



## ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

### Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

## ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

### Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.

REPORT OF A STUDY  
of  
ESCAPES FROM PENITENTIARIES  
1966-67 to 1968-69

HV  
8657  
S5  
c.3

REPORT OF A STUDY  
of  
ESCAPES FROM PENITENTIARIES  
1966-67 to 1968-69

Copyright of this document does not belong to the Crown.  
Proper authorization must be obtained from the author for  
any intended use

Les droits d'auteur du présent document n'appartiennent  
pas à l'État. Toute utilisation du contenu du présent  
document doit être approuvée préalablement par l'auteur.

S. A. Shuster  
Correctional Research  
Canadian Penitentiary Service  
October 29, 1969

HV  
8657  
SS  
C.3

Copyright of this document does not belong to the Crown  
Under the provisions of the Copyright Act, the author for  
any work of art  
The reproduction of this document is prohibited without the  
written consent of the author or the publisher  
The reproduction of this document is prohibited without the  
written consent of the author or the publisher

1970

CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Introduction .....	1
Part I Purpose and Scope of the Study .....	3
II Methodology .....	5
III Overview of Escapes and Recaptures .....	6
IV Escapes of Inmates of Maximum Security Institutions ..	10
V Escapes of Inmates of Medium Security Institutions ...	14
VI Escapes of Inmates of Minimum Security Institutions...	24
VII Summary of Findings .....	28
VIII Comment and Recommendations.....	32
Appendix "A": Escape Card .....	36
Appendix "B": Tables 5 to 11 inclusive .....	37

## INTRODUCTION

This study was undertaken as a result of concern expressed over the number of escapes from medium security institutions during the months immediately preceding August, 1969. It was hoped that, by examining circumstances surrounding escapes over a three-year period, some knowledge might be derived to assist the Penitentiary Service in determining what counter-measures, if any, might be necessary.

Initially, only escapes from medium security institutions were to have been considered in this study; however, the terms of reference were later broadened to include the collection and analysis of data on escapes from maximum and minimum security institutions. The fiscal years 1966-67 to 1968-69 comprise the period under study. Therefore, escapes which occurred prior to April 1, 1966 and after March 31, 1969 are not within the scope of this study.

This report, by the very nature of the subject under study, is apt to present a one-sided view of the correctional reality. It is concerned with escapes and, consequently, with the custodial aspect of penitentiary operations. At the same time, however, penitentiary institutions are also responsible for training programs aimed at attitude and behaviour modification of their inmates. It should, therefore, be stressed at the outset that references in this report to particular institutions are certainly not intended to reflect on the quality of their training programs or even necessarily on the efficiency of their custodial staff or procedures.

In addition to the strictly custodial factors, such as degree of control over inmate movement, number and deployment of custodial staff and alertness of staff, there are other factors which may affect, in one way or another, the incidence of escapes from a particular institution. Some of these other factors include:

- (a) the selection practice which results in inmates with certain characteristics being placed in a particular type of institution;
- (b) the social climate of the institution;
- (c) the geographical location of the institution which includes climatic and topographical conditions and the proximity of the institution to other institutions and population centres;
- (d) the static security of the institution comprising the buildings and perimeter security;
- (e) situational factors which may arise within the institution (e.g., the dislike of an inmate by other inmates or by staff) or outside the institution (such as an inmate's problems with his family).

I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The primary purpose of this study is to isolate some common factors related to escapes so that counteraction might be taken to prevent or reduce the incidence of such occurrences. Consequently, the focus of study is on the escape itself: the method, the time and location of the escape, etc., rather than on the characteristics of the escapers, the institutional climate that existed at the time of the escape or the inmates' reason for escape. Furthermore, both time considerations and the lack of information on Penitentiary Service Headquarters' files precluded undertaking a more "in-depth" study of factors other than those related to the escape itself.

As this study is directly related to possible preventive measures by the Penitentiary Service, it was decided that its scope would be limited to escapes from penitentiary premises where, at least, a modicum of security exists, i.e., maximum, medium and minimum security institutions. Therefore, "escapes" from Community Release Centres were excluded from this study as were all escapes from outside hospitals and from courts, as well as failures to return from Day Parole and Temporary Absence without escort. Also excluded were escapes from the temporary custody of other enforcement agencies; however, escapes from penitentiary officer escort are included.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

For purposes of this report, the following working definitions of terms have been adopted:

ESCAPE - an act committed by an individual inmate who,

without proper authorization, leaves the penitentiary reserve or, when not on the reserve, leaves the place where the escorting officer has permitted him to be.

ESCAPER - an individual who commits the act of escape.

ESCAPE-EVENT - an occasion in which one inmate, or more than one simultaneously, commit the act of escape.

The first implication of the above definitions for the study is that an inmate is not considered to be an escaper until he leaves the penitentiary reserve without proper authorization. Any other breaches of institutional security in which an inmate is recaptured on the reserve are considered as attempted escapes<sup>1</sup> and are not included in the statistical tables presented in this report.

1

It is interesting to note that there are 16 cases in which inmates were reported by the institutions as having escaped but, upon application of the above definition and upon examination of the details of the escape, it was found that these escapes were unsuccessful and have thus been classified as "attempted escapes". The distribution of these cases comprises: 2 inmates in maximum security institutions, 10 in medium and 4 in minimum security institutions. It is quite possible that, in the absence of a reliable and accurate reporting system for escapes, this study report may very well include information concerning escapes which were actually only attempts.

II. METHODOLOGY

In order to obtain a sufficiently large and representative sample, all cases of escape from Penitentiary Service institutions or penitentiary custody during the three fiscal years 1966-67 to 1968-69 were examined in detail. An "escape-card" was designed and used to record and code pertinent information. (see Appendix "A"). Data were extracted from both the inmate files at Headquarters and Board of Inquiry reports on the escapes. Unfortunately, it was found that much of the required information was not on file at Headquarters and that many Inquiry reports were never received from the regional offices. (Existing instructions permit the Regional Director discretion in the forwarding to Headquarters of Inquiry reports on escapes; see Divisional Instruction 101.01, para. 3 b). Consequently, where it appeared from the inmate's file that a Board of Inquiry would be convened but the report was not on Headquarters file, institutions were requested to send copies of reports to this office. Approximately 20 additional Boards of Inquiry were received in this manner.

