

THE FEASIBILITY OF
INSTITUTING SUBSIDIZATION OF
THE RELEASED INMATE

Thesis for the Degree of M. S.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
NORMAN C. COLTER
1970

12558



THE FEASIBILITY OF INSTITUTING SUBSIDIZATION
OF THE RELEASED INMATE

by

Norman C. Colter

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

School of Criminal Justice

Approved

1970

William A. Goldberg
W.A. Goldberg, Ph.D., ASCW

Victor G. Strecher
Victor G. Strecher, Ph.D.

R.C. Trojanowicz
R.C. Trojanowicz, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

THE FEASIBILITY OF INSTITUTING SUBSIDIZATION
OF THE RELEASED INMATE

By

Norman C. Colter

All inmates at one time were first offenders. After the first offense some leave the stream of criminal activity and never return; some leave following probation, but others continue on to jail or reformatory. Some draw out of the current after this first institutional experience, but others continue on their course to multiple prison sentences before they change their pattern of life. Some seem never to abandon the steady trek to and from prison.

The rate of recidivism among inmates is extremely high during the first six months following their release from prison. This release begets a host of economic and social problems. To find his way out of a life of crime, the released prisoner needs to attain economic self-sufficiency through acquiring an adequate legitimate income. He also needs to develop satisfying social relationships with noncriminal persons and to sever his ties with those committed to crime. The two most pronounced deterrents to a

successful reformation seem to be economic deprivation and the inability to affiliate with noncriminal social groups.

Most releases subsist only through the help of friends and relatives. The latter tend to provide room and board, but where such assistance is lacking, emergency food and shelter are available at welfare missions in the "skid row" areas of large cities; this is hardly a condition conducive to a self-sufficient noncriminal life. Sometimes the homes of relatives which are returned to because of the availability of free subsistence cause a return to neighborhoods or family social relationships which only foster further criminality.

The primary hypothesis of this study is: that financial assistance during the first six months following release would be a deterrent to recidivism.

The secondary hypothesis of this study is: that this financial assistance would not be an additional burden on the taxpayer. Rather, in the long run, it will cost less to fund this type of program than to maintain the current practice of incarceration.

This study includes a compilation of data received from the various departments of corrections and inmate interviews. There are sections devoted to the history of release procedures, recidivism, and aid available to released inmates from private societies and public agencies.

Norman C. Colter

I have discussed a method of convincing the taxpayers and legislators of the need for financial assistance to released inmates during the immediate post-release period.

My proposal may not be the only method of lowering the rate of recidivism but it is apparent that the current process of "rehabilitation" in most systems is not successful.

THE FEASIBILITY OF INSTITUTING SUBSIDIZATION
OF THE RELEASED INMATE

A Thesis
Presented to
the School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by
Norman C. Colter
August 1970

Copyright by
NORMAN C. COLTER
1970

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincerest appreciation to the contributing Departments of Corrections for making this thesis possible. I would like to extend my thanks to the Michigan Department of Corrections for allowing me to interview inmates at the State Prison of Southern Michigan.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the members of my thesis committee, and particularly to Dr. William A. Goldberg without whose many hours of instruction and guidance I could not have completed the project.

I also wish to thank my wife, Betty Ann, and my children, Gregory and Marianne, whose patience, understanding and assistance have enabled me to complete this thesis and my education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
 Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED . .	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	4
Scope of the Study	7
Definition of Terms Used	9
II. FINANCIAL COST OF PRISON SYSTEMS	11
Administration of Corrections	11
Over-All Cost of the System	14
Personnel	17
Hidden Costs	22
III. BACKGROUND OF RELEASE PROCEDURES	24
Pardon	24
Parole	27
Discharge	30
IV. RECIDIVISM	31
Introduction	31

Chapter	Page
Causative Factors and Rates	32
Time Lapse from Parole to Violation	35
V. POST-RELEASE AID	38
Introduction	38
Volunteers of America	39
Salvation Army	41
John Howard Society	43
Conclusion	45
VI. DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE DATA	47
VII. INMATE QUESTIONNAIRE DATA	59
VIII. PLANNING FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSED PROGRAM	66
Establishing Eligibility of Released Inmate	66
Responsibility for Distribution of Funds .	68
Convince Legislators and Taxpayers of Need for Program	69
IX. CONCLUSIONS	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY	77
APPENDIX 1	80
APPENDIX 2	83

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Inmate Wage Range or Level by Systems, 1970 . .	48
2. Released Inmate Aid in Terms of Grants, Loans, and Bus Ticket Home by Systems, 1970	52
3. Rate of Recidivism and Yearly Cost of Incarceration by Systems, 1970	56
4. Length of Time Since Previous Release, Survey of Fifty Inmates, State Prison of Southern Michigan at Jackson, July 1, 1970	59
5. Percentage of Inmates Returned to Prison for New Crime, Parole Violation, or Combination of Both; Survey of Fifty Inmates, State Prison of Southern Michigan at Jackson, July 1, 1970	60
6. Money in Account or Available Upon Release, Survey of Fifty Inmates, State Prison of Southern Michigan at Jackson, July 1, 1970 . .	61
7. Inmate Survey Regarding Lack of Adequate Living Expenses as Contributing Factor to Return, Number of Dependents to Support, and Estimated Time of Needed Assistance-- Fifty Inmates from State Prison of Southern Michigan at Jackson, July 1, 1970 . .	62

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

Introduction

Doing time means losing time and many men feel a driving need to make up for the wasted years. So much of living has gone by, so much loss of earnings, so much enjoyment, so much opportunity, that the tolerance for frustration can become slight. There is an urge to acquire such visible symbols of success as expensive watches or rings. Another manifestation is the desire for a "good front" seen in stylish and expensive clothes. Unless things break right and quickly, the temptation is ever present to revert to known habit patterns and do it the easy way. Linked with this is often a "chip-on-the-shoulder" defensiveness which expects discrimination and projects it even on the most sincere helping efforts if they do not immediately produce the desired results.

It is a truism, too, that a man's real punishment begins when he returns to society and all of us in law enforcement, institutional treatment and after-care work are actively concerned about the kind of climate society maintains for the ex-convict. There are undoubtedly a number

of men who do not seem to care much about their future return to society. But in most cases the man judges our efforts by the answer to his supreme question--"How will society accept me on release?" He has paid his debt, he has made his time, he wants to go straight. Will he be given the chance?

Eventually he confronts his community again and immediately becomes aware of certain needs common to all human beings. As a biological organism he must exist and to this end needs food, clothing and shelter. I found there is little question that the amount of his "gate money" is inadequate, in modern terms, to provide him with subsistence and necessities to last him till he has found a job and secured his first pay. In essence he is all too often to all intents and purposes insolvent the day he is released.

This is one area of need to which I would draw your attention. Efforts should be made to secure better gratuities based not on a relationship to time served, which may be a proper one to be observed in regard to prison earnings, but on a realistic appreciation of the need for physical survival faced by any man leaving prison. The material needs of a man who has been in prison for only three months are largely the same as those of longer-sentence men. It is not so much the length of time served which is the important factor here; but rather, even for a

short-sentence man, the dislocation from home, job and community relationships and the stigma of being an ex-convict. If reasonable provision is not made for his needs at this point we may well be leaving him in circumstances conducive to his return to crime.

Statement of the Problem

Corrections (America's prisons, jails, juvenile training schools, and probation and parole machinery) is the part of the criminal justice system that the public sees least of and knows least about. It seldom gets into the news unless there is a jail break, a prison riot, or a sensational scandal involving corruption or brutality in an institution or by an official. The institutions in which about a third of the corrections population lives are situated for the most part in remote rural areas, or in the basements of police stations or courthouses. The other two-thirds of the corrections population are on probation and parole, and so are widely, and on the whole invisibly, dispersed in the community. Corrections is not only hard to see; traditionally, society has been reluctant to look at it. Many of the people, juvenile and adult, with whom corrections deals are the most troublesome and troubling members of society: the misfits and the failures, the unrespectable and the irresponsible. Society has been well content to keep them out of sight.

The invisibility of the system belies its size, complexity, and crucial importance to the control of crime. Corrections consists of scores of different kinds of institutions and programs of the utmost diversity in approach, facilities, and quality. On any given day it is responsible for approximately 1.3 million offenders. In the course of a year it handles nearly 2.5 million admissions, and spends over a billion dollars doing so.¹ If it could restore all or even most of these people to the community as responsible citizens, America's crime rate would drop significantly. For as it is today, a substantial percentage of offenders become recidivists; they go on to commit more, and often more serious, crimes. Recidivism, its causes and my suggested solution, will be the core of this thesis.

Purpose of the Study

The immediate problem of most ex-inmates is survival. Gate money from institutions or prison earnings from the penitentiaries are so small that ex-inmates are to all intents and purposes insolvent when they leave prison. A rough estimate used to be that a penitentiary inmate would have on release an average of about \$7.50 a

¹The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Corrections (Washington, D.C.: Govt. Printing Office, 1967), p. 159.

year for time served plus a dress-out of clothing seasonally appropriate.² Recently prison earnings have increased and more money will be available to the men as they leave, though estimates are still difficult to suggest. The securing of food, shelter, and work clothes is an immediate necessity.

There is an assumption that it is possible to apply various measures to juvenile and adult offenders which will result in lower rates of recidivism or reinvolvement in criminality than can be achieved in a system of corrections structured entirely around punitive goals. Prevailing opinions on this issue tend toward polar extremes. One rather common view regarding the treatment of offenders is that once an appropriate structure is provided for rehabilitative efforts, including larger budgets, smaller case loads, wider use of probation, better classification programs, more trained workers in corrections, higher salaries, and the like, dramatic reductions in recidivism will quickly follow. This is a position of unbridled and undue optimism, for there is little empirical basis for such a faith.³ Improvements in correctional structure could have little effect upon recidivism until

²A. M. Kirkpatrick, "The Human Problems of Prison After-Care" (John Howard Society of Ontario), 1970, p. 9.

³Don C. Gibbons, Changing the Lawbreaker (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 15.

improvements are also made in the practice theory of treatment, and even then dramatic reductions in delinquency and criminality may be unlikely.

