be considered on the occasion of their first review. For those coming up for a second or subsequent review the percentage was 12.68 even though the expectation of obtaining parole is higher after a first review. The reasons for opting out are being examined by the Home Office Research Unit.

The process of selection

28. The process begins with the compilation of a dossier. This is often voluminous. We are well aware of the burden placed upon the many people concerned in contributing to it, collating the material and reproducing the resulting document for consideration by a Local Review Committee; by the Parole Unit of the Home Office; by the Secretariat and a panel of the Parole Board; and occasionally by a Minister. For subsequent reviews the whole process must be repeated with additional information bringing the dossier up to date.

29. Summaries or other forms of simplifying and shortening the dossier would save the Board much time. But it would greatly add to the administrative problems and it would also detract from the relative completeness of the portrait of a personality which emerges. It must be emphasised that the dossier is the very corner-stone of parole. All recommendations and decisions are based on the information contained in it. We are constantly concerned with this information, its nature and its form. Much of Chapter III is concerned with this important subject and with some of the efforts we have made during the year to elicit the right kind of information.

30. The decision-making process is very thorough and it takes an average of three and a half months between the time a prisoner is interviewed by a member of a Local Review Committee to the time he is informed of the parole decision. Sometimes it may take even longer—for example, when additional information is required; or when, very occasionally, it is decided for a special reason to refer a case to another panel.

Consideration by the Local Review Committee

31. Every dossier is first studied and discussed by a panel of the Local Review Committee. All dossiers are then processed by the Home Office, which refers to the Board all cases favourably recommended by Local Review Committees, with the exception of the cases referred to in paragraph 34, as well as certain other cases which are not so recommended. Those cases which are neither recommended by Local Review Committees nor referred to the Board, are refused by the Home Office on behalf of the Home Secretary.

Consideration by the Parole Board

32. The Board works in panels of about five members, normally including a judge, a psychiatrist and a principal probation officer and whenever possible a criminologist. Each member has a different background and points of view are likely to differ. The composition of panels is changed constantly to ensure a high degree of consistency of decision-making within the Board as a whole. The chairmanship rotates among all members and the proceedings are purposely informal, to allow for full and frank discussion.

33. Membership of the Board does not normally exceed three years, partly to guard against the danger of entrenched attitudes, and partly on account of the heavy burden on members who, in most cases, are already engaged professionally in other work. It is generally felt that the cumulative effect of reading large numbers of case dossiers cannot easily be sustained for longer.

Grant of parole without reference to the Board

34. The "devolutionary measure" foreshadowed in last year's Report has now got under way. Section 35 of the Criminal Justice Act 1972 which came into force on 1 January 1973 empowers the Home Secretary, in such class of cases agreed with the Parole Board, to release prisoners on licence on the recommendation of the Local Review Committee without first seeking the advice of the Board. At present cases thus dealt with do not include sentences of three years or more or offences of violence, sex, arson or drug trafficking and the recommendation of the Local Review Committee must be unanimously favourable. 813 prisoners were released on licence under this procedure in 1973.

Chances of being paroled

35. The ratio of parolees to those who complete the balance of their sentence (less remission) in prison is at present of the order of 40:60. It is important to stress this fact in order to allay misunderstanding and uncertainty both among prisoners and the public at large.

CHAPTER III—INFORMATION AND CRITERIA

General Points

36. What we hope to see emerge from the dossier as a whole is the picture of a personality; the family background and something of the neighbourhood in which he grew up; achievements and failures at school, at work and in relationships with others, including marriage; the onset of criminal behaviour, its developing pattern, the nature of the present offence(s) and any relevant factors such as drink. Previous sentences indicate whether there has been experience of institutions and what the response may have been to probation or a previous period on licence. The initial reaction to the sentence may vary from equanimity to depression and sometimes to a period of angry rebellion.

37. We need information about the prisoner's adjustment to, or reaction against, the régime and whether he has made use of whatever facilities are available in the prison. Impressions of character and personality are valuable and it is helpful to know how a prisoner feels about himself and how he relates to others. Any personal handicap, whether physical, intellectual or educational, helps to build up a portrait of the person, his problems and his prospects.

38. It is also important to be informed of personal relationships outside the prison, both before and during the period of detention. It may be helpful to know if a wife, other family members and any friends are supportive to the prisoner; what special problems may have been created by his absence from his family or may arise when he rejoins them. In this connection we are aware that prisoners tend to remember the situation as it was before entering prison and may find it difficult to appreciate the adjustments which time and circumstance have brought about at home.

Special Points

39. *Reports from Probation Officers.* The social enquiry report made to the trial court gives a picture of the individual's home background, work record, contacts with the Probation and After-Care Service and response to previous supervision ordered by the courts. This report is supplemented by the prison welfare officer, who may bring up to date domestic information from his contacts with the prisoner and with his colleagues in the area where the prisoner lives. The welfare officer is often able to comment on the prisoner's personality, attitudes and needs and his probable response to statutory supervision. We also receive a home circumstances report from an officer in the Probation and After-Care Service where the prisoner will return to live and work with the information about the family and work prospects; or about other accommodation if the person has no home to go to. All these reports are essential to our assessment for parole, and are of a high standard.

40. *Prison reports.* From the different members of the prison service we look for information about behaviour in prison, vocational training, educational attainments, social activities and descriptions of character traits. We much appreciate the excellent pen portraits we often receive from uniformed officers and prison chaplains as well as by assistant and deputy governors.

41. *Medical reports.* Many prisoners have an unremarkable medical history so that no special information is called for. But in cases of odd or apparently motiveless crimes (and these may include arson, sex offences and violence against the person) and of marked personality disturbances, up to date psychiatric assessments (with information about previous treatment and its effects, if any, advisability of continued treatment, and a prognosis) are required. In the case of long-term prisoners it is desirable to have information about their day to day behaviour with special reference to such matters as apathy, depression, response to stress and signs of deterioration.

42. *The prisoner's representations.* The prisoner is entitled to make his case for being granted parole. Those who cannot easily express themselves in writing may be assisted by the prison staff or a fellow prisoner. In addition, a member of the Local Review Committee reports his discussion with the prisoner, and may add anything which has not yet been said or sufficiently emphasised in his representations.

43. *Recommendations by Local Review Committees.* The reasons given by Local Review Committees in making their recommendations are the only formal communications about prisoners between the Committees and the Board. We therefore attach great importance to receiving detailed reasons for or against parole.