After the available information was recorded on the "escape-cards" (one card per escaper), the cards were grouped together by escape-event and filed by institution within each of the fiscal years. This was done in order to permit break-downs by type of security and year as well as to make the necessary distinction between the event (the escape) and the individual(s) involved in that event (escapers).

III. OVERVIEW OF ESCAPES AND RECAPTURES: APRIL 1, 1966 TO MARCH 31, 1969

1. ESCAPES

During the fiscal years 1966-67 to 1968-69, a total of 248 inmates escaped from penitentiary institutions or officers. A break-down of the total is provided in TABLE 1. It is important to note that the figures associated with the different degrees of security institutions reflect the number of inmates who escaped while on register of that institution and not necessarily the degree of security to which any inmate was subject at the time of his escape. For example, an inmate of a maximum security institution working outside the walls at the time of escape is nevertheless counted in this table as a maximum security escape. A more refined break-down of the security conditions under which the escape took place will be presented in the sections of this report which deal with the various classes of security institutions.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF ESCAPERS BY INSTITUTIONAL SECURITY CLASS AND FISCAL YEAR

<u>Security Class of Institution</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Maximum	7*	11	4	22
Medium	23	17	32**	72
Minimum	47	55	52	154
TOTAL	77	83	88	248

\* : includes 1 female (Prison for Women)

\*\* : includes 2 females (Matsqui)

A similar break-down of the number of escapes (events) is presented below:

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF ESCAPE-EVENTS BY INSTITUTIONAL SECURITY CLASS AND FISCAL YEAR

<u>Security Class of Institution</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Maximum	4*	9	4	17
Medium	14	11	23**	48
Minimum	34	36	31	101
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>166</u>

\* : includes 1 from Prison for Women

\*\* : includes 2 from Matsqui (F)

2. RECAPTURES

Of the 248 inmates who escaped during the three-year period under study, 243 had been recaptured by mid-October, 1969. A distribution of "time at large" for each institutional security class is presented in TABLE 3.

TABLE 3

TIME AT LARGE BETWEEN ESCAPE AND RECAPTURE

A. ESCAPERS OF MAXIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

<u>RECAPTURED</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>CUM. %</u>
Less than 2 hours	7	31.8	
2 and under 24 hours	8	36.4	68.2
1 to 7 days	6	27.3	95.5
8 to 31 days	1	4.5	100.0

B. ESCAPERS OF MEDIUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

<u>RECAPTURED</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>CUM. %</u>
Less than 2 hours	10	14.3	
2 and under 24 hours	14	20.0	34.3
1 to 7 days	20	28.6	62.9
8 to 31 days	13	18.6	81.4
32 days to 6 months	10	14.3	95.7
7 months to 1 year	<u>3</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	70		

C. ESCAPERS OF MINIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

<u>RECAPTURED</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>CUM. %</u>
Less than 2 hours	5	3.3	
2 and under 24 hours	29	19.2	22.5
1 to 7 days	64	42.4	64.9
8 to 31 days	27	17.9	82.8
32 days to 6 months	17	11.3	94.0
7 months to 12 months	5	3.3	97.4
Over 1 year	<u>4</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>

151

Time-at-large appears to be related to the type of institution from which the inmate escaped: inmates of maximum security institutions were apprehended most quickly, 68% within 24 hours and 95% within 7 days of their escape while the comparable figures for medium security institutions are 36% and 64%. These differences may be attributed in part to the relative

rapidity in detection of the escape in maximum security institutions as compared with escapes from lesser security. Differential police reaction to the escapes is probably also a contributing factor.

TABLE 4 shows the length of time the two un-recaptured escapees from medium security institutions and the three from minimum security institutions have remained unlawfully at large.

TABLE 4  
INMATES UNLAWFULLY AT LARGE

<u>SECURITY CLASS OF INSTITN.</u>	<u>UNDER 1 YEAR</u>	<u>1 &amp; UNDER 2 YRS.</u>	<u>OVER 2 YRS.</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Maximum	0	0	0	0
Medium	1	1	0	2
Minimum	0	2	1	3
TOTAL	1	3	1	5

IV. ESCAPES OF INMATES OF MAXIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

1. INCIDENCE OF ESCAPES

A total of 22 inmates who were on register of maximum security institutions escaped while under penitentiary custody during the three-year period under study. The distribution of escapes by year and institution and the rate of escapes per 1000 average inmate population<sup>1</sup> in the institution is presented in TABLE 5 (See Appendix "B"). With the obvious exception of Manitoba Penitentiary, which accounted for 60% of these escapes, the escape rate of inmates of maximum security institutions is relatively low. However, a closer examination of the circumstances surrounding the escape (see paragraph 5 below) will indicate that the real incidence of escape from maximum security conditions is much lower than the 22 reported in TABLE 1.

2. MONTH OF ESCAPE (See TABLES 6 and 7 in Appendix "B")

The three-month period, July to September, was the most "popular" period for escape, accounting for approximately two-thirds of all escape-events and 60% of all escapers from maximum security institutions.

1

No claim is made that the rates (per M) presented are the true rates of escape. They are based on the average number of inmates actually in the institutions and not on the total number of individuals "at risk" (which is not available). The lower the degree of security institutions, the greater is the population turnover. Therefore, caution should be exercised in the interpretation of the rates and it is suggested that the comparisons between institutions are more statistically valid within the same class of security than between classes of security.

3. DAY OF ESCAPE (See TABLES 8 and 9 in Appendix "B")

Sixty per cent of the escapes from maximum security institutions occurred on Thursday or Friday. For this no adequate single explanation has been found, despite the temptation to speculate.