It should not be forgotten that many ex-inmates have old debts or debts incurred by their families during their imprisonment. On release their immunity from pressure to pay these debts ceases, and before they have even solved the problem of survival they are under pressure to pay up. Often their personal belongings or family furnishings have vanished or have been used to eke out an existence for their dependents so that they frequently start from way behind scratch.

It is the purpose of this thesis to show that there is a definite need for financial assistance to inmates during the initial months after release from prison. It is my contention that this type of program could have a greater impact on reducing the rate of recidivism than current rehabilitative practices popular in today's institutions. I further intend to show that this type of assistance will not be a greater burden on taxpayers. Rather, in the long run, it will cost less to fund this type of program than to maintain the current practice of incarceration.

Scope of the Study

The feasibility of instituting subsidization of the released inmate necessitated research among various departments of corrections. A cover letter and research questionnaire (Appendix 1) were mailed to the director of each of the fifty state departments of correction, plus the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and the Canadian Penitentiary Service. This questionnaire was designed to show:

1. Present daily wage of inmates.
2. Amount received at time of parole or discharge.
3. Rate of recidivism within first six months.
4. Current yearly cost per inmate during incarceration.
5. Any assistance to inmates' families during their incarceration.

It was mailed out on April 22-23, 1970. As of July 1, 1970 all departments had replied except the following: Utah, New Mexico, Arkansas, Mississippi, Illinois, Alabama, New York, Virgin Islands, and Virginia. The percentage of return was 83.6% (46 out of 55) which I felt was exceptionally good. In many cases not only was the questionnaire returned but additional literature was sent pertaining to the above areas. Mr. N. A. Carlson of the Federal Bureau of Prisons and Mr. Amos E. Reed of the Oregon Corrections Division have requested copies of the thesis upon completion.

A request was submitted to and approved by Gus Harrison, Director, Michigan State Department of Corrections to personally interview 50 returnees at the State Prison of Southern Michigan at Jackson. On June 26, 1970 arrangements were made with Ex Rhodes Barham, Director of the Reception and Diagnostic Center at Southern Michigan Prison to interview the inmates. These interviews were personally conducted with the assistance of Henry Risley, Vocational Counsellor of the Center on July 1, 1970. The inmate interview questionnaire consisted of the following questions: (Appendix 2)

1. How long has it been since you left here?
2. Length of time between arrest and actual return to the system.
3. Return for parole violation or new crime.
4. Money that you had, or was available to you, when released the last time.
5. Do you feel that lack of adequate living expenses was a contributing factor to your return?
6. Did you have anyone other than yourself to support when you were released?
7. How long do you feel you could have used assistance with living expenses before you could have maintained them on your own?

Those inmates who participated were strictly volunteers and their identity remains anonymous. I used the first fifty-one inmates who had completed their testing for this study. This method was used because of the complexity of the prison system.

The scope of this study will include a compilation of data received from the various departments of corrections and the inmate interviews.

This study will include a discussion of the yearly cost of maintaining an inmate in prison, the obvious as well as the hidden costs. Included also will be a discussion of the cost of the prison system as a whole.

It is my feeling that this study would be incomplete without sections devoted to the history of release procedures, recidivism, and aid available to released inmates from private societies and public agencies.

Anticipated problems and their solutions in establishing subsidization of the released inmate will be discussed in depth and a program established for the implementation of such a plan.

Definition of Terms Used

Prison Systems--refers to the entire state-wide system rather than to an individual prison. For example--in Michigan this includes Jackson, Marquette, Ionia, M.T.U. and their satellites.

Recidivism--habitual or chronic relapse, or tendency to relapse, into crime or antisocial behavior patterns.⁴ For the purposes of this study it will also include parole violators.

⁴Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language (New York: The World Publishing Company, 1964).

Grants--by this I mean money given outright to the prisoner at the time of release. (Question 2-a of Appendix 1)

Loans--by this I mean money loaned to the prisoner at the time of release which he must pay back.

Subsidy--for purposes of this study will mean financial assistance given outright to eligible inmates upon their release from prison for a specified period of time.

Average Daily Wage--this means the wage paid directly to the inmate by the prison system.

Cost Per Capita of Inmate--this is the total cost, including everything from medical expenses to education, of maintaining an inmate in prison for one year.

Rate of Recidivism--percentage of released inmates that return to prison.

Parole--may be defined as post-institutionalization care of the offender that is legally compulsory and usually lasts for an extended period. It is a time of qualified freedom for the offender, based on the assumption that, on the one hand, he no longer needs to be incarcerated but, on the other, is not yet prepared to assume a full role in society without a trial period of observation and supervision.⁵

⁵U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, The Reentry of the Offender into the Community (by Elliot Studt) (Washington: 1967), p. iii.

CHAPTER II

FINANCIAL COST OF PRISON SYSTEMS

Administration of Corrections

Corrections is fragmented administratively, with the Federal Government, all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, most of the country's 3,047 counties, and all except the smallest cities having one or more correctional facilities, if only a primitive jail in which to lock up overnight those who are "drunk and disorderly." Typically, each level of government acts independently of all the others. The Federal Government has no control over state corrections. The states usually have responsibility for prisons and parole programs, but probation is often a county or municipal function. Counties do not have jurisdiction over the jails operated by cities and towns. This situation is in sharp contrast to correctional systems in other urban and industrialized countries, where correctional activity usually is the responsibility of the central government.⁶ It is this

⁶The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Corrections (Washington, D.C.: Govt. Printing Office, 1967), p. 5.

fragmentation and duplication that makes the construction and maintenance of a prison system an extremely costly project for the taxpayers.

In the vast majority of city and county jails and local short-term institutions, no significant progress has been made in the past 50 years.⁷

In the second decade of this century, Louis Robinson wrote:

From many points of view, the jail is the most important of all our institutions of imprisonment. The enormous number of jails is alone sufficient . . . to make (one) realize that the jail is, after all, the typical prison in the United States . . . From two-thirds to three-fourths of all convicted criminals serve out their sentence in jails. But this is not all. The jail is, with small exception, the almost universal detention house for untried prisoners. The great majority, therefore, of penitentiary and reformatory prisoners have been kept for a period varying from a few days to many months within the confines of a county or municipal jail. Then, too, there is the class, not at all unimportant in number, of individuals, who, having finally established their innocence, have been set free after spending some time in the jail awaiting trial. Important witnesses also are detained in jail, and it is used at times for still other purposes, even serving occasionally as a temporary asylum for the insane . . . The part, therefore, which the jail plays in our scheme of punishment cannot be overestimated. Whether for good or for evil, nearly every criminal that has been apprehended is subjected to its influence.⁸

⁷"Local Adult Correction Institutions and Jails," Crime and Delinquency, January 1967, p. 137.

⁸Louis N. Robinson, Penology in the United States (Philadelphia: John C. Winston, 1921), p. 32.

Now, in the seventh decade, this statement by Robinson and his comments on filth, neglect, and maladministration still accurately describe the role and status of jails and short-term institutions in the United States.

Great strides have been made in prison administration since the early days of Sing Sing. We conceive the modern prison to be a humanely run place with good food, adequate housing and health facilities, a classification system to effectively separate and process different types of inmates, efficient prison industry, a well-trained staff, and an educational, vocational, religious, psychiatric, and general guidance program to aid the inmate in his rehabilitation. Despite all this, we find prisons crowded (we have had about a 5% yearly increase in the number of inmates but considerably less expansion of facilities) and remarkably ineffective if measured by recidivism rates. While there is considerable variation from one prison to another, the over-all average of inmates released from prison but returned under sentence for new crimes is about 60%.⁹ (There is no assurance that all of the remaining 40% become law-abiding; it is suspected that many violate the criminal law but are not caught.)

⁹Donald J. Newman, "Crime and Crime Prevention," Collier's Encyclopedia Yearbook (1961), p. 176.

Over-All Cost of the System

Expenditures for corrections in the United States during 1965 totaled about one billion dollars, excluding new construction, amortization, the cost of some services shared with other agencies and paid for out of other budgets, and many other items which an accountant would use to arrive at the true cost picture. The National Survey of Corrections found that the various governmental units plan to spend over a billion dollars on capital improvement during the coming 10 years. This is a conservative estimate, since construction costs can be expected to rise and some jurisdictions do not project capital expenditures over a 10-year period.

By far the largest item is the \$435 million spent to operate institutions for adult offenders--more than 40 percent of all spending for operating correction in 1965. The bulk of this \$435 million was spent to feed, clothe, and guard prisoners. Add to this sum the \$148 million spent on county and city jails, where the great bulk of prisoners were adults, and it will be seen that well over half the national investment in corrections went to the management of adult criminals in institutions. About \$320 million was spent for all juvenile corrections, with over two-thirds of that sum allocated for institutional programs.

Although more dollars were spent on adult corrections than on juvenile programs, the average per capita

expenditure for the juvenile was much larger than that provided for the adult felon or misdemeanor. The average annual cost of institutionalizing a juvenile in 1965 was \$3,613 whereas the comparable figures for the felon and the misdemeanor were \$1,966 and \$1,046, respectively.¹⁰ It should be remembered that the juvenile offender of today may well be the adult inmate of tomorrow.

The fact that both the general population and the general crime rate are increasing has caused serious overcrowding in most prison systems. One answer to this has been the increased use of probation and the lessening of time served by liberalizing parole eligibility. In states with highly professional probation and parole agencies, as many as 85 percent of all convicted felons may be on probation or parole.¹¹ Despite this trend, prison populations are increasing faster than new building and expansion programs.

The administration of a prison system is extremely costly, and the construction of new correctional facilities presents a serious tax problem. Even a minimum-security correctional institution may cost about \$20,000 per cell

¹⁰The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Corrections (Washington, D.C.: Govt. Printing Office, 1967), p. 5.

¹¹Donald J. Newman, "Crime and Crime Prevention," Collier's Encyclopedia Yearbook (1964), p. 198.

to build. Furthermore, the initial cost of construction is but a minor part of the total tax bill. The more "correctional" the institution, the greater the operating cost. A maximum-security institution with limited training and vocational facilities may have a budget of from \$1,200 to \$800 per inmate annually. An institution with more adequate psychiatric, educational, vocational, and classification programs may cost upward of \$4,000 per inmate per year.¹²

To the extent that overcrowding in prison must be met by the construction of new facilities, it is felt by most prison administrators that this construction will involve the expansion of prison farm and camp programs and the construction of small institutions with medium- or minimum-security dormitories or cottages. There is virtually no penological support for the construction of maximum-security, walled, and towered prisons.¹³ (I would disagree, in part, with the preceding statement. I feel that at least 10% of the prison population need the confinement of concrete and steel (maximum security). A maximum security institution may be defined as that which contains the type of inmate who is likely to make active efforts to escape, would not hesitate to use violence in

¹²Ibid., p. 198.