44. *Criteria for selection.* The criteria used by Local Review Committees and the Board derive from guidelines proposed to Parliament by the late Lord Stonham, Minister of State in the Home Office during the Second Reading debate of the Criminal Justice Bill in 1967. Based on all the available information and opinion referred to in paragraphs 36 to 43, the criteria by which the Board makes its recommendations are summarised in paragraphs 45 to 49.

45. *The risk.* In the light of the prisoner's criminal record, personality, attitudes, criminal associates and relevant medical information about him, is the risk of his re-offending likely to be reduced and the prospect of his rehabilitation enhanced by his early release and by a period of statutory supervision and support in the community; or is it preferable to release him unconditionally at the end of his sentence? If the nature of the risk is likely to give rise to public alarm as the result of a further offence being committed during the parole period, might this give rise to widespread publicity and be damaging to the parole system itself?

46. *The prisoner's response.* Has the prisoner shown, by his own efforts to respond constructively to prison treatment, by the advantage he may have taken of training facilities, or by his concern for any dependants and his plans for the future, that he wishes to steer clear of crime?

47. *The prisoner's needs.* Does the information about the prisoner indicate that he is likely to fail again on leaving prison without statutory supervision and support? May such help from a supervising officer also be needed to solve any family or employment problems? May release at this stage create additional domestic difficulties? Are his needs best met by a long or a relatively short period on parole?

48. *The offence.* This is the most difficult of the criteria which we were enjoined to consider. It is true that the sentence already reflects the nature and gravity of the offence and any previous offences. The Board has, however, always agreed on the need to act in broad consonance with sentencing policy and notes pertinent remarks by the judge or the Court of Appeal, which may indicate the intention of the Courts regarding the offender or others like him involved in particularly heinous crimes. When several prisoners were involved in an offence, differences in their sentences may need to be taken into account in considering the appropriate date for parole. Another factor to be borne in mind may be that a large amount of property or cash, obtained as a result of the crime, has not been recovered. Finally, there are a few notorious crimes which have attracted wide publicity and created serious public indignation and anxiety. In making its recommendations to the Home Secretary, the Board discusses these various aspects, one or more of which may lead us to conclude that parole, at least at the first review in a long sentence, is not appropriate, despite other favourable features in the case.

49. *The decision.* This is reached after balancing all the factors, some of which may conflict with each other, in order to determine where the advantage, to the prisoner as well as the public, appears to lie. Where these two interests appear to be opposed, our perception of the public interest prevails.

50. *Reasons for refusal.* Our discussions about giving prisoners reasons for the refusal of parole have continued with the Home Office. We are well aware of the importance which many people place on this issue which is, however, by no means simple to resolve.

CHAPTER IV—THE PAROLE LICENCE

The normal licence

51. The normal conditions of the parole licence are that:—an offender shall report, without delay, to the officer in charge of the probation and after-care office and place himself under the supervision of whichever probation officer is nominated for this purpose from time to time; further, he shall keep in touch with his probation officer in accordance with that officer's instructions and inform him at once if he changes his address or changes or loses his job; if his probation officer so requires, he must receive visits from that officer where he, the licence-holder, is living; finally, the paroled offender must be of good behaviour and lead an industrious life throughout his licence period.

52. For some prisoners about to be paroled accommodation has to be arranged. Some of them also have jobs waiting for them but many employers are understandably unwilling to engage a man before his release from prison. The experience and assistance of probation officers in this situation is a useful aspect of parole.

Special conditions

53. 368 or 11 per cent. of prisoners were released on parole in 1973 who had no known home of their own. They had to be found hostel accommodation, lodgings or perhaps a bed-sitter. Their licence was likely to have a special condition that they should "reside where approved by the probation officer". Similarly, if the prisoner's work record was poor or if a particular type of employment was conducive to the commission of offences, his licence was likely to have a condition that he should "work as approved by the probation officer". When a prisoner's criminal record shows that his offences have derived from, or were connected with, a particular kind of job, or from being self-employed, the Board may make a specific condition "not to be employed in . . .".

54. The question of medical treatment after release arises from time to time. Where this is for some physical condition, problems do not usually ensue but with psychiatric disturbances consideration may have to be given to the desirability of introducing into the terms of the licence some requirement concerning treatment. Some prisoners are not sufficiently troubled by their behaviour or its social effects to want to co-operate or persist in treatment, and for them such special conditions are usually inappropriate. The best chance for psychiatric treatment lies in the prisoner's willingness to have it but there are some who for some reason have difficulty in making and keeping a resolution even though they may be in favour of treatment. This may be satisfactorily re-enforced by imposing a condition of treatment. Where the need for psychiatric treatment is established and the means of providing it have been arranged, preferably with a doctor who already knows and has a good relationship with the offender, the licence may then contain a condition that the released person should receive treatment at a particular hospital under the direction of a certain doctor. Such a condition may also serve to emphasise, to all concerned, an offender's needs.

55. Occasionally there may appear to be a degree of risk to a particular person when a prisoner is released. For instance, there may have been threats to a divorced wife, or danger to a child against whom the prisoner has previously offended. If, despite this the balance of advantage is in release on parole, the Board may decide to make a special condition: "not to contact . . . without permission of the supervising officer". Under this condition probation officers are empowered to refuse parolees permission to contact the person at risk; to supervise the visit, or, if appropriate, to involve the local social services department.

56. Exceptionally, the Board recommends that the conditions of a parole or a Young Prisoner licence should be relaxed, in recognition of good response to supervision and clear evidence that the parolee has been successfully rehabilitated into the community. The parolee is then no longer required to report to his supervising officer but remains liable to recall if he re-offends.

57. When requests to travel abroad while on parole are referred to the Board, permission is recommended only when there are special grounds for the journey and when no foreseeable risks are involved.

58. When a Court has recommended that a prisoner should be deported at the conclusion of his sentence, the Board considers the case for parole on the premise that the prisoner would remain under supervision in the United Kingdom until his final date of discharge at the end of his sentence. A release plan, with satisfactory accommodation in this country is, therefore, a requisite for parole in such cases.

Duration of licence

59. The average length of licence for 1973 was again eight months. To place this period in perspective it must be remembered that about one half of all those prisoners who are eligible for parole are serving sentences of less than three years and that such sentences allow for less than twelve months on parole. The longest period on licence granted last year exceeded three years. During 1973 2,428 prisoners (32 per cent.) were released on, or close to, the earliest date on which they became eligible. Statistics about the length of licence in relation to the length of sentence may be found in Appendix 1, Table 3.