4. TIME OF ESCAPE (See TABLES 10 and 11 in Appendix "B")

Six equal intervals were used to divide the day to conform approximately to the periods of sleep, work and recreation. Sixty-five per cent of the escapes from maximum security occurred during working hours; the majority of these (eight out of eleven) during the afternoon. However, it should be noted that almost all of those who escaped during this time period were at work on the reserve outside the walls.

5. AUTHORIZED LOCATION OF INMATE AND METHOD OF ESCAPE

TABLE 12

AUTHORIZED LOCATION OF INMATE AT TIME OF ESCAPE

<u>From maximum security Institutions</u>	<u>Inmates who escaped</u>	<u>Escape-Events</u>
From inside the walls or fence	8	6
From outside the walls (on reserve)	11	8
Not at Penitentiary Institution	3	3
TOTALS	22	17

The above figures reveal that 50% of inmates of maximum security institutions who escaped during the three-year period were at work outside the walls or fence in conditions of medium or minimum security at the time of their escape. The majority (seven)

of these escapes were inmates of Manitoba Penitentiary; the other four were from Dorchester Penitentiary. All three of the escapes from points beyond the limits of the Penitentiary reserve (one each belonging to Kingston Penitentiary, Prison for Women and Saskatchewan Penitentiary) occurred while the inmates were under escort of a penitentiary officer.

Of the eight escapers who were within the walls at the time of escape, two broke out of their cell block to effect their escape (from Dorchester in 1966 and 1968) and the other six inmates (five from Manitoba in 1967 including three in one escape-event, and one from British Columbia in 1969) escaped during recreation period by climbing the exercise-yard wall or fence.

In none of the above escapes were there assaults or threats of assault on penitentiary officers associated with the escape itself, although one escaper stole a private car at knife-point after leaving the reserve.

#### 6. TIME-LAPSE BEFORE DISCOVERY OF ESCAPE

In four of the six escape-events from within the walls, the inmates were discovered while escaping. One other escape was discovered about 35 minutes after the inmate was last seen in his cell and the time-lapse before discovery of the escape of a Manitoba inmate by unknown method during the recreation period was  $2\frac{1}{2}$  hours.

7. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF BOARDS OF INQUIRY

Boards of Inquiry were convened to inquire into the circumstances of 15 of the 17 maximum security escape-events. Of the two escapes which did not result in a formal inquiry, one was a walk-away from the vocational training building at Dorchester (outside the walls) and the other was the escape of an inmate from a doctor's office in downtown Prince Albert. In seven of the eleven escape-events which occurred beyond the walls, either on the reserve or elsewhere, some degree of negligence or lack of vigilance on the part of penitentiary officers was found. The most common recommendation of the Boards investigating the six escape-events from within the institution related to the need for improvements in a perimeter security such as better lighting and more guard posts.

V. ESCAPES OF INMATES OF MEDIUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

1. INCIDENCE OF ESCAPE (See TABLE 5)

(a) GENERAL

During the three-year period, 72 inmates of medium security institutions escaped. (This figure excludes two inmates on the register of Joyceville Institution who were in a minimum security environment at Smithfield Trailer Camp at the time of their escape.) The number of inmates who escaped from medium security decreased from 23 in 1966-67 to 17 in 1967-68, but rose sharply in the following year to 32. However, the rate of escapes per 1000 medium security population in 1968-69 (12.2) was at a level only slightly above that of 1966-67 (10.2).

(b) ESCAPES FROM OLDER MEDIUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

St. Vincent de Paul Industrial Annex had four escapes in 1966-67 and only one since then. Federal Training Centre had three escapes in 1967-68. Leclerc and Joyceville Institutions have had similar patterns for the three-year period; both institutions have shown a decrease in the number of escapes each successive year. On the other hand, the number of inmates who escaped from Collins Bay increased from none in 1966-67 to five in 1968-69. Mountain Prison had relatively few escapes during the three-year period.

(c) ESCAPES FROM NEWER MEDIUM SECURITY  
("A" & "Y") INSTITUTIONS

Springhill Institution, which received its first inmates in September, 1967, had no escapes to the end of March, 1969.

Warkworth Institution, which opened at the same time, had only one escape. The number of escapes from Cowansville Institution during the three years was four, zero and two, respectively, while escapes at Matsqui (Male) Institution rose from none to two, and then increased to seven in 1968-69. Drumheller Institution, which had no escapes during the first seven months of operation in 1967-68, also had a total of seven escapes in 1968-69 and, as a result, had the highest rate of escapes of all medium security institutions in any of the three years. This fact may be connected in some way with the nature of Drumheller's inmate training program, which is understood to be very progressive, calling upon each inmate to exercise a relatively large measure of self-control.

2. MONTH OF ESCAPE (See TABLES 6 and 7)

A somewhat surprising finding is that more medium security inmates escaped during March than in any other month, and the quarter January-to-March had approximately 50% more escapes than any other quarter-year period. The fewest number of escapes occurred between July and September. Overall, the number of inmates who escaped during the cold weather months (October to March) outnumbered the "warm weather" escapes by 43 to 29. The figures for 1968-69 show a similar pattern. These results have an obvious bearing on any consideration for perimeter security devices which may be contemplated for the future. Another interesting finding is that, while a substantial proportion of medium security inmates escape during the cold months, the number of escape-events occurring during the fall and winter months (26) is only slightly higher than

during spring and summer (22), indicating that multiple escapes are more prevalent during the cold weather months. This has been particularly so for the month of March.

3. DAY OF ESCAPE (See TABLES 8 and 9)

Approximately 45% of inmates who escaped from a medium security institution did so on a Monday or Tuesday. The least frequent days of escape were Friday and Saturday.