¹³Ibid., p. 199.

so doing, and is likely to use violence outside, after he has escaped.) During my field service trip with the Canadian Penitentiary Service I visited Archambault Institution, Ste. Anne des Plaines, Quebec. This penitentiary complex, the first to be built in Canada, was planned in accord with the present concepts in criminology and penology. The construction program which commenced in 1966 provided for a total expenditure of approximately \$25,000,000. A maximum security institution and the services buildings such as stores, maintenance shops, main kitchen and the water, heat and power plants have been completed. The construction of a minimum security annex is planned to accommodate the inmates to be employed in the services maintenance. Later, a reception center and a medical center will be constructed. When in full operation, the institution will employ approximately 250 officers whose annual salary will amount to more than \$1,750,000. When the construction of this complex is completed, it will employ approximately 415 officers whose annual salary will be more than \$3,000,000.¹⁴

Personnel

Correctional agencies across the country face acute shortages of qualified manpower, especially in

¹⁴Data received from Warden LeCorre of Archambault Institution, Ste. Anne des Plaines, Quebec, Canada during my tour of the institution on November 20, 1969.

positions charged with responsibility for treatment and rehabilitation. Thousands of additional probation and parole officers are required now to achieve minimum standards for effective treatment and control. Many more thousands will be needed in the next decade.

Similar, though not as acute, shortages are commonplace in specialist positions within correctional institutions. Teachers, caseworkers, vocational instructors, and group workers are all needed in great numbers, as are personnel to carry out classification and screening functions, within both institutional and community programs.

Guards and house parents are substantially more numerous, but there is a major need to recruit more adequately qualified persons and to develop new skills and perspectives, so that these thousands of workers may play a significant role in rehabilitative programs. Today the great potential which they have for changing offenders, rather than merely overseeing them, goes largely unrealized.

At the beginning of 1962 there were approximately 42,387 employees in state and federal correctional institutions for adults, the great majority of them guards or members of custodial staffs. This figure does not include employees in juvenile training schools, in jails, or in detention facilities.

There is a great need for professionally trained help. A study made in 1960 showed that there were only 33 full-time and 50 part-time psychiatrists working in correctional systems throughout the United States. The study also showed only 109 full-time psychologists, 605 full-time social workers, and 144 full-time physicians or surgeons. Professional schools of social work are not yet capable of producing enough graduates with master's degrees in corrections to staff correctional programs. In early 1963 Wisconsin, which has one of the most professional correctional services, had approximately 100 vacancies for professional social workers, with no prospects of filling them.¹⁵

Over 121,000 people were employed in corrections on an average day in 1965, 15 percent in community programs, which handled 67 percent of all offenders, the other 85 percent in institutions, where 33 percent of all offenders were confined.

Functionally classified 63,000, or 52 percent of all staff, were custodial employees--guards, supervisors, and house parents. Another 34,000 or 28 percent, were engaged in service or administrative functions. Thus, only 24,000 workers, or 20 percent, were primarily engaged

¹⁵Donald J. Newman, "Crime and Crime Prevention," Collier's Encyclopedia Yearbook (1963), p. 240.

in activities specifically designated as aimed at treatment. This figure includes all the probation and parole workers, as well as social workers, psychiatrists, psychologists, and teachers.¹⁶

Many correctional manpower problems stem from conditions which make the field unattractive to competent and ambitious persons. Salaries are very low. For example, the median starting salary for custodial employees in adult institutions is between \$4,000 and \$5,000 per year. In juvenile institutions, it is even lower--\$3,000 to \$4,000. Teachers, social workers, and counselors do not fare much better. Higher education in the United States has displayed little interest in the special problems involved in dealing with offenders under correctional treatment. In addition, working conditions are difficult, and the public image of the work--and therefore its prestige--are generally poor.¹⁷

As a result of these conditions, administrators of correctional programs tend to have limited backgrounds. Too often they are promoted to their managerial posts from within the system, without adequate training, experience, or fitness for their task. A number are also chosen largely on the basis of political considerations.

¹⁶The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Corrections (Washington, D.C.: Govt. Printing Office, 1967), p. 6.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 6.

Correction faces a difficult task in recruiting the enormous numbers of additional manpower it so desperately needs. It must compete with other institutions in attracting professional personnel and must enlarge and improve its line custodial staff. Three general ways to deal with the problem are to (1) reduce the rate of staff turnover; (2) provide intensive in-service training and upgrading programs; and (3) bring in new people. Better salaries and opportunities for career advancement are vital. New sources of manpower, such as former inmates and students, should be exploited. Finally, correction must erase its "stigma" and stimulate community interest and support.¹⁸

The quality of the personnel in the prison constitutes the single most important influence on the day-to-day life inside and on the eventual personal and social adjustment of the prisoner when he is released. There is no more urgent subject, then, for executive attention in the administration of the prison.¹⁹

Fulfillment of the above suggested programs would constitute an additional burden on the already over-loaded taxpayer.

¹⁸Charles W. Phillips, "Developing Correctional Manpower," Crime and Delinquency (July 1969), p. 415.

¹⁹W. T. McGrath (ed.), Crime and Its Treatment in Canada (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1965), p. 318.

Hidden Costs

The cost of crime is more than the losses of victims. Taxpayer assessments such as police salaries and equipment, courts, crime laboratories, and research programs must be added to give a more accurate total. This final sum would be increased even further if the cost of theft insurance, protective devices like burglar-alarm systems, and the loss of productive labor by the men in prison (and their guards) were included.

Much of the cost of crime is other than financial. Certainly the major price we pay is in loss of life and health, both physical and mental. Furthermore, every citizen pays some emotional price for crime in terms of insecurity and anxiety, and the ultimate cost to our society of corruption, vice, and racketeering is immeasurable.

The financial cost to our society of supporting the offender's family while he is incarcerated must also be considered. Many of these families do support themselves but many others rely on welfare benefits for support. Although I was unable to find any statistics on welfare costs of dependent families of imprisoned offenders, it can be assumed that these costs run into hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

Currently, there is a movement afoot in several countries to reexamine the problem of restitution or

compensation to the victim. Realizing that the offender is in no position to pay indemnity for his act, criminal lawyers and criminologists are seriously contemplating the possibility of the state's making compensation to the victim for harm, injury, or death. Precedent is found in workmen's compensation laws (or industrial injury acts), which have existed in many countries for two to three generations. The absence of state responsibility for injury to the victim becomes somewhat ludicrous when one contemplates the growing efforts in modern countries to rehabilitate the offender as a part of probation, prison, and parole (or after-care) administration. The state--rightly so--is making a greater and greater investment in attempts to treat, reeducate, and restore offenders, so that they can lead fairly stable and useful lives in the community. But the state, as of the present, has little, if any, concern for the victim and his dependent. The question is: shouldn't the state have as much, if not more, concern for those who have been injured or who have suffered loss at the hands of the offenders?²⁰

²⁰Walter C. Reckless, The Crime Problem (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1967), p. 144.

CHAPTER III

BACKGROUND OF RELEASE PROCEDURES

Pardon

Historically, the principal forms of mitigation of punishment consist of pardons and commutations of sentences. All civilized countries make use of some form of the pardon power to give flexibility to the administration of justice in criminal cases. In England this power historically is vested in the Crown. But in the United States it is vested in the People, who can delegate the power to whomever they please. As a matter of practice, the People have found it most convenient to give the power to the executive branch of the government. Thus, under the United States Constitution the pardon power in federal cases has been delegated to the President; and practically all the state constitutions have delegated this power in state criminal cases to the governor, either alone or in conjunction with advisers.²¹

²¹Charles L. Newman, Sourcebook on Probation, Parole and Pardons (Springfield: Thomas Books, 1964), pp. 43-44.

Growth of population plus the complexities of modern government have routinized the administration of pardon so that executives usually exercise the power at a distance, seldom seeing in person the recipient of their boon. In 34 states pardon boards (or pardon-parole boards) process all pardon requests; in eight other states the governors are assisted by pardon attorneys, advisory officers, or parole commissioners; the remaining governors handle pardon directly.²²

Under ancient common law a declared felon was considered civilly "dead," his property was forfeited, and various disabilities were visited upon him as a citizen. Under present legal provisions, forfeiture no longer takes place, but conviction for felony usually entails other automatic disabilities which can seriously impede one's role as a member of society. The rights to vote, hold public office, invoke the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination, be a credible witness, institute lawsuits, and serve on juries are variously abrogated. Full pardon, which may at the same time release a prisoner, restores these rights. Prisoners released by completion of sentence or by parole must, in most states, later petition the governor for a full pardon to obtain such

²²D. R. Taft and R. W. England, Jr., Criminology (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964), p. 484.

restoration. Conditional pardon, used almost exclusively as a release measure, not only does not restore civil rights, but, as its name implies, imposes obligations upon the pardonee, who may variously be required to report periodically to state authorities, remain in the state, meet financial obligations, reimburse the state for trial cost, submit to confinement in a state asylum, or meet any other legitimate requirement deemed in the public interest.

Full pardon can be of value in rehabilitating an offender seeking to re-establish his role in society, although sound practice would dictate the automatic restoration of civil rights at some point in the correctional process.

The correctional value of conditional pardon is doubtful if no supervision of the released person is provided; without supervision, such pardon is tantamount to absolute release without restoration of civil rights. In Texas and a few other states without parole laws, supervised conditional release functions as parole.²³

In 1961, out of 102,122 prisoners released from state institutions, 14 were released by pardon and 32 by conditional pardon (these accounted for less than one-tenth of one percent of the total). This statistic points

²³R. W. England, Jr., "Pardon, Commutation, and Their Improvement," Prison Journal (April 1959), p. 24.

out the small number of inmates released by these methods. This paper is mainly concerned with those inmates released by way of parole, expiration of sentence, and discharge. These totaled 94,469 out of 102,122 in 1961.²⁴

Parole

For the purposes of this study, parole is defined as the release of an adult felony offender from a penal institution, after he has served part of his sentence, under supervision by the state and under prescribed conditions, which if violated, permit his re-imprisonment.