Effects of supervision

60. Records of the supervision of each parolee are prepared by probation officers but it is appreciated that many officers commence their records from the day of sentence and have assisted offenders and their families while they have been in prison. At the time of recommending parole, the Board sometimes asks to see terminal reports and, occasionally, calls for other "interim" reports during the licence. This "feed-back" provides valuable information about the effects of supervision and support, as well as about the efforts of the parolee himself to cope with the problems which he has experienced after leaving prison. From time to time members of the Board have met parolees with their supervising officers to gain first hand impressions of the results of granting parole, and to discuss difficulties in regard to release plans and procedures.

61. We cannot stress too strongly the importance of this communication between the Board and the Probation and After-Care Service, since the period of supervision is such an essential component of the system. We would like to pay tribute to the care and skill of probation officers, and to acknowledge the efforts of the great majority of parolees to make a success of parole.

Failures to observe the licence

62. Further reports are submitted by supervising officers when parolees fail to comply with the conditions of their licence. When those infringements appear to merit the attention of the Home Office, reports are forwarded by the Principal Probation Officer, with any recommendation for action; appropriate cases are then referred to the Board.

63. During 1973 384 cases were referred to us and of these we recommended that the licence be revoked and the person be recalled to prison in 233 (parolees only) cases. When expressed in relation to the total number of parole recommendations made in 1973, this means that 7.54 per cent. were recalled compared with 8.1 per cent. in 1972. In 118 further cases we recommended that a formal warning letter be sent to the parolee; in 33 cases no action was taken. Of the 233 cases where a recall order was made, 109 (46.78 per cent.) were because of convictions for fresh offences. In addition, the Courts revoked parole licences in 13 cases, compared with 16 in 1972.

64. A further 110 paroled prisoners who were not recalled to prison, were convicted and sentenced after the completion of their parole periods but for offences committed while still on licence. Although we may have been aware that charges had been brought, we are usually reluctant to recall a person to prison before he has been found guilty, and without regard to the decision of the Court.

65. During the six years of the parole scheme, out of 14,443 offenders paroled only 46 serving sentences for serious crimes of violence or for major sex offences have been further convicted of similar offences.

66. When reports resulting in recall to prison indicate that there may be important lessons to learn from the failure on parole which are helpful to our future work, a full review is undertaken by all members of the Board. In 1973 6 such reviews were made.

67. It is important to view failures to observe the conditions of a parole licence against the background of the individual person. For many inadequate and insecure offenders, with a disturbed or deprived upbringing, a poor work record and numerous prison sentences, it may be a considerable achievement to survive without a fresh conviction for longer than previously in the community, even with the statutory support of a probation officer. In such cases minor infringements of licence, including some petty offence, may not justify recall to prison. A report of one such example is at paragraph 74. Even when recall is necessary, something may have been gained as a result of parole.

68. For the reason given in paragraphs 64 and 67, and because of those convictions which have taken place after the licence has expired (paragraph

64) the actual numbers recalled to prison should not be taken as a true indication of parole failures.

Extracts from reports on parolees

69. Below are extracts of reports by probation officers which indicate that the parole period has often but not invariably been used constructively.

70. "... continues to report precisely as required and his general performance seems quite sound.

"Shortly after his marriage ... changed his work and is now employed in the stores department of ... In this position he has been able to assist with the employment of younger ex-offenders and has shown an entirely healthy interest in this and I feel this is most beneficial to him.

"His tendency to self aggrandizement has noticeably declined during the last few months. He continues to remain fully aware of the fact that he has too much at stake should he revert to criminal activities".

71. "... has made a good start on parole and obtained work at a local factory. It is felt that he needs close and firm supervision to see that he is not affected by stronger characters who might have a bad influence on him. Generally his progress has confirmed the decision for early release and the future on parole appears to be good".

72. "Since his release from prison in ... he has settled down to quite a stable routine of life. He has been involved in business on his own account as a sub-contractor which has involved a fair degree of travel. His wife speaks highly of his efforts in the home and his readiness to act as a good father. There is no doubt that he has worked very hard and there is no question of his neglecting the family. He has not been prone to socialising or frequenting public houses and it was felt that his efforts were genuine".

73. "... is in breach of his licence having failed to keep in touch with the supervising officer and failed to observe reporting arrangements. He did not inform the supervising officer of his change of address or loss of employment and his behaviour gives cause to believe that he is at risk especially in view of the fact that his sentence of imprisonment was for wounding. In view of the circumstances, I support the supervising officer's recommendation that his licence should be revoked" (the Parole Board subsequently endorsed this recommendation and the offender was recalled to prison).

74. "This has been a short but very useful period of parole ... (the client's) behaviour at the time tended to be aggressive and immature and I had to suggest recall but the Parole Board preferred the risk of allowing him to continue at liberty. It seems likely that this experience was a constructive one for him as he realised how close he had come to being recalled and he was able to discuss at some depth the contrast between the mature and the immature aspects of his behaviour. The following interviews were used to develop his understanding of himself. ... I am considerably more optimistic for his future chances than I have been before".

Recalls and revocation

75. Table 4 gives a summary of offenders on parole from determinate sentences who were recalled by the Secretary of State as well as the number

of licences revoked by the higher courts; 13 licences were in fact revoked by the Courts compared with 16 in 1972. Recalls and revocations accounted for 7.54 per cent. of those on parole while serving determinate sentences, which is marginally lower than the previous year. In addition a total of 52 Young Prisoner licence holders and offenders serving extended sentences were recalled.

Releases after recall

76. A prisoner who has been recalled from parole may make written representations against his recall and has the right to be interviewed by a member of the Local Review Committee. Such cases are then referred to the Parole Board, which reconsiders the earlier decision to recall in the light of these documents and any other information. In 1973 137 representations against recall were made and of these 38 were again released to the supervision of the Probation and After-Care Service.

CHAPTER V—COMMUNICATION AND LIAISON

Board meetings

77. During 1973 panels of the Board met on 163 occasions to consider cases for parole or recall from licence. These meetings were normally held in London, Birmingham and Manchester averaging three each week. We also met in other cities to which further reference is made at paragraph 88.