4. TIME OF ESCAPE (See TABLES 10 and 11)

Almost one-half of all escapes from medium security institutions occurred during the later evening hours (2001 to 2400 hours). While the precise time of escape was not known in some cases, it is estimated that more than 60% of the escapes took place during the evening recreation period after dark. This finding might help to explain the previous finding that the majority of escapes from medium security institutions occurred during the fall and winter months (i.e., the short-day months). It is possible that despite winter conditions, the opportunity to escape under cover of darkness, combined with more limited recreational activities, was a contributing factor in these escapes. Escapes during working hours accounted for about 30% of escapes. Only a small proportion of medium security inmates escaped during the middle of the night.

The patterns among the institutions were somewhat varied. For example, all three of the escapes from the St. Vincent de Paul Industrial Annex and two-thirds of the escapes from F. T. C. and

Leclerc took place during working hours. On the other hand, Drumheller and Matsqui, in particular, showed a preponderance of escapes during the recreation period.

5. AUTHORIZED LOCATIONS OF INMATES AND METHOD OF ESCAPE

(a) LOCATION OF INMATES AT TIME OF ESCAPE

TABLE 13 summarizes the authorized location of the inmates of medium security institutions at the time of escape; it reveals that almost 90% of escapes in the three-year period took place from within the perimeter walls or fence.

TABLE 13

AUTHORIZED LOCATION OF INMATES AT TIME OF ESCAPE

<u>From medium security Institutions</u>	<u>Inmates who escaped</u>		<u>Escape-events</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
From within the perimeter walls or fence	64	88.9	43	89.6
From outside the walls or fence (on reserve)	6	8.3	3	6.3
Not at penitentiary institution	2	2.8	2	4.1
TOTALS	72	100.0	48	100.0

All six inmates who were outside the perimeter were at work on a penitentiary reserve at the time of escape (three inmates of Collins Bay and three of St. Vincent de Paul Industrial Annex in 1967). The two inmates who escaped while off the reserve were on Temporary Absence under penitentiary officer escort.

(b) METHOD OF ESCAPE FROM PERIMETER SECURITY

Table 14 below shows the break-down of escapes from within the walls or fence by the method of escape.

TABLE 14

METHOD OF ESCAPE FROM PERIMETER SECURITY

<u>Escape method</u>	<u>Inmates who escaped</u>		<u>Escape-events</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
By climbing fence or walls	50	78.1	34	79.1
By cutting through perimeter fence	3	4.6	2	4.7
By escaping through hole in wall	2	3.1	1	2.3
By digging under perimeter fence	1	1.6	1	2.3
By driving through main gate	4	6.3	2	4.7
By unknown method	4	6.3	3	6.9
TOTALS	64	100.0	43	100.0

Close to 80% of all breaches of perimeter security in medium security institutions were by climbing the walls or fence. Furthermore, in the few cases where the method of escape from the institution could not be determined by the investigating Board, it is likely that the inmates effected their escape by scaling the perimeter fence or wall. The one escape-event in which the inmates made their escape through the perimeter wall occurred at Collins Bay Penitentiary in May, 1968, when the institution was undergoing renovations and the escapees took advantage of this situation by prying off a board that was covering a hole in the wall. All escapes

by inmates driving through the main gate were from Leclerc Institution using cars taken from the garage. These occurred before the new access road was completed.

(c) BREAK-OUTS FROM BUILDINGS

There were 43 escape-events (involving 64 inmates) which occurred from within the medium security institutions during the three-year period. Twenty-six per cent (11 events involving 19 inmates) were the result of inmates breaking out of locked buildings. Of the escapes which occurred while the inmates were confined in buildings, the following distribution was found:

TABLE 15

BREAK-OUTS FROM BUILDINGS

<u>Type of Building</u>	<u>No. of Inmates</u>	<u>No. of Escape-events</u>
From the recreation building	11	6
From cell blocks	7	4
From other buildings	1	1
<hr/>		
TOTALS	19	11

All the break-outs were from the older medium security institutions. All four break-outs from Federal Training Centre and Leclerc (two apiece) were initiated from the gymnasium. Four of the five inmates who escaped from Collins Bay in 1968 effected their escape on two separate occasions while portions of the institution were being renovated, a circumstance which greatly facilitated their escape. A total of five separate

break-outs involving eight inmates took place at Joyceville Institution; these included two escapes (4 inmates) from the gymnasium and two other escapes (3 inmates) by breaking out of cells through cell windows.

In only one case of escape from medium security institutions was the use of force or the threat of force on a penitentiary officer reported. This occurred in 1967 when one of three inmates of St. Vincent de Paul Industrial Annex working outside the perimeter at the pump-house attacked a Correctional Officer and with two accomplices drove off in a penitentiary truck.

(d) USE OF TOOLS OR EQUIPMENT IN THE ESCAPE

In at least eight escape-events from medium security, institutionally-owned or home-made tools were used in conjunction with the escape. In five escapes, inmates used ladders somewhere along their escape route; only one of these had been improvised. The use of vehicles which were on the reserve occurred in three instances.

6. TIME-LAPSE BEFORE DISCOVERY OF ESCAPE

The time-lapse (between the time when the inmates were last reported seen or counted and the time the escape was discovered) was determined from institutional reports in 42 of 46 cases of escape from medium security institutions. The following table shows the distribution of time-lapse, where known, for escape-events.

TABLE 16

TIME-LAPSE WHERE KNOWN BEFORE DISCOVERY OF ESCAPE

<u>Time-lapse</u>	<u>No. of escape-events</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Cumulative %</u>
Immediately	13	30.9	
Within 30 minutes	10	23.8	54.8
31 to 60 minutes	5	11.9	66.7
Over 1 hour to 2 hours	5	11.9	78.6
Over 2 hours to 4 hours	4	9.5	88.1
Over 4 hours to 7 hours	5	11.9	100.0
TOTAL		42	

Time-lapse before discovery of the escape is apparently related to the type of activity the inmate was engaged in at the time of the escape, which in turn is related to the degree of supervision he was under. On the average, the greatest time-lapse was found in cases of escape during recreation, while escapes from work locations had the shortest time-lapse.