One of the principal reasons for the development of the parole system has been the growing realization that something more than the usual prison program would have to be introduced to make any real headway toward crime control. Modern penology sets two standards for any effective method of treatment: First, that it provide adequate protection for society, and second, that it have as its objective the rehabilitation of the offender. Parole has inherent possibilities for better-than-average success in both these respects. In addition to its merits as a protective and rehabilitative device, parole is an economical method of treating the offender. Recidivism has come to

²⁴D. R. Taft and R. W. England, Jr., Criminology (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964), p. 483.

be the most perplexing problem in crime control, and since parole shows more promise of preventing recidivism than any other treatment method we now have, properly administered it can serve as one of the most effective means for preventing and controlling crime.²⁵

In general, parole is granted to a prisoner so that he may return to normal living. It usually is given partly as a reward for his good behavior in prison and partly as a result of evidence that he would be a good risk if he were permitted to return to his community. Parole is usually granted by a parole board when a prisoner appears ready for a normal life. Its purpose is to encourage him to find respectable employment and to regain the place in society he has temporarily lost. Usually the parolee is expected to report to a parole officer and to live up to whatever special provisions govern his parole. A violation of parole may mean his return to jail. It should be remembered that a man on parole is still a prisoner, who is being allowed to complete his prison term outside of jail. While parole may sometimes be unwisely granted, in general, when properly administered, it is an excellent method of restoring a criminal to society.

In Michigan the Parole Board consists of five members, appointed by the Corrections Commission according to

²⁵U. S. Attorney General, Survey on Release Procedures Vol. IV, Parole (Washington: 1939), pp. 515-16.

Civil Service regulations. In this state each person, except a lifer, is eligible for parole when he has served the minimum term of his sentence, less good time allowances. Men serving for murder, first degree, or under the Lifer Law, receive special instructions and explanations while in the Reception Diagnostic Center. Each person is automatically interviewed by the Parole Board at the expiration of his minimum sentence, less earned good time allowances. He is advised in writing of his eligibility dates shortly after he arrives at the Reception Diagnostic Center. Three members (a majority) of the Parole Board must agree on the decision reached in each case. No cases are decided until a man has been interviewed. Present policy permits parole hearings about 120 days before the minimum eligibility date. Where parole is denied, a future review date is set, reasons are given and advice offered. Michigan law requires every employable person to have a satisfactory home and job before he may be released under parole supervision.²⁶

Having worked for the Michigan Corrections Department I chose to cite its rules regarding parole. The lack of uniformity among the states is, of course, the most obvious defect of parole regulations. These regulations in

²⁶Michigan Department of Corrections, Corrections Quarterly (Lansing: October, 1968), pp. 44-5.

the fifty states should be carefully reexamined--not separately in each state, but in a coordinated fashion. Lack of uniformity, impracticality, and multiplicity of regulations are not the only defects. Others are redundancy, complexity, legal jargon, inconsistency, and irrelevancy.

Discharge

Discharge from prison provides neither selection nor supervision in the community as do parole and mandatory release. Discharge is permanent and unconditional. It occurs when the maximum term of imprisonment has expired, when deductions for good behavior or other institutional credits require complete discharge rather than mandatory release, or when an act of clemency commutes the sentence "to the time served," or unconditionally pardons the prisoner. Expiration of sentence and other discharges accounted for 42.1% of all prisoners released from state institutions in 1961 (43,024 out of 102,222).²⁷

²⁷D. R. Taft and R. W. England, Jr., Criminology (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964), p. 483.

CHAPTER IV

RECIDIVISM

Introduction

Even in the better textbooks on criminology there is no exact definition of recidivism. The dictionary defines the word as a tendency to relapse into crime. While the term is used somewhat differently by various investigators, it is generally agreed that a recidivist is a prisoner who has previously been in correctional custody. The problem at once arises whether or not men who have been on probation should, when committed to prison, be termed recidivists since, technically, they are in correctional custody and have broken a law. Similarly, should an inmate who has been previously in a boy's school for petty stealing be considered a recidivist? Again, should a prisoner whose only previous record consists of a 30-day jail sentence for drunkenness be considered a recidivist? In the prison system the professional staff diagnoses recidivism, not according to previous record alone, but largely on the basis of personality make-up. Thus, a "two-time loser" may not be designated a recidivist, and, conversely, a man who has never been arrested before may

be diagnosed as a recidivist.²⁸ This individualized understanding of each case by the professional staff is not shared by the practical prison officials who generally take the position that every man who has served time before is a recidivist.

Causative Factors and Rates

Parolees of any age find transition from the institution to the free community difficult, although the older person who has been incarcerated for a long time may experience a more severe disorientation immediately after release than does his counterpart who has been incarcerated only a few months. A parolee knows when he is treated with suspicion, indignity, and rejection. All parolees can be confused by ambiguous instructions and inconsistent behaviors among the officials on whose decisions they have to depend. However, it is well to keep in mind the nature of the particular parolee population and to consider the different kinds of operational provisions that might be necessary to provide conditions of self-worth, adequate resources, role clarity, opportunities for independent decision making, and supporting fellowship for juvenile or adult parolees.

²⁸Donald Clemmer, The Prison Community (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1958), pp. 57-8.

Unfortunately our crimes against criminals do not cease when, having served his sentence, the offender is released from prison. He reenters a world utterly unlike the one he has been living in and also unlike the one he left some years before. In the new world, aside from a few uneasy relatives and uncertain friends, he is surrounded by hostility, suspicion, distrust, and dislike. He is a marked man--an ex-convict. Complex social and economic situations that proved too much for him before he went to prison have grown no simpler. The unequal tussle with smarter, "nicer," and more successful people begins again. Proscribed for employment by most concerns, and usually unable to find new friends or ways of earning a living, he tries to survive.

His chief occupation for a time will be the search for a means of livelihood, accompanied by innumerable rebuffs, suspicious glances, discouragements and hostile encounters and, of course, inevitably, temptations. Aside from his parole officer, toward whom he may not always feel kindly, the first friendly face that such an individual is likely to see is that of some crony of the old days who has been waiting for a little help to do a little job.

Remember, we are talking about a human being, a handicapped one at that, one who needs all the things that the rest of us do and a little bit more! You and I can get along without committing crimes (most of the time);

but obviously the criminal cannot, or at least he did not, and often does not. The fellow who has been in prison is worse off; he suffers not only from whatever made him commit a crime in the first place, but he now has what the prison did to him and, in addition, what society gives to former victims. He has a heavy burden.

The recidivism, or relapse, rate varies from one prison to the next, but the over-all average of inmates released from prison but returned under sentence for a new crime is about 25 percent. In addition about 25 percent of released inmates are returned to prison for parole violations. During 1961 there were 51,445 inmates paroled from state prisons and 14,822 parole violators returned (some of these violators had been released in earlier years).²⁹

The best current estimates indicate that, among adult offenders, 35 to 45 percent of those released on parole are subsequently returned to prison. The large majority of this group are returned for violations of parole regulations; only about one-third of those returned have been convicted of new felonies.³⁰

²⁹Donald J. Newman, "Crime and Crime Prevention," Collier's Encyclopedia Yearbook (1962), p. 187.

³⁰William A. Goldberg, Twentieth Century Corrections (East Lansing: Gibson's Bookstore, 1970), p. IX-63.

Time Lapse from Parole to Violation

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the U.S. Board of Parole issued warrants for 1,063 parolees who violated regulations for various reasons. Of the total, 223 (21 percent) broke parole within 2 months after release from prison, 18 percent in 3 to 4 months, and 12.9 percent in 5 to 6 months. More than half (51.9 percent) broke parole in 6 months or less. Within the year after parole almost three-fourths (73.6 percent) had violated parole regulations.³¹

The incidence of parole violations, in state prisons, is inversely related to the time under supervision; i.e., more violations occur in the first 6 months, with the number decreasing thereafter. In 1964 the Pennsylvania Board of Parole returned 786 parole violators to the various prisons in the state. In more than one-third (36.4 percent) of the cases, violations occurred in less than 6 months after parole, and 27.3 percent in 6 to 12 months. In other words, about two-thirds (63.7 percent) violated parole within the year and were returned to prison. Less than one-fourth (23 percent) were returned in the next year, and 7.2 percent in the second year after parole.³²

³¹Walter A. Lunden, Crime and Criminals (The Iowa State University Press, 1967), p. 311.

³²Ibid., pp. 312-3.

In 1963 the parole authority in New York State declared 2,280 parolees delinquent either for absconding (693) or because of other violations. A few less than half (46.9 percent) had been on parole for less than 6 months when violations occurred. Almost three-fourths, 1,615 (70.8 percent) violated parole within less than 12 months.³³

It is a disconcerting fact to those working in corrections and law enforcement that the majority of offenders fail to successfully complete parole. The consequences of this excessive rate of failure, while serious for the offender, are critical for society, for it is the community that will suffer in the long run from the inability of individual members to behave in an acceptable fashion. In addition, the following question arises: Is this high incidence of parole failure the fault of the offender, the parole process, or society, or are all three at fault to varying degrees?

The high percentage of parole violations in the early months of parole are important for a number of reasons. The first few months after parole are critical for parolees; therefore, more financial help is needed (in my opinion) in the early stages of parole. In

³³Ibid., p. 313.

addition, if the parolee can make adjustments in the first six months after parole from prison, his chances for success are better.

CHAPTER V

POST-RELEASE AID

Introduction

Essentially in the after-care agency we are seeking out the strengths which we believe to be inherent in every human being. We help men to earn their living on their strengths and not their weaknesses. This means that our attitude to the ex-inmate must be accepting though not condoning of past crimes or future criminal intention. Moralizing is but empty preachment, and casting blame for failure, trivial or great, adds no strength to the man's struggle. It is essential to accommodate the agency's service to the man's need which is the essence of individualizing service. This must be done within agency policy and resources, but inventiveness and initiative should draw in other resources from outside the agency.