78. The Board met in plenary session on one occasion in 1973 and held an informal overnight conference at Cumberland Lodge, Windsor Great Park. The General Purposes Committee of the Board met at quarterly intervals.

79. Home Office officials attended General Purposes Committee meetings and have been present at panel meetings, by invitation, from time to time. There has been close consultation throughout the year between the Chairman and the Secretariat on the one hand, and the appropriate Home Office Departments on the other.

Visits to prisons

80. During the year members of the Board visited 10 prisons and had discussions with Local Review Committees, members of the prison service and with groups of prisoners about the working of the parole system. We regard this not only as a valuable opportunity to answer questions and clarify problems but also for everyone concerned to air criticisms and grievances.

81. It is usual for visiting Board members, subject to the agreement of the Governor, to discuss the parole system with a group of prisoners. We recognise that prisoners may feel the system is operated by faceless and anonymous people. On these occasions they can at least see some of us and put their points to us personally. It is clear from these meetings what a strain waiting for the result of a review can be, and that there is a high degree of cynicism about the system and distrust of those who operate it. Often some issue arises which we are able to rectify. For example, prisoners are understandably anxious when the earliest date of parole eligibility passes without any notification. A dossier may be held up for further information or consideration and, in such cases, it has been agreed that the Home Office

should send a note to the prison concerned, so that prisoners do not feel that their case has been lost sight of.

Visits to probation areas

82. Three visits were made to probation areas, during which we held discussions with Probation and After-Care Committees, principal, senior and main grade officers. During one such visit we also met hostel wardens, landlords providing accommodation for paroled offenders and others and a number of parolees. The main purpose of these contacts was to discuss the reports, both before and after the grant of parole, which the Board needs to receive from officers in the field; and to help us better to understand the real problems presented to the Service by the parole system.

Visits to police forces

83. In pursuance of the Board's policy of promoting a better understanding of the objects of the parole system four visits were made to police forces during 1973. The discussions enabled Board members to explain the value we place on receiving from the police full reports of the circumstances of the offence for which prisoners were convicted. By agreement with the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, a senior police officer spent a month with the Parole Unit of the Probation and After-Care Department of the Home Office, to make himself familiar with the requirements of the Board and to advise on procedure.

Lectures and conferences

84. Members of the Parole Board have been invited to give talks on the work of the Board on training courses organised by the Birmingham, Bristol, Lancashire and Thames Valley police forces; they have also participated with Home Office officials at five conferences of neighbouring Local Review Committees around the country. Addresses by the Chairman included those to the Association of Chief Police Officers, the annual conference of Prison Governors, a Liverpool Crime Conference and the Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency. A group of Board members took part in a course organised by the South East Regional Training Officer for the Probation and After-Care Service, during which one day was devoted to parole.

85. Additionally several members attended a conference on parole organised by the Cambridge Institute of Criminology. Talks were given by the Secretary of the Board to the Assistant Governors' and Prison Welfare Officers' courses held at the Prison Service Staff College at Wakefield and Board members were involved in the Development Courses held for Prison Officers at the Officers' Training School, Leyhill.

86. Recently the Home Office organised the first training course for newly appointed independent members of Local Review Committees at the Prison Service Staff College in which Board members also participated. Board members have also attended regional conferences of the Prison Medical Services.

Evidence to the Interdepartmental Committee

87. During 1973 at the invitation of the Committee on Mentally Abnormal Offenders (under the Chairmanship of the Rt. Hon. Lord Butler of Saffron Walden), the Board submitted written evidence based on the advice of its psychiatrist members regarding the treatment of persons suffering from mental disorders during their stay in prison and subsequent to their release.

Press and Public

88. The Board was invited to visit various cities in England and Wales and during the year held meetings in Cardiff, Leeds, Liverpool and Newcastle-upon-Tyne, which attracted publicity and provided an opportunity to answer questions about parole. The Board is anxious that the public should have as much information as possible about the parole system.

Overseas visits

89. Members of the Board took the opportunity to see something of parole and penal systems in California, Canada and Japan whilst on private visits to those countries.

90. A list of overseas visitors to the Board during 1973 is given in Appendix 3.

CHAPTER VI—RESEARCH

Reviews of the parole system

91. A number of studies and reviews of parole have been made during the year. Notable among these was the January issue of the British Journal of Criminology which was entirely devoted to articles on our system. Additionally a review of the system by Mr. K. B. Moode was published in the July issue of the Prison Service Journal.

Research

92. We are indebted to the Home Office Research Unit for the information which is contained in Appendix 4. ○

CHAPTER VII—SECRETARIAT

93. The Secretariat acts as the main channel of communication between the Board, departments of the Home Office and all agencies concerned with the parole scheme. It is responsible for:—sorting, allocating and despatching case dossiers and supporting papers to Board members for their study before panel meetings, arrangements and minutes of meetings, correspondence relating to parole and offenders on parole with Home Office departments and prisoners' relatives and other interested parties, visits to prisons, police forces and Probation and After-Care Service headquarters.

94. The Secretariat has been increased to ten officers seconded from the Home Office to deal with the increased workload during the year.

95. We wish to record our sincere appreciation of the unremitting help we have received from and the cordial relationship we have enjoyed with its members.

CHAPTER VIII—PAROLE IN PERSPECTIVE

96. The introduction of parole into our penal system in 1967 was acclaimed at the time as a major reform. It received approval in principle on all

sides in Parliament and the Committee stages in both Houses were notable for the constructive and collaborative spirit in which the main features of the scheme were worked out. It was natural that the expectations of prisoners were raised as the date for the first releases (1 April 1968) approached, following the interest evinced by certain sections of the press about the prospective early release of large numbers of offenders. It was, however, no less natural that the Local Review Committees, the Home Office and the Parole Board should have approached their task with considerable caution. Officials, Committee and Board members were new to the work; the administrative machinery was untested. It therefore behoved everyone to proceed carefully, to strive for consistency and to overcome the initial problems in the processing and scrutiny of nearly 5,000 dossiers relating to prisoners eligible for consideration at the starting date.

97. Initially, the Home Office rejected a considerable number of cases which had been recommended by the Local Review Committees and referred to the Board only such recommended cases as appeared to be good parole prospects. The outcome, the release of some 450 prisoners (8.5 per cent. of those eligible) attracted criticism in the press and caused great disappointment in the prisons, especially among the long-term prisoners. As a result of representations from the Board, the Home Secretary agreed that in future he should refer all cases which had been favourably recommended by Local Review Committees. In doing so he pointed out that he might well be in the position of having to disagree with the Board's findings in some cases.