An interesting finding, in part related to the above observation, was that an analysis of the data by year revealed that the average time-lapse (where known) for medium security institutions for the year 1966-67 was 47.5 minutes; for 1967-68, 45 minutes; but for 1968-69 the average time-lapse of 110 minutes was more than double that of either of the two previous years. The major contributors to this increase were Collins Bay Penitentiary (N = 3, Aver. = 293 minutes) and Drumheller Institution (N = 3, Aver. = 180 minutes).

7. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF BOARDS OF INQUIRY

As far as can be determined from information at this Headquarters, of the 48 escape-events from medium security institutions, 40 resulted in institutional Boards of Inquiry being convened. Those escapes for which a Board of Inquiry was not held are distributed as follows: four from Cowansville, three from Drumheller and one escape while on Temporary Absence from Joyceville. Less than one-half (18 of 40) of the Inquiry reports were sent to this Headquarters after review by the Regional Director. Missing reports were requested and used (where available) for purposes of this study.

Analysis of the findings and recommendations of the Inquiry reports on escapes from medium security institutions reveals the following areas of concern:

- improvements in custodial procedures such as more thorough searching, more frequent or more careful inmate counts, in 12 reports;
- better perimeter lighting, in seven reports;
- the need for more correctional staff, in five reports;
- negligence or lack of vigilance on the part of staff, in four reports;
- + improvements to the security of buildings, in three reports;
- better control of equipment, such as tools, ladders, etc., in three reports;
- better control of inmate movement, in three reports;
- other findings and recommendations; in eight reports.

In summary, it would appear that the great majority of recommendations in one form or another were related to the dynamic (staff) aspects of institutional security in medium security institutions. It is suggested that a more detailed examination of the evidence given at the Boards of Inquiry would probably reveal lapses in institutional security other than were contained in some of the findings and recommendations of the Boards. Recommendations concerning improvements in perimeter lighting were also a fairly recurrent theme. However, most of the recommendations for improved lighting related to escapes which occurred in 1966 and 1967 and it is assumed that implementation of these recommendations at Leclerc and Joyceville Institutions was a contributing factor in the reduction of night-time escapes from these institutions in 1968-69.

## VI. ESCAPES OF INMATES OF MINIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

### 1. INCIDENCE OF ESCAPE (See TABLE 5)

The number of inmates who escaped from minimum security institutions during the three years 1966-67 to 1968-69 totalled 154, representing 101 separate escape-events for the period. The incidence of escape did not vary greatly from year to year; increasing slightly in 1967-68, and then showing a minor decrease in 1968-69. However, a falling population in minimum security institutions resulted in an increase in the rate of escapes during the three-year period.

Most of the Farm Annexes had relatively low rates of escape. On the other hand, a few more isolated institutions, such as Landry Crossing and Agassiz Correctional Camps, had consistently high rates of escape in each of the three years.

### 2. MONTH OF ESCAPE (See TABLES 6 and 7)

Escapes from minimum security institutions occurred most frequently during the July-to-September quarter, reaching a peak in August and accounting for approximately 45% of escapes. More than two-thirds of escapes took place during the warm weather season (April to September).

### 3. DAY OF ESCAPE (See TABLES 8 and 9)

The frequency of escapes on Sunday was twice that of any other day of the week (30% of all minimum security escapes) and the three-day period, Friday to Sunday, accounted for more than 60% of escapes.

4. TIME OF ESCAPE (See TABLES 10 and 11)

A significant proportion (64%) of inmates escaped during the 8.00 p.m. to midnight period. Escapes during the other time periods of the day showed little variation.

5. AUTHORIZED LOCATION OF INMATES AND METHOD OF ESCAPE

Information on file was too scanty to provide a detailed analysis of either the authorized location of inmates at the time of their escape or the method of escape. It is assumed from available information that the vast majority of the inmates were on the reserve at the time of their escape. It would appear, also, that most escapes could best be described as "walk-aways"; that is, there were no attempts to use force or the threat of force on officers, and most of the inmates were not confined in locked quarters at the time of their escape. There were, however, five reported cases of inmates breaking out of locked buildings and four escape-events involving the theft of penitentiary vehicles. There was also the unusual case of two inmates of Agassiz Correctional Camp who used a revolver and knife to force a penitentiary officer to drive them to New Westminster.

6. TIME-LAPSE BEFORE DISCOVERY OF ESCAPE

The time-lapse from the time the inmate was last seen or counted could be determined in only 63% of escape-events from minimum security institutions. TABLE 17 summarizes the time-lapse (where known) in discovery of escapes.

TABLE 17  
TIME LAPSE BEFORE DISCOVERY OF ESCAPE (WHERE KNOWN)

TIME LAPSE	NO. OF ESCAPE-EVENTS	%	CUMULATIVE %
Immediately	2	3.2	
Within 30 minutes	7	11.1	14.3
31 to 60 minutes	16	25.4	39.7
Over 1 hour to 2 hours	21	33.3	73.0
Over 2 hours to 4 hours	12	19.0	92.0
Over 4 hours to 7 hours	4	6.4	98.4
Over 7 hours to 9 hours	1	1.6	100.0
TOTAL	63		

A comparison of the above table with the corresponding statistics on medium security institutions (See TABLE 15) reveals that, while a much greater proportion of medium security escapes were discovered within 30 minutes (55% versus 14%), the comparative figures are nearly equal after two hours. Of further note is the fact that the average time-lapse for minimum security institutions in 1966-67 was 86 minutes, increased to 136 minutes in 1967-68 and then decreased to 109 minutes in 1968-69. However, this latter time-lapse was almost identical to that found for medium security escapes during the same year.

7. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF BOARDS OF INQUIRY

It has been established that, at least, 10 Boards of Inquiry were held on minimum security escapes during the three-year period, of which 5 were reported to this Headquarters.