It is essential to focus service on the prison experience and its effect on re-establishment. After-care agencies are not relief agencies nor are they "hand-out" way stations for transients. They are rendering a recognized social service by approved methods authorized and supported by their communities, and in doing this have

developed policies and practices based on long experience and observations. Not the least important factor in their work is the rather unique knowledge they have of prisons and of the criminal population. They are in and out of the institutions frequently, know the staff and many of the inmate populations, have studied the penal system and participated in its growth and development, and have developed considerable skill in the work of parole and after-care.

The role in which they work must be kept clear since after-care involves working with men on full-term release as well as on parole. The former are free men under no obligation to ask for service nor to fulfill any legal requirements. They can be brought into relationship only through the effectiveness of the caseworker and the manner in which the agency is able to meet their need. This is also true of men on parole since relationship is a matter of content and not of periodic reporting which may be an empty formality.

Volunteers of America

This organization, founded in 1896 by Ballington and Maud Booth, maintains well over 500 program centers in posts throughout the nation. Its annual budget is in excess of \$10 million. It serves, during the course of an average year, more than two million persons.

For another thing, it has come to occupy a significant place in the roster of organizations that serve this nation's needy. From the commander in chief, right down to area and local staff people, Volunteers of America officers serve on scores of nation, regional and state bodies whose job it is to work toward solutions of spiritual and social problems. And the organization's services are often used as pilot studies for projected wide-range programs of major significance.

The Correctional Services Department offers counseling designed to aid prisoners to overcome personal and family problems, gives material assistance to inmates' families, and provides job placement service for the discharged prisoners and parolees. Working closely with prison authorities, Volunteers of America officers encourage inmates to maintain prison discipline and to prepare for reentry into society.

The Adult Corrections Program offers three services at the present time. The Parolee Program provides the "down-and-outer" inmate with a home and job placement so that at the time of his parole hearing he has a somewhat specific future. Adult probation cases are referred to them as an alternative to a prison sentence. They are currently in the midst of defining a program with the State of Michigan for a "pre-release" program. The

return rate with inmates from the Volunteers is less than ten percent.³⁴

Salvation Army

The Salvation Army was founded in 1865 by William Booth, an English minister. It is an international religious and charitable organization whose purpose is to undertake the spiritual, moral and physical rehabilitation of all persons in need who come within its sphere of influence, regardless of race or creed. It is a church with stated doctrines, precepts and teachings, and its officers have the status and powers of ordained clergymen of other denominations; it is recognized by the Military Services, Internal Revenue, U.S. Courts, the Councils of Churches and the National Correctional Chaplains Association. It is a unique organization whose purpose is primarily spiritual, but in many areas its function is social service, or a combination of both when indicated. This is the idealism or philosophy of The Salvation Army.

As rehabilitation programs have been instituted within the prisons and facilities to meet new concepts in penology, so the work of The Salvation Army in this field has been changed and developed to keep pace with new trends

³⁴Personal Interview with William Clements, Captain, Volunteers of America, Jackson, Michigan; July 6, 1970.

and practices. As a religious, voluntary agency, it acts in a supplementary role to that of public agencies dealing with personal problems of the offender and his rehabilitation. There is cooperation with both public and private agencies. There is coordinated effort in working with probation and parole authorities at the State and Federal levels.

The following are services available, in many sections of the country, to parolees and discharged offenders.

1. Counseling.
2. Supplementary supervision of parolees under Advisorship or Sponsorship program.
3. Employment information, referrals, contacts made, letters of introduction, telephone calls.
4. Answering service for clients who have no phone or permanent address.
5. Storage of personal property items, without charge, until man has residence.
6. Home visits when necessary to families of inmates and ex-inmates living in local area.
7. Assistance to parolees and discharged inmates in these categories: board, room, clothing, shoes; clothing secured from laundries and cleaners, hair cuts, toilet articles, fees for drivers licenses, fees for birth certificates, tools necessary for employment.
8. Released inmates' families are referred to The Salvation Army Family Service Bureau. However, there are instances when a parole agent, in an emergency, refers the family to this department,

the immediate needs are met, and proper referral made.³⁵

John Howard Society

John Howard was Britain's first penal reformer. He spent most of his adult life, until his death in 1790, acquainting the public with the deplorable conditions in British prisons and those of the Continent.

Prisoners' aid work began in Canada in 1874 when a group of church workers began visiting prisoners in the Toronto Jail. They soon realized that spiritual comfort was not in itself enough and formed the Prisoners' Aid Society which ceased operation in 1915. In 1928, within four months of his appointment as Toronto's Chief of Police, General D. C. Draper discovered that nothing was being done to help released prisoners resume their place in society, and in 1929 he established the Citizens Service Association with headquarters in Toronto.

In 1935 the name was changed to the Prisoners' Rehabilitation Society to interpret more properly to the public the nature of the service. In 1946 the name was again changed to the John Howard Society with a view to standardizing the description of prison after-care

³⁵Lt. Colonel Carl R. Dueill, "The Salvation Army," Correctional Review--California (July-August, 1966), pp. 12-13.

societies in Canada. The John Howard Society of British Columbia in 1931 was the first in Canada to use the designation. Today there is a John Howard Society in every province with branches in every major city in Canada.

The present-day service offered by the Society is divided into two phases--pre-release and after-care. In both phases social counseling, which in the latter case may go on for years, is the Agency's chief function and concern. Most ex-inmates need help to adjust to the problems of their new environment, solve personal and family difficulties and overcome the stigma the community attached to their past.

The pre-release service is performed within the institution and bridges the gap between institutionally dependent life and the self-supporting independence of community living. At the same time, the man's targets and experience are noted and forwarded as advance information to the Society's branch in the area to which he will go.

Upon release, the ex-inmate may go to one of the Society's Branches where his immediate financial needs, when properly established, will be met. He may be given nominal sums for food, lodging, work clothing, tools and miscellaneous items. Over \$47,000 is spent for these purposes annually. This is done as part of the total re-establishment plan and not as an unrelated handout.

Job placement is carried out through the close cooperation of the special service officers of the local Canada Manpower Centers who have done an outstanding job over the years. Ex-inmates are considered to be socially handicapped persons for the first 30 days following release and thus to be eligible for the service of these counselors.

Over 400 parolees are placed under the parole supervision of the Society workers annually at the request of either federal or provincial authorities.³⁶

Conclusion

Other agencies have made a brief splash in the field of after-care but have not survived long enough for a true evaluation of their efforts to be made. The societies covered in the preceding paragraphs have survived for many years and are making valuable contributions to the rehabilitation of ex-inmates.

Hindsight is easier than foresight, and in generalizing the principles of assistance to ex-inmates the after-care agencies have formulated clear but flexible policies. They know that it is useless to counsel a hungry man and so provide assistance for food, shelter,

³⁶Based on personal correspondence between D. Grant Lennie, Administrative Assistant, John Howard Society of Ontario, Toronto, Canada, and the writer; June 16, 1970.

and clothing. If a man does not know where he will eat or sleep, his anxiety is focused on survival and not on the other positive approaches to his re-establishment. It is true that the resources available for such material assistance are minimal and barely serve to keep a man alive. It is also true that they cannot be provided indefinitely so that the client is constantly impressed with the inevitable day when he must be self-supporting.

CHAPTER VI

DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

The purpose of the Director Questionnaire has been covered on pages 7 and 8. A sample of the questionnaire and cover letter may be found in Appendix 1.

Question No. 1 was: What is the present daily wage range of the inmates in your system (range or level)? Originally my intention was to determine an average daily wage but due to the variation of answers I decided to record the answers exactly as received from the various department of corrections. There is a discrepancy within the systems as to what a work week is. It varies from 20 hours per week for some inmates to 70 hours per week for others depending upon the type of work assignment. Due to the importance of this question any attempt to alter the answers, for the sake of conformity, would have changed their value.

Table 1, 2 and 3

Source: Data received from Research Questionnaires sent to the director at each of the fifty state departments of corrections, plus the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and the Canadian Penitentiary Service by the writer, 1970. Forty-six of the fifty-five systems responded.

Table 1
Inmate Wage Range or Level by Systems, 1970

System	None	Hourly	Daily	Monthly	Special
Alaska			50¢-\$2.50		
Arizona	x			\$3-\$24	Legislation expected
California			10¢-60¢		
Colorado			38¢-74¢		
Connecticut					
Delaware			10¢-90¢		
Florida	x				
Georgia	x				Legislation passed
Hawaii				Non-Industries \$1-\$6 40 Other Positions \$5-\$10	
Idaho		6¢-15¢	Industries 56¢-\$1		
Indiana			15¢-25¢		
Iowa			20¢-\$1		
Kansas			10¢-30¢		
Kentucky			15¢-\$1.20		
Louisiana		2¢-5¢			
Maine					
Maryland	x		40¢-95¢		
Massachusetts			25¢-50¢		
Michigan			20¢-\$2.50		
Minnesota			20¢-\$1		

Table 1 (continued)

System	None	Hourly	Daily	Monthly	Special
Missouri				Non-Industries \$3 Industries \$20	
Montana			10¢-50¢		
Nebraska				\$3-\$20	
Nevada			30¢		
New Hampshire			Industries 50¢		
New Jersey			33¢-54¢		Legislation authority \$1/day
North Carolina	x				Max. 200 hrs./mo.
North Dakota			0¢-50¢		
Ohio		8¢		Industries \$5-\$10 Others-\$2	
Oklahoma					
Oregon			25¢-\$3		
Pennsylvania			25¢-60¢		
Rhode Island			50¢-\$1		
South Carolina				\$2.20-\$21	
South Dakota			60¢-\$1		
Tennessee				\$10-\$20	
Texas	x				
Vermont		10¢			
Washington	.		4¢-14¢	Forestry \$18-\$21	

Table 1 (continued)

System	None	Hourly	Daily	Monthly	Special
West Virginia			15¢-50¢		
Wisconsin			Inside-40¢ Outside-45¢		Industries incentive 80¢/day
Wyoming			\$1		
Puerto Rico			15¢-\$1.70	\$2.50-\$15	
Dist. of Columbia					
Federal Bureau		17¢-42¢			
Canada			35¢-65¢		

Table 1 showed that six of the responding systems did not, at the present time, pay a wage to inmates for work performed. The remaining systems paid from a minimum of 2¢ per day to a maximum of \$3.00 per day. Sixteen systems paid less than 60¢ per day. Very few people could save anything on such wages. Canteen prices in most systems could very well consume these wages. It should be evident from these figures that it would be extremely hard for an inmate to save any money for expenses after he is released. Furthermore, we have no guarantee that everyone is working.