98. Later, a further advance was made when agreement was reached to send to the Board a selection of cases not recommended by Local Review Committees, as one measure designed to offset possible differences in perception by Committees which severally assessed a wide variety of categories of offender in the different prisons. As a result of these increased referrals to the Parole Board, combined with an encouragingly low percentage of adverse reports on paroled offenders and greater experience of everyone concerned, the number of prisoners released on parole rose significantly between 1968 and 1970. However, while opinions among our membership naturally differ, caution continued to prevail in the councils of the Board over those who would have preferred a more adventurous policy. In regard to offenders who might resort to violence, two serious failures within the first twelve months of the scheme served as a warning that risks of this order could readily bring parole into disrepute.

99. Prior to the referral to the Board of cases unfavourably viewed by Local Review Committees, there had been a high level of agreement between the assessment of the committees and the Board. In 1973 the number of cases of prisoners who had not been recommended locally but who were referred to the Board exceeded 1,000, of whom 22 per cent. none the less received parole. This area of disagreement naturally reduced the overall consonance between the two stages of assessment, but it has always been accepted that differences in perception and assessment at local and national level, provided they are not too wide, are a healthy feature of the scheme; moreover unlike the Local Review Committees, the Board had the benefit of advice from judges, criminologists and psychiatrists, and we often receive later information not available to the Local Review Committee. The greater the

risk to the public, or the more significant the consequences of early release in other respects, the more important it becomes to apply additional scrutiny before the final decision is taken.

100. Since 1970 the annual recommendation rate has shown a slower upwards trend and the question arises as to whether, and to what extent, the increase might be accelerated under the present system. There is the prospect of some progress in granting parole to further offenders, who are not recommended by the Local Review Committees but who present a relatively high risk of re-offending unless they have supervision and support in the community, when it is administratively possible to refer such cases to the Board.

101. Meanwhile, the parole system despite its limitations, has already brought certain bonuses. More information is made available about individual prisoners which must be kept up to date; there is an obligation to observe and report at regular intervals on conduct, attitudes and progress. It is reasonable to claim that understanding of inmates by prison staff, as well as communications between different branches of the prison service, have improved. The introduction of more independent Local Review Committee members has added a further link between prison and the community outside.

102. Through-care and after-care by the Probation Service has also benefited by the parole system. There is increasing contact between prisoners, the welfare officers in the prisons and with probation officers in the community in regard to prisoners, their families, accommodation and employment problems on release.

103. For prisoners eligible for parole, it has provided a ray of hope and a spur to think and plan constructively. For some it may have been conducive to good behaviour. About 13,000 out of 14,000 have survived parole, to some benefit for themselves and for the nation's economy. Against this it must be admitted that parole has given rise to tensions and anxieties among prisoners and their dependants; the policy of not giving reasons for refusing parole has added to a sense of grievance on being turned down. The drawbacks have been experienced by most prisoners, whereas the benefits have been enjoyed only by a minority.

104. Certain of the studies referred to in paragraph 91 suggest that there are weaknesses in the system and call for changes which would improve communications and bring prisoners into the assessment procedure more closely than is the case at present, and increase the period and number of paroles. There is much to be said for planning penal treatment so as to ensure a continuous progress, during a prison sentence, towards rehabilitation in the community for the great majority of prisoners, other than those serving very short sentences; but the means are lacking to facilitate further progress along these lines at the present time.

105. Looking to the future, therefore, it may soon be timely to review our parole system in the light of experience gained during the past six years, having due regard to other systems. It would seem likely that such major changes as may be desirable could not be brought about without other reforms in the wider context of penal treatment and changes in sentencing policy.

106. In conclusion, it may be claimed that the operation of the system on the basis of the 1967 and 1972 Statutes has provided useful experience in, and some positive evidence concerning the value of, combining custodial treatment with controlled release in the community on a much larger scale than had previously been attempted.

JOHN HUNT
SEBAG SHAW
SUSAN BARING
R. H. BEESON
JOHN BLISS
GORDON J. BORRIE
BRIAN D. BUSH
A. E. COX
PHOEBE M. DAVID
ROBIN DAVID
T. C. M. GIBBENS
BRUCE GLEN
RUNDLE HARRIS
SHEILA A. HIMMEL
ELSPETH HOWE
M. M. INNES
E. JACOBY
H. J. KLARE
SHIRLEY KOMROWER
DAVID LOWSON
J. W. MARSH
NORTHAGE DE V. MATHER
J. D. MORTIMER
PATRICK O'CONNOR
PETER L. OSBORNE
LOUIS PETCH
M. A. PARTRIDGE
PETER SCOTT
P. SHERVINGTON
A. WILCOX
A. WORTHY
A. YATES

APPENDIX 1

Statistics of Parole Recommendations in 1973

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS MADE IN DETERMINATE SENTENCE CASES FROM 1 JANUARY 1970 TO 31 DECEMBER 1973

Cases	1970		1971		1972		1973	
	First reviews	Second or subsequent reviews	First reviews	Second or subsequent reviews	First reviews	Second or subsequent reviews	First reviews	Second or subsequent reviews
(a) Total dealt with	6,625	1,829	8,156	2,232	7,215	2,429	8,020	2,594
(b) Prisoners declining consideration	424	217	451	284	416	294	439	329
(c) Total considered by Local Review Committees	6,201	1,612	7,705	1,948	6,799	2,135	7,581	2,265
(d) Recommended for parole by Local Review Committees	2,003	567	2,649	811	2,453	957	2,797	1,135
(e) Not recommended for parole by Local Review Committees	4,198	1,045	5,056	1,137	4,346	1,178	4,784	1,130
(f) Local Review Committees' recommendations for parole accepted without further reference ...	—	—	—	—	—	—	805	8
(g) Referred to the Parole Board	2,758 (755)*	808 (241)*	3,566 (917)*	1,018 (207)*	3,229 (776)*	1,221 (264)*	2,989 (997)*	1,432 (305)*
(h) Recommended for parole by the Parole Board ...	1,751 (266)*	459 (69)*	2,367 (253)*	604 (46)*	2,143 (203)*	783 (72)*	1,623 (193)*	908 (91)*
(i) Total of (f) and (h)	1,751 (266)*	459 (69)*	2,367 (253)*	604 (46)*	2,143 (203)*	783 (72)*	2,428 (193)*	916 (91)*