In the Inquiry reports examined for this study, recommendations concerning the following aspects of institutional security were noted:

- improvements in custodial procedures relating to contraband, inmate counts, etc., in five reports;
- negligence or lack of vigilance, in two reports;
- improvements to the security of buildings, in one report;
- better perimeter lighting, in one report;
- careful scrutiny of inmates who are about to be returned to greater security.

Although this last recommendation is found in only one Inquiry report, it is the writer's impression that there were several cases of escapes from minimum security by inmates who were aware of their impending transfer to medium or maximum security, or who were about to face additional charges in court.

## VII. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

### A. General

1. The total number of inmates who escaped from all classes of penitentiary institutions during the three years under study was 248, an average of 83 escapes per year. A gradual increase in the number of escapes was observed over the period, from 77 in 1966-67 to 88 in 1968-69. The largest single increase was found in escapes from medium security institutions. Escapes from minimum security institutions during the period accounted for over 62% of all escapes.
2. Of the 248 inmates who escaped during the three years, all but five escapers have been recaptured to date. Speed of recapture is related to the type of security institution from which the inmate escaped; the greater the security type the shorter the time at large after escape.

### B. Maximum Security Institutions

1. The highest rate of escapes from maximum security institutions was in 1967-68; the fiscal year 1968-69 showed the lowest rate of escapes during the three-year period.
2. Of the 22 inmates who escaped during the three-year period while on the register of maximum security institutions, less than one-half (eight) were within the perimeter walls in condition of maximum security at the time of escape.
3. Escapes from conditions of maximum security represented

a very small proportion (3.2%) of all escapes which occurred during the three-year period under study.

4. Most of these escapes took place during recreation, a period of free inmate movement, by means of scaling the exercise yard wall or fence.
5. There were no instances of assault or threat of assault on penitentiary officers in the escapes from maximum security institutions during the three-year period.

C. Medium Security Institutions

1. The rate of escapes from all medium security institutions decreased in 1967-68, but almost doubled in 1968-69 to a level 20% higher than in 1966-67.
2. With one exception (Collins Bay Penitentiary), most older medium security institutions showed a general decline in the number of escapes over the three-year period.
3. The higher rate of escapes from medium security institutions in 1968-69 is mainly attributable to the two newer medium security institutions in the Western Region (Drumheller and Matsqui Institutions).
4. The quarter-year period, January to March, accounted for approximately 50% more escapes than any other quarter. The fewest number of escapes from medium security institutions occurred during the summer months.
5. Nearly one-half of all escapes from medium security institutions took place from 8.00 p.m. to midnight. More than

60% of escapes occurred during the evening recreation period, at dusk or after dark, while escapes during working hours represented 30% of the total.

6. Almost 90% of escapes from medium security institutions were from within the perimeter walls or fence.
7. The most frequent method of escaping from within the perimeter (80%) was by scaling the walls or fence.
8. Ladders and vehicles have been used in effecting escapes from within medium security perimeters.
9. Twenty-six per cent of escapes from within the perimeter involved breaking out of locked buildings. All escapes of this type were from the older medium security institutions.
10. More than one-half of all escapes from medium security institutions were discovered within 30 minutes of the event. Those escapes which were discovered later usually occurred during the recreation period when close supervision of inmates is difficult.
11. It was found that the average time-lapse (where known) before discovery of escape in 1968-69 was more than double that of either of the two previous years.
12. Analysis of the recommendations of Inquiry reports on escapes from medium security institutions revealed that most of the recommendations related, in one way or another, to custodial factors rather than to improvements in the physical plant.

D. Minimum Security Institutions

1. Fewer inmates escaped in 1968-69 than in 1967-68 from minimum security institutions, though both years had higher rates of escape than 1966-67.
2. In general, the Farm Annexes had lower rates of escape than did the other minimum security institutions.
3. Forty-five per cent of escapes took place during the summer quarter.
4. A significant proportion (30%) of minimum security escapes occurred on Sunday.
5. Almost 65% of escapes from minimum security institutions occurred during the 8.00 p.m. to midnight period.
6. Most escapes from minimum security could be classified as "walk-aways".

VIII. COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Canadian Penitentiary Service is charged with the two-fold responsibility of: (a) the custody and control of its inmates; and (b) their training and rehabilitation. Both aims are designed to contribute to what is generally considered as the ultimate objective of corrections, namely, the protection of society by the reduction of the incidence of crime. It is generally recognized that, while these primary aims are not necessarily incompatible, certain restrictions imposed on inmates for purposes of custody do, in fact, limit their opportunities for social re-education, particularly in the area of personal responsibility and self-control.

In maximum and minimum security institutions, the degree of emphasis on either custody or rehabilitation is presumably resolved by the type of inmates who are selected for these institutions. A maximum security inmate is by current standards considered to be one who is both likely to attempt escape and, if he succeeds, is considered to be a danger to society. The converse is true in the case of minimum security inmates. Consequently, the choice in priority given to custody and control on the one hand, and training and rehabilitation on the other, is fairly clear-cut in both maximum and minimum security institutions.

However, the same cannot be said with respect to medium security institutions. "Medium security" implies a balance or compromise between the needs for custody and for rehabilitation. In medium security institutions, this balance appears to have been struck by reducing the degree of control over inmate movement within

the perimeter and, at the same time, providing for security by means of a fenced enclosure supplemented to a fairly large extent by perimeter patrols and posts which rely on staff vigilance to prevent escapes.

It appears to this writer that this concept used in the planning of the new medium security institutions has not proved entirely successful. Perhaps it is a result of lack of sufficient numbers of correctional staff in these institutions, or proper vigilance, or optimum deployment. Whatever the reason, it has been found that less than one-third of escapes from medium security institutions are detected immediately. It is submitted that early detection of escape is the key, not only to rapid apprehension but, also, to prevention of such occurrences. A comparison (by year) of escape rates with the average time-lapse before discovery of escape in medium and minimum security institutions, reveals some relationship between the two variables; namely, that the escape rate varies directly with the time-lapse so that, in general, lower escape rates are associated with shorter time-lapses before discovery of escape. While this finding does not necessarily imply a causal relationship between the two variables, it is suggested that there may well be a deterrent effect in the early detection of escapes.