Question No. 2 was: Is any money given to inmates at the time of their parole or discharge? If so, how much? The answer to this question was subdivided into four sections: (a) Other than what is in their accounts (referred to in Table 2 as grants); (b) Amount of clothes; (c) Bus Ticket home; and (d) Any amount loaned to prisoner. Since all systems furnished at least one complete set of clothes I did not tabulate this answer in Table 2.

Table 2 showed that thirty-one systems gave \$25 or less to released inmates with seven of these giving nothing. It further revealed that fourteen systems gave less than \$100 and only one system gave over \$100. In today's fast-moving society such tokenism is totally inadequate.

Thirty-four out of the forty-six responding systems had no authorized money available for lending to released

Table 2

Released Inmate Aid in Terms of Grants, Loans, and
Bus Ticket Home by Systems, 1970

System	Grant	Loan	Bus Ticket
Alaska	None	None	Yes
Arizona	\$25	None	Yes
California	Up to \$80	Tools only	Yes
Colorado	\$25	None	Yes
Connecticut	\$20	Up to \$200	Transportation provided
Delaware	None	None	Yes
Florida	\$25	None	Yes
Georgia	\$25	None	Yes
Hawaii	Up to \$15	None	Yes
Idaho	\$15	None	No
Indiana	\$15-\$20	Up to \$75	Yes
Iowa	Up to \$100	None	Yes
Kansas	Up to \$50	None	Yes
Kentucky	\$20	None	No
Louisiana	\$20	Inmate Lending Fund	Yes
Maine	\$50	None	Yes
Maryland	\$20	None	Unknown
Massachusetts	\$50	None	No
Michigan	Parolees-none	Parolees-Up to \$60	
Minnesota	Dischargees-\$10-\$20		
	\$25	None	No

Table 2 (continued)

System	Grant	Loan	Bus Ticket
Missouri	\$25	None	Yes
Montana	\$25	None	No
Nebraska	\$30	None	Yes
Nevada	\$25	None	No
New Hampshire	\$30	Prisoners' Aid Assoc. & Sm. Loans	Furnished by Parole Officer
New Jersey	Up to \$50	Special Cases- Up to \$150	Yes
North Carolina	\$15-\$20	Special Cases- Inmate Fund	Transportation furnished
North Dakota	\$18.50	None	Yes
Ohio	\$25	None	Yes, if cost over \$8
Oklahoma	Up to \$25	None	Yes
Oregon	Parolees-Up to \$50 Dischargees Up to \$100	Work Release Enrollee-Up to \$150	No answer
Pennsylvania	None	None	Yes
Rhode Island	Up to \$20	None	No
South Carolina	None	None	Yes
South Dakota	\$20	None	To place sentenced
Tennessee	\$25	None	Yes
Texas	Parolees-\$5 Dischargees-\$150	Yes (Inmate Welfare Fund)	Parolee-Yes

Table 2 (continued)

System	Grant	Loan	Bus Ticket
Vermont	\$5/mo. Up to \$200	None	If needed
Washington	Max. \$40	Small Loan	Yes-in State
			Out of State-
			Up to \$25
West Virginia	None	None	Yes
Wisconsin	\$10	Up to \$50 thru	Yes
		Parole Agent	
Wyoming	\$50	None	Yes-up to \$25
Puerto Rico	None	None	Yes
Dist. of Columbia	\$50-\$100	None	Yes
Federal Bureau	Up to \$100	None	Yes
	(Aver. \$20-\$35)		
Canada	None	None	Yes

inmates. The remaining twelve systems had small loans available to a maximum of \$200 (some of these had stringent requirements regarding eligibility).

Table 2 revealed that thirty-nine systems gave a bus ticket, or furnished transportation, home to the released inmate (within the state). Many systems do not furnish transportation beyond the state line. Transportation of any kind was not furnished by seven systems. I wonder how many of these seven states have laws against hitch-hiking!

The data from questions three and four will be compiled in Table 3. Question No. 3 was: What is your current rate of recidivism within the first six months? If compiled over a different time period, please state. Question No. 4 was: What is your current yearly cost per inmate during incarceration?

Table 3 revealed that the yearly cost of incarceration ranged from a low of \$950.00 (Louisiana) to a high of \$6,924.05 (Alaska). In my opinion, as the recommendations of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice are instituted the cost of incarceration has no way to go but up, especially for poorer systems.

In nineteen of the forty-six responding systems the recidivism rate was computed over a six-month period. The figures revealed that there was a low of 8% (Federal

Table 3
Rate of Recidivism and Yearly Cost of
Incarceration by Systems, 1970

Systems	Recidivism Rate			Yearly Cost of Incarceration
	6 mos.	1 year	Special	
Alaska			N.A.*	\$6,924.05
Arizona	50%			\$2,598.80
California		28.7%		\$2,000.00
Colorado	30%			\$3,136.00
Connecticut			N.A.	\$5,475.00
Delaware			N.A.	\$2,646.25
Florida			N.A.	\$2,100.00
Georgia	25%			\$2,091.45
Hawaii	28.7%			\$5,500.00
Idaho			N.A.	\$4,000.00
Indiana		32%		\$1,280.00
Iowa	55%			\$2,778.00
Kansas			33%-2yr.	\$2,867.00
Kentucky			N.A.	\$1,865.00
Louisiana	30%			\$ 950.00
Maine		25%		\$2,900.00
Maryland			Avg./ Country	\$3,450.00
Massachusetts	30%			\$4,212.93
Michigan			28%-2yr.	\$2,680.00
Minnesota			N.A.	\$5,074.00
Missouri	32%			\$2,273.95
Montana		53%		\$5,288.85
Nebraska	35%			No Answer
Nevada		34%		\$3,100.00
New Hampshire	33%			\$2,633.30
New Jersey	30%			\$2,730.00
North Carolina	10.4%			\$2,470.00
North Dakota	35%			\$3,000.00
Ohio			N.A.	\$2,175.40
Oklahoma	35%			\$1,500.00
Oregon			N.A.	\$2,144.16
Pennsylvania	24%			\$3,705.00
Rhode Island		70%		\$4,599.10
South Carolina			N.A.	\$1,641.00
South Dakota			N.A.	\$2,847.00

Table 3 (continued)

Systems	Recidivism Rate			Yearly Cost of Incarceration
	6 mos.	1 year	Special	
Tennessee		10.8%		\$1,613.30
Texas			16%-5yr.	\$1,153.40
Vermont			N.A.	\$5,500.00
Washington	18.6%			\$2,795.00
West Virginia	6.2%**			\$3,524.83
Wisconsin		28.5%		\$3,808.40
Wyoming	35%			\$2,540.40
Puerto Rico			N.A.	\$1,365.00
Dist. of Columbia			29%-3yr.	\$5,621.00
Federal Bureau	8%			\$3,398.15
Canada		48%		\$6,000.00

*Not Available

**Parole Violators Only

Bureau) and a high of 55% (Iowa). Twelve of these nineteen systems had a recidivism rate of 30% or over.

Nine more systems computed their recidivism rate over a one-year period. The range in these states was from a low of 10.8% (Tennessee) to a high of 70% (Rhode Island).

Thirteen systems had no available statistics on their recidivism rate.

After scanning the figures from many angles I could find no correlation between the yearly cost of incarceration and the rate of recidivism.

The rate of recidivism among the thirty-three systems who had compiled this data represents a large

portion of the inmate population. Any method that could salvage these lives, or a part of them, would be a tremendous saving to the taxpayer. It could also help to eliminate the problem of overcrowding now present in many systems.

Question No. 5 relating to assistance given inmates' families during their incarceration was found to be insignificant to this study. Welfare assistance given these families is no different than that given to other unfortunate members of society.

CHAPTER VII

INMATE QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

The scope and method used for the inmate interviews have been covered on pages 8 and 9. A sample of the questionnaire may be found in Appendix 2.

Question No. 1 was: How long has it been since you left prison?

Tables 4, 5, 6 and 7

Source: Data tabulated was received from Inmate Questionnaires voluntarily filled out by fifty inmates from the State Prison of Southern Michigan at Jackson. This survey was conducted by the writer on July 1, 1970 with the assistance of Henry Risley, Vocational Counselor at the Reception and Diagnostic Center. Out of a total of fifty-one inmates only one refused to fill out the questionnaire.

Table 4

Length of Time Since Previous Release, Survey of
Fifty Inmates, State Prison of Southern
Michigan at Jackson, July 1, 1970

Number of Inmates	3 months or under	3-6 months	6-9 months	9-12 months	1-2 years	over 2 years
8	16%					
8		16%				
5			10%			
4				8%		
11					22%	
14						28%

Table 4 revealed that 32% of the fifty inmates interviewed returned to prison within the first six months following their previous release. This lends support to my contention that the first six months is a crucial period for the released inmate. I feel it is of interest to note that 72% returned within the first two years.

Question No. 2 referring to the length of time between arrest and actual return to the system received a variety of answers. They varied anywhere from six days to nine months. This brings to light one very costly phase of the criminal justice system which is not tabulated in the over-all cost of the prison system.

Table 5

Percentage of Inmates Returned to Prison for New Crime, Parole Violation, or Combination of Both; Survey of Fifty Inmates, State Prison of Southern Michigan at Jackson, July 1, 1970

Number of Inmates	N.C.*	P.V.**	N.C. & P.V.
17	34%		
19		38%	
14			28%

*New Crime

**Parole Violation

Table 5 reveals that between new crimes and the combination of new crimes and parole violations we have

62% that would possibly have to go through the costly court system. Again, I would like to emphasize that any method that would help to prevent the return of an inmate to prison would be a tremendous savings to the taxpayer.

Table 6

Money in Account or Available Upon Release, Survey
of Fifty Inmates, State Prison of Southern
Michigan at Jackson, July 1, 1970

Number of Inmates	Under \$50	\$50- \$100	\$100- \$150	\$150- \$200	Over \$200
28	56%				
7		14%			
4			8%		
1				2%	
10					20%

Table 6 revealed that the majority of inmates--twenty-eight (56%)--had less than fifty dollars when released from prison. There were an additional seven (14%) who had less than one-hundred dollars. The combination (70%) of these two sections shows a definite need for financial assistance during the crucial weeks following release.