28

APPENDIX 1—TABLE 1—continued

(j) Recommended by the Parole Board for consideration earlier than normal statutory review ...	97	9	223	24	243	19	333	23
(k) Not recommended by the Parole Board ...	910	340	976	390	843	419	1,033	501
(l) Percentage of cases considered which were recommended by Local Review Committees (d) to (c)	32.9		35.8		38.2		39.93	
(m) Percentage of Local Review Committees' recommendations for parole which were accepted without further reference (f) to (d)	—		—		—		20.68	
(n) Percentage of cases referred to the Parole Board which were recommended for parole (h) to (g)	62.0		64.8		65.8		57.25	
(o) Percentage of cases considered by Local Review Committees which were finally recommended for parole (i) to (c)	28.3		30.8		32.7		33.96	
(p) Percentage of all cases dealt with which were finally recommended for parole (i) to (a)	26.1		28.6		30.3		31.51	

* The figures in brackets show the number of cases within the categories concerned, which were considered by Local Review Committees unsuitable for parole.

29

APPENDIX 1—continued—TABLE 2

DETERMINATE SENTENCE CASES CONSIDERED AT FIRST REVIEW BY THE PAROLE BOARD IN 1973
SHOWING THE PERCENTAGE OF FAVOURABLE RECOMMENDATIONS ACCORDING TO THE TYPE OF OFFENCE AND LENGTH OF SENTENCE

CATEGORY OF OFFENCE		Sentence										Total Cases Referred and % Recommended
		Less than 2 yrs.	2 yrs.—2 yrs. 11 m.	3 yrs.—3 yrs. 11 m.	4 yrs.	4 yrs. 1 m.—4 yrs. 11 m.	5 yrs.—5 yrs. 11 m.	6 yrs.—6 yrs. 11 m.	7 yrs.—7 yrs. 11 m.	8 yrs.—8 yrs. 11 m.	10 yrs. or more	
MANSLAUGHTER	Referred ...	—	4	18	13	—	14	7	12	1	4	73
	Recommended ...	—	3	9	4	—	6	—	3	—	1	26
	% Recommended	—	75.0	50.0	30.8	—	42.9	—	25.0	—	25.0	35.6
VIOLENCE	Referred ...	12	172	141	45	2	22	3	7	1	3	408
	Recommended ...	5	124	83	13	1	6	—	1	—	—	233
	% Recommended	41.7	72.1	58.9	28.9	50.0	27.3	—	14.3	—	—	57.1
ROBBERY	Referred ...	7	91	153	47	6	43	10	13	9	4	383
	Recommended ...	4	63	75	12	—	9	2	1	—	—	166
	% Recommended	57.1	69.2	49.0	25.6	—	20.9	20.0	7.7	—	—	43.3
HOMOSEXUAL	Referred ...	—	23	22	13	3	6	4	4	—	1	76
	Recommended ...	—	14	12	5	—	1	—	—	—	—	32
	% Recommended	—	60.9	54.6	38.5	—	16.7	—	—	—	—	42.1
HETEROSEXUAL	Referred ...	3	68	74	44	1	16	11	14	3	2	236
	Recommended ...	3	51	39	16(1)	—	4	2	3(1)	—	—	118(2)
	% Recommended	100.0	75.0	52.7	36.4	—	25.0	18.2	21.4	—	—	50.0
BREAKING	Referred ...	25	329	214	34	3	25	5	9	2	2	648
	Recommended ...	15	261	150	13	1	11	1	4	—	1	457
	% Recommended	60.0	79.3	70.1	38.2	33.3	44.0	20.0	44.4	—	50.0	70.5
THEFT	Referred ...	23	181	132	30	3	18	7	2	1	—	397
	Recommended ...	15	125	92	12	1	8	1	—	1	—	255
	% Recommended	65.2	69.1	69.7	40.0	33.3	44.4	14.3	—	100.0	—	64.2

APPENDIX 1—TABLE 2—continued

FRAUD	Referred ...	11	71	105	32	6	19	5	5	3	—	257
	Recommended ...	7	43	55	7	3	7	—	—	—	—	122
	% Recommended	63.6	60.6	52.4	21.9	50.0	36.8	—	—	—	—	47.5
HANDLING	Referred ...	6	49	57	9	6	12	3	—	1	—	143
	Recommended ...	2	31	38	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	75
	% Recommended	33.3	63.3	66.7	33.3	16.7	—	—	—	—	—	52.5
OTHER OFFENCES	Referred ...	17	129	120	37	4	40	11	9	1	—	368
	Recommended ...	9	73	44(1)	8	1	3	1	—	—	—	139(1)
	% Recommended	52.9	56.6	36.7	21.6	25.0	7.5	9.1	—	—	—	37.8
SUB TOTAL (taken to Table 2(a))	Referred ...	104	1,117	1,036	304	34	215	66	75	22	16	2,989
	Recommended ...	60	788	597(1)	93(1)	8	55	7	12(1)	1	2	1,623(3)
	% Recommended	57.7	70.6	57.6	30.6	23.5	25.6	10.6	16.0	4.6	12.5	54.3

The figures in brackets show the number of cases in which the Home Secretary decided not to implement the Board's recommendation.

APPENDIX 1—continued—TABLE 2(a)

DETERMINATE SENTENCE CASES CONSIDERED AT SECOND OR SUBSEQUENT REVIEW BY THE PAROLE BOARD IN 1973
SHOWING THE PERCENTAGE OF FAVOURABLE RECOMMENDATIONS ACCORDING TO THE TYPE OF OFFENCE AND LENGTH OF SENTENCE