The finding that the majority of escapes from medium security take place during the evening recreation hours suggests that one possible approach to the reduction of escapes from these institutions would be to concentrate on detection systems involving staff supplemented by mechanical or electrical warning devices.

This approach, if feasible, should not necessarily result in a change in the character of medium security institutions which might result if the perimeters were to be fortified by structural changes or by the addition of a formidable type of barbed wire.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

This report does not offer any specific recommendations with respect to improvements in institutional security. However, every effort has been made to uncover factors common to escapes in the various classes of institutional security. It is hoped that an examination of the findings and the related tables may suggest certain counter-actions that might be undertaken to reduce the number of escapes. The following recommendations relating mainly to the existing reporting system are made in order that those who have the task of evaluating institutional security may be in a better position to isolate deficiencies in the dynamic (staff) or static (structural) components of the security system. It is recommended therefore:

1. That a uniform and reliable reporting system on escapes be devised. This system should ensure
  - (a) that all cases of escape and recapture are reported to Headquarters as soon as possible;
  - (b) that adequate checking procedures be instituted at this Headquarters to ensure that all escapes are recorded, and
  - (c) that supplementary information concerning details of the escape be forwarded to this Headquarters via an escape-form in all cases of escape.

2. That Divisional Instruction No. 101.01, para. 3(b), be amended so as to require that all Inquiry reports on escapes from closed institutions be forwarded to this Headquarters in order that complete documentation may be available for planning and policy decisions.
3. That institutions be reminded of their duty to comply with D.I. No. 101.01, para. 3(b), which states:

"In cases of escapes from closed institutions, the Institutional Head shall convene a Board of Inquiry..."
4. That the Commissioner's Directive No. 101, para. 2(b), relating to Boards of Inquiry on escapes from minimum security camps, be reviewed with a view to specifying those circumstances for which an Inquiry should be held. (e.g., three or more inmates who walk away at the same time.)
5. That wherever possible, Inquiry reports contain supplementary documentation such as a plan or map of the institution showing the escape route and location of yard and perimeter patrols at the approximate time of escape.
6. That wherever possible, the Board should be reconvened after recapture of the inmate to hear evidence of the inmate's account of the escape and to inquire into the reasons for escape.

APPENDIX "A"

ESCAPE CARD

Inmate No.	Name				FPS No.	Institution	CODE
Date of Escape	Day	Last seen	hrs.	Escape discovered	Time	Recaptured by:	Time at Large
				Date	hrs.	Pen. Officers <input type="checkbox"/>	
						Police <input type="checkbox"/>	
Board of Enquiry			Probable Escape Route			Recommendations of B. of E. regarding:	
Not Reported on H.Q. File			Described			Staff Bldgs Equip Other (Specify)	
Yes	No	Ind	Yes	No	Yes	No	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If 'YES' File No:			Un.	Yes	No	Photos	Map
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DETAILS OF ESCAPE

1. Break out of bldgs.	2. Escaped Perimeter	3. Escaped Reserve	CODE	Describe:	CODE	TYPE
Yes No	Yes No	Yes No				Esc. <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>				Walk away <input type="checkbox"/>
Specify:	Location: Method:			Use of tools and/or equip.		? <input type="checkbox"/>

If 'NO' to 1,2,3, give details of m.o. of escape (including location, no. of inmates, officers, use of m.v., etc.)

At time of escape, authorized location of inmate was: Inside perimeter , outside perimeter , not at Pen. Inst.

1. At work  (job), with \_\_\_ other inmates, \_\_\_ Pen. officers, at \_\_\_\_\_

2. Recreation  with \_\_\_ other inmates, \_\_\_ Pen. officers, at \_\_\_\_\_

3. Other

Number and Location of Patrol Officers at Time of Escape

YARD		PERIMETER	
Number: _____	Not reported: <input type="checkbox"/>	Number: _____	Not reported: <input type="checkbox"/>
Position: _____	Not reported: <input type="checkbox"/>	Position: _____	Not reported: <input type="checkbox"/>

Assault on officers \_\_\_\_\_ threat of assault \_\_\_\_\_; escaped alone \_\_\_\_\_ with others \_\_\_\_\_ (accomp. over)

If not at Pen. Inst., inmate escaped from: \_\_\_\_\_

Charged with escape? \_\_\_\_\_; convicted? \_\_\_\_\_; Sentence \_\_\_\_\_

TABLE 5

Number of Inmates who Escaped and Rate per 1000 average inmate population from 1966-67 to 1968-69.