Because of the relationship between Questions Five, Six, and Seven I decided to tabulate the results in Table 7. Question No. 5 was: Do you feel that lack of

Table 7

Inmate Survey Regarding Lack of Adequate Living Expenses as Contributing Factor to Return, Number of Dependents to Support, and Estimated Time of Needed Assistance--Fifty Inmates from State Prison of Southern Michigan at Jackson, July 1, 1970

Inmate Interview Number	Lack of Adequate Living Expenses		Number of Dependents		Estimated Time of Needed Assistance
	Yes	No	Self	Others	
1	x		x	7	6 months
2	x		x		2 months
3	x		x	4	1 month
4	x		x		3-5 weeks
5	x		x		3 weeks-1-1/2 months
6		x	x		3 weeks-1 month
7	x		x		6 months
8		x	x		6 months
9		x	x	2	2 months
10		x	x		2 weeks
11			x	3	2 months
12	x		x	4	2 months
13	x		x		30 days
14	x		x	2	1-1/2 months
15		x	x		2 months
16		x	x	3	None
17		x	x		60 days
18		x	x		2 months
19		x	x	2	60 days
20	x		x		2 weeks

Table 7 (continued)

Inmate Interview Number	Lack of Adequate Living Expenses		Number of Dependents		Estimated Time of Needed Assistance
	Yes	No	Self	Others	
21		x	x		4 months
22	x		x		3 months
23		x	x		2-3 weeks
24		x	x		None
25	x		x	3	2-1/2 months
26		x	x	2	None
27		x	x		None
28		x	x		None
29	x		x	3	6 months
30	x		x		1 month
31		x	x	3	6 months
32	x		x	2	3 months
33		x	x		3 months
34	x		x	3	None
35		x	x		30 days
36		x	x		None
37		x	x		None
38	x		x	10	6 months
39			x		2 months
40	x		x		90 days
41		x	x		None
42		x	x		None
43	x		x		2 months
44	x		x		3 months

Table 7 (continued)

Inmate Interview Number	Lack of Adequate Living Expenses		Number of Dependents		Estimated Time of Needed Assistance
	Yes	No	Self	Others	
45		x	x		30 days
46	x		x		1 month
47		x	x		1-2 months
48		x	x		3 months
49		x	x		1 month
50	x		x		4 weeks

adequate living expenses was a contributing factor to your return? If answer is yes, why? Question No. 6 was: Did you have anyone other than yourself to support when you were released? Question No. 7 was: How long do you feel you could have used assistance with living expenses before you could have maintained them on your own?

Table 7 revealed that twenty-two out of fifty (44%) inmates felt that lack of adequate living expenses was a contributing factor in their return to prison. Out of this number there were ten (45.4%) family men who had a total of forty-one dependents requiring support. Twenty-eight inmates stated that the lack of adequate living expenses was not a contributory factor in their return. It is interesting to note that nineteen of these twenty-eight stated they could have used assistance after release ranging from a period of two weeks to six months. On an overall basis forty out of fifty (80%) inmates stated they could have used assistance ranging up to six months, following release.

If we let the figures do the talking it should be evident to those in the correctional field that a program of financial assistance is needed if the rate of recidivism is to be reduced.

CHAPTER VIII

PLANNING FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSED PROGRAM

Establishing Eligibility of Released Inmate

In my opinion the already established Parole Board should be quite capable of determining the eligibility of the released inmates (meaning parolees and discharges). Formation of another costly department should not be necessary. Furthermore, I would not set up such stringent guidelines as to make a costly investigation necessary.

My research revealed that the majority of inmates leave prison with fifty dollars or less (see Table 6). I feel this is not enough for bare existence or survival when you look at the cost of the following: transportation, food, lodging, clothing and support of dependents. There are few inmates who leave prison debt-free. Many have bills accumulated by themselves and their families during their incarceration. In many cases even when the inmate has a job to go to it may be three or four weeks before he receives a full paycheck.

Since I consider the first six months after release a critical period for an inmate I would suggest financial

assistance during this time to the amount of two hundred dollars a month, if need can be established. This would not be enough to make him totally dependent on the program but would show him that people care enough to help him through this critical period. It should be made clear to the inmate that this money is an outright gift and not a loan requiring repayment.

The inmate would be required to submit an affidavit sixty days before release testifying to his need for assistance. The inmate should be made aware that this assistance would be a one-time opportunity. If he should return again to the system it would not be available to him, under any circumstances. I feel that this is necessary because there has been too much paternalism in government assistance programs in the past.

I found that during the inmate interviews question number five of the questionnaire relating to lack of adequate living expenses as a contributory factor to return elicited some rather interesting answers. I propose now to quote some of them verbatim. I am doing this because it is hard for those of us who have never served time to fathom the true feeling of an inmate.

Inmate Interview No. 1--"because I was behind whole lot--thing like I did had the money at time--I was merely frustrate over everything I just couldn't see myself under those conditions."

Inmate Interview No. 2--"when I was released job was very hard to find, and they are still hard to find. And one other thing no one likes to hire an ex-con."

Inmate Interview No. 13--"could not find work right away."

Inmate Interview No. 20--"laid off work--no compensation, three twenty-eight dollar checks from welfare in eight weeks--food allowance."

Inmate Interview No. 22--"they don't give you nothing to live on that is why we have to take what we want."

Inmate Interview No. 32--"I wasn't making expenses on the job I had and left for California eight days before my parole became final--therefore violated my parole."

Inmate Interview No. 44--"education, clothes, transportation, rent and food funds."

From my own experience working (State Prison of Southern Michigan) in a correctional system at the grass roots level I feel this is an accurate sampling of inmate feeling. Many times I have heard inmates make this statement--"if only I could have gotten away with that job it would have been enough to put me over the hump." By "hump" they were referring to the crucial period immediately following release.

Responsibility for Distribution of Funds

The responsibility for distribution of funds would rest with the State Parole Board. Since this Board already has the addresses of the parolees it would be very little trouble to include the addresses of the discharges.

A special pay voucher could be made out monthly and sent to the state treasury office who in turn would issue and send out checks to eligible released inmates.

Convince Legislators and Taxpayers of Need for Program

Complaints about appalling and neanderthal conditions in the prisons of this nation are not new. They have been periodically making the headlines in various states for a long time.

Now, finally, there seems to be a genuine, growing concern in Congress and other official areas to launch long-needed reforms. The biggest problem, perhaps, is sufficiently motivating those persons who can help start things moving.

A significant step may have been accomplished recently when 23 judges, as a part of a seminar, spent a night in Nevada State Prison, locked up with the inmates. The judges were quite shaken after only one day of imprisonment, and some said the system is putting 18, 19, and 20 year olds in jail and making hardened criminals out of them.

Prisons, of course, were never intended to be resorts for criminal offenders. But neither should they be merely cages where inmates have utterly no hope for the future.

This is in no way a criticism of Nevada prisons, nor those of any other state. But it has been obvious for a long time that major reforms are needed.

Reforms, however, take money, and many wardens and correction officials of states are quick to note that their efforts in the past to upgrade have gained little support where it is needed.

Perhaps if more judges and members of the legal profession took time to closely study their own prisons, they might be able to pinpoint the real need areas and obtain the necessary support of lawmakers and other essential officials.

Many prisons, for example, simply lack facilities to sufficiently house the growing number of persons being committed, and little is being done about it.

There is a crying need in many areas for better rehabilitation programs; segregation of hard-core, repeat offenders from first offenders and the acquisition of more highly trained professional personnel.

Rehabilitation not punishment, should be the primary goal of any prison. Many correctional institutions are not accomplishing that goal, and they will not until they are provided with the facilities and personnel to do so.³⁷

Not many taxpayers are afforded the opportunity of the judges cited above. They must depend on accurate reporting by the news media for many facts and figures. The news media, in many cases, must rely on experts in the field who have thoroughly documented their data. Before a salesman can sell his product he must know it thoroughly, so too, must the initiator of a new idea. It is a well known fact that the press is a very influential factor in the American way of life. If a program of this nature is to gain any support it would need their backing. This would assure the maximum amount of exposure to the maximum number of people. It should not be forgotten that these members of the press are also taxpayers. If they can be convinced of the need for such a program on a dollars and cents basis then they could do an excellent selling job to the man on the street. A State Senator from Michigan recently discussed with the writer ways of selling this program to the public and to the legislators. He agreed with me that the only way to convince taxpayers of the need for such a program was in dollars and cents. Senator Fleming

³⁷ Editorial, State Journal, Lansing, Michigan, July 20, 1970, p. A-8.

stated that the legislator is influenced to support a program not only through personal contact with the taxpayer but through telephone calls, telegrams, and letters from him.³⁸

It is my belief that this program does not need a ream of paper to emphasize its necessity. A piece of chalk, a blackboard, and a few documented figures (made public) are all that would be necessary. With the help of the press the following points would be the ones to emphasize: (1) the cost and maintenance of a prison system as described earlier in the report, along with the cost of updating many of our archaic systems would be an added burden on the taxpayer. (2) The high rate of recidivism during the first six months following release and how costly this return can be, or is. For example, it is astounding that the arrest, trial and imprisonment of a single repeating offender costs the taxpayer approximately \$50,000. This includes the cost of over \$6600 per year to maintain him in prison but does not cover the \$3000 per year it might well take to look after his family on welfare while he is imprisoned.³⁹ While these figures

³⁸State Senator James Fleming--Michigan, Personal Interview, July 6, 1970.

³⁹Based on personal correspondence between D. Grant Lennie, Administrative Assistant, John Howard Society of Ontario, Toronto, Canada, and the writer; June 16, 1970.

pertain to Canada I have no reason to believe that the statistics for the United States systems, over-all, would differ greatly when projected construction has been completed. In the United States even a minimum-security cell built for this individual costs about \$20,000. It is only slightly less expensive, in many cases to confine an individual in a county jail system. This fact was brought to light when construction figures were revealed for the new Oakland County Law Enforcement Complex. This facility is being constructed to replace the overcrowded, 40-year old jail in Pontiac, Michigan. The new \$8 million facility will house 470 inmates. Cost-wise this would amount to approximately \$17,021 per inmate.⁴⁰ (3) To project the problems facing released inmates and attempt to show how frustrated they become in trying to solve them. (4) To show how little \$1200 (as proposed in this program) is compared to the cost of re-entry into the system. It should not be forgotten that the \$1200 to keep released inmates on the street is smaller than the price of six months' incarceration in many ways.