CATEGORY OF OFFENCE		Sentence										Total Cases Referred and % Recommended
		Less than 2 yrs.	2 yrs.—2 yrs. 11 m.	3 yrs.—3 yrs. 11 m.	4 yrs.	4 yrs. 1 m.—4 yrs. 11 m.	5 yrs.—5 yrs. 11 m.	6 yrs.—6 yrs. 11 m.	7 yrs.—7 yrs. 11 m.	8 yrs.—9 yrs. 11 m.	10 yrs. or more	
MANSLAUGHTER	Referred ...	—	—	6	4	—	8	4	7	1	14	44
	Recommended ...	—	—	5	3	—	3	3	4	—	6(2)	24(2)
	% Recommended	—	—	83.3	75.0	—	37.5	75.0	57.1	—	42.9	54.6
VIOLENCE	Referred ...	—	2	71	38	4	40	14	8	8	18	203
	Recommended ...	—	1	57	25(1)	1	25	8	6	—	13	136(1)
	% Recommended	—	50.0	80.3	65.8	25.0	62.5	57.1	75.0	—	72.2	67.0
ROBBERY	Referred ...	—	5	83	43	8	60	20	29	18	40	306
	Recommended ...	—	4	66	28(1)	4	40(1)	13	22	11	12(3)	200(5)
	% Recommended	—	80.0	79.5	65.1	50.0	66.7	65.0	75.9	61.1	30.0	65.4
HOMOSEXUAL	Referred ...	—	1	4	6	—	6	3	5	2	—	27
	Recommended ...	—	1	3	6	—	3	—	3	—	—	16
	% Recommended	—	100.0	75.0	100.0	—	50.0	—	60.0	—	—	59.5
HETEROSEXUAL	Referred ...	—	1	25	28	—	27	23	12	7	6	129
	Recommended ...	—	—	18	20	—	15	12	6	4	1(1)	76(1)
	% Recommended	—	—	72.0	71.4	—	55.6	52.2	50.0	57.1	16.7	58.9
BREAKING	Referred ...	—	15	144	49	11	52	24	18	6	6	325
	Recommended ...	—	9	123	30	8	35	17	10	3	6	241
	% Recommended	—	60.0	85.4	61.2	72.7	67.3	70.8	55.6	50.0	100.0	74.2

APPENDIX 1—TABLE 2(a)—continued

THEFT	Referred ...	—	3	38	24	3	19	9	3	2	—	101
	Recommended ...	—	3	33	13	1	13	6	2	—	—	71
	% Recommended	—	100.0	86.8	54.2	33.3	68.4	66.7	66.7	—	—	70.3
FRAUD	Referred ...	—	5	24	24	2	23	6	3	8	2	97
	Recommended ...	—	4	15	11	—	12	3	3	1	1	50
	% Recommended	—	80.0	62.5	45.8	—	52.2	50.0	100.0	12.5	50.0	51.6
HANDLING	Referred ...	—	2	15	4	4	9	3	—	—	—	37
	Recommended ...	—	2	12	2	3	4	1	—	—	—	24
	% Recommended	—	100.0	80.0	50.0	75.0	44.4	33.3	—	—	—	64.9
OTHER OFFENCES	Referred ...	—	3	44	39	1	35	11	9	8	13	163
	Recommended ...	—	2	25(2)	13(1)	—	15	6	3(1)	1	5	70(4)
	% Recommended	—	66.7	56.8	33.3	—	42.9	54.6	33.3	12.5	38.5	42.9
SUB TOTAL	Referred ...	—	37	454	259	33	279	117	94	60	99	1,432
	Recommended ...	—	26	357	151	17	165	69	59(1)	20	44	908(13)
	% Recommended	—	70.3	78.6	58.3	51.5	59.1	59.0	62.8	33.3	44.4	63.4
SUB TOTAL (carried from Table 2)	Referred ...	104	1,117	1,036	304	34	215	66	75	22	16	2,989
	Recommended ...	60	788	597(1)	93(1)	8	55	7	12(1)	1	2	1,623(3)
	% Recommended	57.7	70.6	57.6	30.6	23.5	25.6	10.6	16.0	4.6	12.5	54.3
TOTAL	Referred ...	104	1,154	1,490	563	67	494	183	169	82	115	4,421
	Recommended ...	60	814	954(3)	244(4)	25	220(1)	76	71(2)	21	46(6)	2,531(16)
	% Recommended	57.7	70.5	64.0	43.3	37.3	44.5	41.5	42.0	25.6	40.0	57.3

The figures in brackets show the number of cases in which the Home Secretary decided not to implement the Board's recommendation.

APPENDIX I—continued—TABLE 3
DETERMINATE SENTENCE CASES RECOMMENDED FOR PAROLE IN 1973
SHOWING LENGTH OF LICENCE PERIOD IN RELATION TO LENGTH OF CURRENT SENTENCE

Period of Licence	Sentence										Total	%
	Less than 2 yrs.	2 yrs. - 2 yrs. 11 m.	3 yrs. - 3 yrs. 11 m.	4 yrs.	4 yrs. 1 m. - 4 yrs. 11 m.	5 yrs. - 5 yrs. 11 m.	6 yrs. - 6 yrs. 11 m.	7 yrs. - 7 yrs. 11 m.	8 yrs. - 9 yrs. 11 m.	10 yrs. or more		
Less than 1 m. ...	11	17	3	2	—	1	—	1	—	—	35	1.1
1 m. but less than 3 m. ...	141	373	78	50	3	17	8	9	—	4	683	20.5
3 m. but less than 6 m. ...	10	854	190	47	7	57	13	8	6	4	1,196	35.9
6 m. but less than 12 m. ...	2	273	560	74	8	77	32	20	5	15	1,066	32.1
12 m. but less than 18 m. ...	—	6	98	63	5	41	13	19	3	9	257	7.7
18 m. but less than 24 m. ...	—	—	22	4	2	21	3	5	5	1	63	1.9
24 m. but less than 36 m. ...	—	—	—	—	—	5	6	6	2	2	21	0.6
36 m. but less than 60 m. ...	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	5	7	0.2
5 yrs. or more ...	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTAL ...	164	1,523	951	240	25	219	76	69	21	40	3,328*	—
PERCENTAGE ...	4.9	45.8	28.6	7.2	0.7	6.6	2.3	2.1	0.6	1.2	—	100.0

* The difference of 16 between the total on this Table and the corresponding total at (i) on Table 1 denotes the number of persons who, although recommended by the Board, were not released on parole.

TABLE 4
SUMMARY OF CASES RECALLED DURING 1973

<i>Offenders on Parole from Determinate Sentences</i>	
1. Recalled by the Parole Board	233
2. Recalled by the Secretary of State	6
3. Revocations by Courts	13
	<hr/> 252
<i>Reasons for the Recalls</i>	
1. Recalled for further offences and in some cases for other breaches of licence conditions	109
2. Recalled for being out of touch and in some cases for other breaches of licence conditions. (Of these 29 had committed further offences while at large)	111
3. Recalled for various breaches of licence conditions other than those above	32
	<hr/> 252
<i>Young Prisoner Licence Holders</i>	
1. Recalled by the Parole Board	38
2. Recalled by the Secretary of State	0
3. Revocation by Courts	0
<i>Extended Sentence Licence Holders</i>	
1. Recalled by the Parole Board	13
2. Recalled by the Secretary of State	0
3. Revocations by Courts	1

TABLE 5
RECALLS DURING 1973 OF OFFENDERS ON PAROLE LICENCE
FROM DETERMINATE SENTENCES

Length of time between release from prison and revocation of licence		
Number of months between release and revocation	Percentage	Number revoked
0 to less than 2	22.2	56
2 to less than 4	27.0	68
4 to less than 6	19.8	50
6 to less than 8	12.7	32
8 to less than 10	6.4	16
10 to less than 12	3.2	8
12 and over	8.7	22
TOTALS	100.0	<hr/> 252

APPENDIX 2

Criminal Justice Act 1972
Release on licence without recommendation
of Parole Board
(SECTION 35)

Criminal Justice Act 1972
SCHEDULE 5
(Amendment to the Criminal Justice Act 1967)

Criminal Justice Act 1972
PART III
MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
Release on licence without recommendation
of Parole Board

35.—(1) If, in any case falling within such class of cases as the Secretary of State may determine after consultation with the Parole Board, a local review committee recommends the release on licence of a person to whom subsection (1) of section 60 of the Criminal Justice Act 1967 applies, the Secretary of State shall not be obliged to refer the case to the Parole Board before releasing him under that subsection and, unless he nevertheless refers it to the Board, may so release him without any recommendation by the Board.

Release on licence without recommendation of Parole Board.

(2) In this section “local review committee” means a committee established under section 59(6) of the said Act of 1967; and in the application of this section to Scotland for any reference to the Parole Board there shall be substituted a reference to the Parole Board for Scotland.

SCHEDULE 5
MINOR AND CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS
The Criminal Justice Act 1967

In the Criminal Justice Act 1967—

(c) in section 60(2) the words “between conviction and sentence” shall be omitted;

1967 c. 80.

APPENDIX 3

OVERSEAS VISITORS TO THE PAROLE BOARD DURING 1973

Dr. Bender, the Minister of Justice for Baden-Württemberg, West Germany, together with three senior officers; Mr. B. D. Bodna, Director of Prisons, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia; Judge Addvar Berrefjord, Ministry of Justice, Norway; Mr. L. Carney, Parole Officer, California, United States of America; Mr. C. F. Coles, QC, Deputy Attorney General, Nova Scotia; Dr. M. Fiscor, Ministry of Justice, Budapest, Hungary; Mr. Teichi Harada, Probation Officer, Tokyo, Japan; The Hon. Mr. Justice M. B. Hoare, CMG, Chairman of the Parole Board, Queensland, Australia; Mr. W. Hendrosilo, Department of Justice, Jakarta, Indonesia; Dr. W. Horowitz, Director of Correctional Services, Ministry of Social Welfare, Israel; Mrs. J. Karp, Ministry of Justice, Israel; Dr. A. Lamont-Smith, Deputy Director of Corrections, Arizona, United States of America; Mr. M. W. McGeechan, Commissioner of Corrective Services, New South Wales, Australia; Dr. B. Pulsford, MB, BS, MANCZP, a psychiatrist member of the Parole Board, South Australia; Professor H. R. Sachs, a member of the Connecticut Parole Board, United States of America; Miss I. Smetana, a Polish lawyer on a United Nations fellowship in London; The Hon. Mr. Justice J. H. Steyn, SC, Judge of the Supreme Court, South Africa; Dr. J. W. de Stoppelaar, research worker, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Mr. G. Street, Chairman, National Parole Board, Ottawa, Canada; Dr. Z. Terlo, Director General, Ministry of Justice, Israel.

APPENDIX 4

PAROLE RESEARCH

Notes contributed by Christopher Nuttall of the Home Office Research Unit.

During 1973, research on the parole scheme undertaken by the Home Office Research Unit has continued to concentrate on an evaluation of the effect of parole on the likelihood of a prisoner returning to crime and on an examination of the selection process particularly at Local Review Committee level.

As anticipated in last year's report a further examination of the effect of parole on the subsequent likelihood of a prisoner being reconvicted was carried out. A study was made of 800 parolees and 250 non-parolees released from prison between October 1969 and March 1970. As yet no results are to hand but they will be made available in due course.

It was suggested in paragraph 30 of last year's report that the best indicator of selection that the Research Unit had found was the statistical estimate of a man's risk of reconviction. As intended, additional work was carried out to identify factors influencing a favourable recommendation, other than the prisoner's predicted risk of reconviction, which is not known by Local Review Committees. It emerged that for men on both first and second reviews, the number of previous convictions, sentence length and intended living arrangements on release were the factors most predictive of selection, while for second review men number of prison offences also appeared important. Having identified those variables, other than predicted risk of reconviction, which distinguished most effectively between men likely to be recommended and men unlikely to be recommended, they are being used to examine the recommendation rates that will be made by individual Local Review Committees.

Other work on parole selection analysed the effects of raising the paroling rate on the proportion of parolees likely to fail on licence. Preliminary indications are that an increase in the paroling rate of up to 10-20 per cent. would be likely to result in only a small increase in the failure rate. This, however, is subject to qualifications which need more study, for example, the gravity of the additional failures.

The research on why some men refuse to be considered for parole has continued. The study also deals with the incidence of opting-out in different types of prison, with the sort of men who decide to refuse consideration and how persistent they are in their behaviour. Information was also collected from both opters-out and from men who did not refuse their reviews on their attitudes towards the parole scheme generally.

The study of 100 parolees released from Stafford and Ford prisons was completed by Dr. Pauline Morris of the Nuffield Foundation and submitted to the Home Office in December.

HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

Government Bookshops

49 High Holborn, London WC1V 5HB

13a Castle Street, Edinburgh EH2 3AR

41 The Hayes, Cardiff CF1 1JW

Brazenose Street, Manchester M60 8AS

Southey House, Wine Street, Bristol BS1 2BQ

258 Broad Street, Birmingham B1 2HE

80 Chichester Street, Belfast BT1 4JY

*Government publications are also available
through booksellers*

ISBN 0 10 214375 7

END