⁴⁰Detroit Free Press (Michigan), July 22, 1970, Sec. C, p. 10, cols. 5-6.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSIONS

It has been the purpose of this paper to emphasize the need of a financial assistance program for released inmates. In 1969 prison systems in the United States and Canada spent from \$950 (Louisiana) to \$6,924.05 (Alaska)--see Table 3--to keep a man confined. After having spent this amount, sometimes for several years, it appears to be extremely poor economics to deny him a few hundred dollars in postrelease aid if this could be a major factor in preventing his return to prison. Indeed, the cost of the apprehension and return-to-prison procedure might exceed that of the aid which would prevent the releasee's return. Of course, financial assistance is not the only solution to the prevention of reimprisonment in every case, and is not even required for many cases. Provision of assistance where the need is greatest would be prudent from an economic as well as from a rehabilitative interest.

Current expenditures for corrections in the United States and Canada are discussed in Chapter II. It is my feeling that the average taxpayer is unaware of these expenses. He sees only the outward face of the institution

and gives little thought, in most instances, to the money needed to maintain those incarcerated therein.

A short background of release procedures is covered in Chapter III. Since pardon, parole and discharge are the main avenues of release only these three areas are discussed.

In Chapter IV I discussed recidivism and its contributory factors. Much evidence was found to support my contention that the first six months following release is a crucial period for releasees. In some instances the rate was as high as 50%.

There are only a few agencies who occupy a significant place in the field of post-release aid. They are the Volunteers of America, The Salvation Army and the John Howard Society of Canada. A short history of these organizations is contained in Chapter V.

In order to acquire sufficient data to support my hypothesis I sent out a research questionnaire to various prison systems in the United States and Canada designed to ascertain daily wage of inmates, amount of financial assistance at time of release, current rate of recidivism, and yearly cost of incarceration. The results of these data are discussed in Chapter VI. One outstanding fact was brought to light. The responding systems paid inmates a daily wage ranging from nothing (prevalent in six states) to \$3.00 (Oregon). It should be evident from these

figures that it would be extremely hard for most inmates to save any money for expenses after they are released. I found no evidence that every able-bodied inmate had a paying job.

Thirty-three of the forty-six responding systems had compiled data regarding the rate of recidivism. This represented a large portion of the inmate population. In seeking a method to reduce this rate we would not only be solving the problem of overcrowding present in most systems but we would also be releasing into society a large group of potentially productive people.

It is hard for the average citizen to imagine the problems confronting the releasee upon his return to society. A personal view of this was deemed necessary to my study. This was accomplished by interviewing fifty returnees to the State Prison of Southern Michigan at Jackson. The results of these interviews are covered in Chapter VII. Table 7 in this chapter revealed that twenty-two out of fifty inmates felt that lack of adequate living expenses was a contributing factor in their return to prison. On an over-all basis forty out of fifty stated they could have used assistance ranging up to six months following release. If we let the figures do the talking it should be evident to those in the correctional field that a program of financial assistance is needed if the rate of recidivism is to be reduced.

The planning for the implementation of financial assistance to the released inmate is covered in Chapter VIII. I have suggested a method of "selling" the proposed program to the press, the legislators and the general public. I feel this can be done strictly on a "dollars-and-cents" basis.

We should work for nothing less than an adequate minimum gratuity payable to all releasees and, in addition, a realistic rehabilitation grant budgeted to make up the difference between the man's available resources including prison earnings and the needs of his individual rehabilitation plan. It is rehabilitation that is the goal, and a slightly higher economic cost at this point may well save untold future institutional and community costs. I feel that we are spending millions for institutional care and pitiful thousands for after-care.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Bennett, James V. I Chose Prison. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.
- Blumberg, Abraham S. Criminal Justice. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967.
- Clemmer, Donald. The Prison Community. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1940.
- Gibbons, Don C. Changing the Lawbreaker. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Glasser, Daniel. The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1969.
- Goldberg, William A., Ph.D. 20th Century Corrections. East Lansing: Gibson's Bookstore, 1970.
- Leinwand, Gerald (ed.). Crime and Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Washington Square Press, Inc., 1968.
- Lunden, Walter A. Crime and Criminals. The Iowa State University Press, 1967.
- McGrath, W. T. (ed.). Crime and Its Treatment in Canada. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1965.
- Menninger, Karl, M.D. The Crime of Punishment. New York: The Viking Press, 1968.
- Newman, Charles L. Sourcebook on Probation, Parole and Pardons. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1964.
- Reckless, Walter C. The Crime Problem. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
- Robinson, Louis N. Penology in the United States. Philadelphia: John C. Winston, 1921.

Salisbury, Harrison E. The Shook-Up Generation. Greenwich: Fawcett Publication, Inc., 1968.

Taft, Donald R., and Ralph W. England, Jr. Criminology. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964.

The American Correctional Association. Manual of Correctional Standards. New York: The American Correctional Association, 1966.

Tunley, Roul. Kids, Crime and Chaos. New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1962.

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language. New York: The World Publishing Company, 1966.

B. MULTIVOLUME WORKS AND SERIES

Newman, Donald J. "Crime and Crime Prevention," Collier's Encyclopedia Yearbook (Covering 1961).

Newman, Donald J. "Crime and Crime Prevention," Collier's Encyclopedia Yearbook (Covering 1962).

Newman, Donald J. "Crime and Crime Prevention," Collier's Encyclopedia Yearbook (Covering 1963).

Newman, Donald J. "Crime and Crime Prevention," Collier's Encyclopedia Yearbook (Covering 1964).

C. GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Task Force Report: Corrections. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1967.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1967.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Task Force Report: Crime and Its Impact--An Assessment. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1967.

U.S. Attorney General. Survey on Release Procedures--Vol. IV, Parole. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1939.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Reentry of the Offender into the Community. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1967.

D. PERIODICALS

Kirkpatrick, A. M. "The Human Problems of Prison After-Care," John Howard Society of Ontario, 1970, p. 9.

"Local Adult Correctional Institutions and Jails," Crime and Delinquency, January 1967, p. 137.

Phillips, Charles W. "Developing Correctional Manpower," Crime and Delinquency, July 1969, p. 415.

Dueill, Carl R., Lt. Col. "The Salvation Army," The Correctional Review (California), July-August 1966, pp. 12-13.

Thurston, Don, Ph.D. "Parole Board," Corrections Quarterly (Michigan), October 1968, pp. 44-45.

England, R. W., Jr. "Pardon, Commutation, and Their Improvement," Prison Journal, April 1959, p. 24.

Detroit Free Press, July 22, 1970.

E. UNPUBLISHED WORKS

Clements, William, Captain. Volunteers of America, Jackson, Michigan. Personal Interview. July 6, 1970.

LeCorre, Warden. Archambault Institution, Ste. Anne des Plaines, Quebec, Canada. Personal Interview. November 20, 1969.

John Howard Society of Ontario. Personal correspondence between D. Grant Lennie, Administrative Assistant, and the writer. June 16, 1970.

Fleming, James, State Senator--Michigan. Personal Interview. July 6, 1970.

APPENDIX 1

5812 Richwood Street
Apt. 9
Lansing, Michigan 48910
April 20, 1970

Dear Sir,

For the past sixteen years I have been actively engaged in the field of law enforcement and corrections. During this time I was employed by the Aroostook County Sheriff's Department, Aroostook County, Maine; the Jackson Police Department, Jackson, Michigan; and the State Prison of Southern Michigan at Jackson.

Approximately six years ago I decided to enter college and have since obtained a B.S. in Police Administration and Public Safety from Michigan State University. At this time I am a Master's Candidate in the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State, engaged in acquiring research data for a thesis which has received the sanction of my advisor, Dr. W. A. Goldberg, Associate Professor in Corrections.

Your assistance will give me information I can obtain in no other way. Will you help by giving brief answers to the five questions enclosed?

Sincerely yours,

Norman C. Colter

Self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed.

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

DATE:

STATE:

DEPARTMENT TITLE:

QUESTION NO. 1: What is the present daily wage range of the inmates in your system? (Range or level)

QUESTION NO. 2: Is any money given to inmates at the time of their parole or discharge? If so, how much?

(a) Other than what is in their accounts

(b) Amount of clothes _____

(c) Bus Ticket home _____

(d) Any amount loaned to prisoner

QUESTION NO. 3: What is your current rate of recidivism within the first six months? If compiled over a different time period, please state.

QUESTION NO. 4: What is your current yearly cost per inmate during incarceration?

QUESTION NO. 5: Does your state provide any type of assistance to inmates' families during their incarceration? If so, approximately how much?

(a) Welfare only _____

(b) Prisoner's wages _____

(d) Work release (% of wages sent home, if any) _____

PLEASE RETURN TO:

Norman C. Colter
5812 Richwood St., Apt. 9
Lansing, Michigan 48910

APPENDIX 2

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

DATE:

STATE:

LOCATION:

ADMINISTERED BY:

INMATE INTERVIEW NO.:

QUESTION NO. 1: How long has it been since you left here?

QUESTION NO. 2: How long was it between the time of your arrest and actual return to the system?

QUESTION NO. 3: Were you brought back for a parole violation or a new crime?

QUESTION NO. 4: Could you, or would, you, tell me the exact amount of money that you had (or was available to you) when you were released the last time?

- _____ a. Exact Amount
- _____ b. Under \$50.00
- _____ c. \$ 50.00-\$100.00
- _____ d. \$100.00-\$150.00
- _____ e. \$150.00-\$200.00
- _____ f. Over \$200.00

QUESTION NO. 5: Do you feel that lack of adequate living expenses was a contributing factor to your return?

- _____ a. Yes
- _____ b. No

If answer is yes, why?

QUESTION NO. 6: Did you have anyone other than yourself to support when you were released?

QUESTION NO. 7: How long do you feel you could have used assistance with living expenses before you could have maintained them on your own?

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03046 6548