INSTITUTIONS	1966 - 1967			1967 - 1968			1968 - 1969		
	AVER. POP. IN INST.	NO. OF ESCAPEES	RATE OF ESCAPEES PER 1000 INMATES	AVER. POP. IN INST.	NO. OF ESCAPEES	RATE OF ESCAPEES PER 1000 INMATES	AVER. POP. IN INST.	NO. OF ESCAPEES	RATE OF ESCAPEES PER 1000 INMATES
<b>MAXIMUM SECUR. INST.</b>									
Dorchester Pen.	521	4	7.6	465	1	2.1	360	1	2.7
S.V.P. Pen.	837	0	0	774	0	0	769	0	0
S.C.U.	-	-	-	17	0	-	37	0	0
Arch. Inst.	-	-	-	-	-	-	28	0	0
King. Pen.	829	1	1.2	753	0	0	666	0	0
Prison for W.	90	0	0	72	1	13.8	69	0	0
Man. Pen.	412	2	4.8	394	9	22.8	376	1	2.6
Sask. Pen.	615	0	0	578	0	0	552	1	1.8
B.C. Pen.	511	0	0	518	0	0	483	1	2.0
Totals	3,815	7	1.8	3,571	11	3.0	3,340	4	1.1
<b>MEDIUM SECUR. INST.</b>									
Langhill Inst.	-	-	-	75	0	0	110	0	0
S.V.P. Ind. Annex	174	4	22.9	147	0	0	120	1	8.3
F.T.C.	329	0	0	287	3	10.4	295	0	0
Leclerc Inst.	445	8	17.9	418	5	11.9	433	2	4.6
Cowansville Inst.	141	4	28.3	159	0	0	170	2	11.7
Joyceville Inst.	443	6	13.5	440	4	9.0	438	3	6.8
Collins Bay Pen.	437	0	0	428	3	7.0	427	5	11.7
Warkworth Inst.	-	-	-	73	0	0	124	1	8.0
Drumheller Inst.	-	-	-	61	0	0	132	7	53.0
Matsqui Inst. (M)	148	0	0	195	2	10.2	194	7	36.0
Matsqui Inst. (F)	-	-	-	37	0	0	34	2	58.8
Mountain Prison	120	1	8.3	144	0	0	142	2	14.0
Totals	2,237	23	10.2	2,464	17	6.8	2,619	32	12.2
<b>MINIMUM SECUR. INST.</b>									
Dor. Farm Annex	71	1	14.0	66	1	15.1	58	6	103.4
Blue Mt. C.C.	42	4	95.2	35	5	142.8	37	0	0
Sprhl. Inst. (Min.)	90	6	66.6	75	6	80.0	69	3	43.4
S.V.P. Farm Annex	78	2	25.6	73	1	13.6	75	0	0
Valleyfield C.C.	94	1	10.6	52	3	57.6	26	1	38.4
Gatineau C.C.	50	2	40.0	33	3	90.9	30	0	0
Joyceville Farm Annex	74	3	40.5	74	0	0	70	7	100.0
Collins B.F. Annex	88	1	11.3	89	2	22.4	85	2	23.5
Beaver Creek C.C.	59	5	84.7	56	1	17.8	56	4	71.4
Landry Crossing C.C.	50	7	140.0	55	7	127.2	43	7	152.7
Smithfield Trailer Camp	9	0	-	10	2	200.0	10	0	0
Mountain Farm Annex	80	5	62.5	73	1	13.6	73	2	27.3
Sask. Farm Annex	84	3	35.7	83	0	0	82	4	48.8
William Head Inst.	126	1	7.9	128	9	70.3	120	10	83.3
Agassiz C.C.	57	6	105.2	56	14	250.0	50	6	120.0
Totals	1,052	47	44.6	958	55	57.4	884	52	58.0

-30-  
TABLE 6

NUMBER OF ESCAPERS BY MONTH

Security Class of Instit.	JAN		FEB		MAR		APR		MAY		JUN		JUL		AUG		SEP		OCT		NOV		DEC		TOTAL	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	Maximum	0	-	0	-	2	9.1	3	13.6	1	4.5	1	4.5	6	27.3	3	13.6	4	18.2	2	9.1	0	-	0	-	22
Medium	7	9.7	7	9.7	12	16.7	0	-	9	12.5	7	9.7	5	6.9	5	6.9	3	4.2	4	5.6	9	12.5	4	5.6	72	100.
Minimum	2	1.3	5	3.2	17	11.0	13	8.4	9	5.8	15	9.7	24	15.6	26	16.9	16	10.4	5	3.2	14	9.1	8	5.2	154	100.
TOTAL	9		12		31		16		19		23		35		34		23		11		23		12		248	

TABLE 7

NUMBER OF ESCAPE-EVENTS BY MONTH

Security Class of Instit.	JAN		FEB		MAR		APR		MAY		JUN		JUL		AUG		SEP		OCT		NOV		DEC		TOTAL	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	Maximum	0	-	0	-	2	11.8	1	5.9	1	5.9	1	5.9	4	23.5	3	17.6	4	23.5	1	5.8	0	-	0	-	17
Medium	3	6.3	4	8.3	6	12.5	0	-	6	12.5	6	12.5	3	6.3	4	8.3	3	6.3	3	6.3	7	14.6	3	6.3	48	100.
Minimum	4	4.0	3	3.0	9	8.9	6	5.9	9	8.9	6	5.9	13	12.9	19	18.8	15	14.8	7	6.9	4	4.0	6	5.9	101	100.
TOTAL	7		7		17		7		16		13		20		26		22		11		11		9		166	

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF ESCAPERS BY DAY OF THE WEEK

Security Class of Instit.	SUN		MON		TUE		WED		THUR		FRI		SAT		TOTAL	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	Maximum	2	9.1	0	-	5	22.7	1	4.5	8	36.4	5	22.7	1	4.5	22
Medium	10	13.9	17	23.6	15	20.8	9	12.5	10	13.9	5	6.9	6	8.3	72	100.0
Minimum	49	31.8	21	13.6	9	5.8	11	7.1	17	11.0	24	15.6	23	14.9	154	100.0
TOTAL	61		38		29		21		35		34		30		248	

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF ESCAPE-EVENTS BY DAY OF THE WEEK

Security Class of Instit.	SUN		MON		TUE		WED		THUR		FRI		SAT		TOTAL	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	Maximum	2	11.8	0	-	3	17.6	1	5.9	6	35.3	4	23.5	1	5.9	17
Medium	6	12.5	10	20.8	10	20.8	6	12.5	9	18.8	4	8.3	3	6.3	48	100.0
Minimum	31	30.7	15	14.9	6	5.9	9	8.9	12	11.9	15	14.9	13	12.9	101	100.0
TOTAL	39		25		19		16		27		23		17		166	

TABLE 10

NUMBER OF ESCAPERS BY TIME OF ESCAPE

Security Class of Instit.	N.R. *	0001- 0400 hrs		0401- 0800 hrs		0801- 1200 hrs		1201- 1600 hrs		1601- 2000 hrs		2001- 2400 hrs		TOTAL	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Maximum		1	4.5	0	-	4	18.2	10	45.5	2	9.1	5	22.7	22	100.0
Medium		1	1.4	4	5.6	10	13.9	12	16.7	10	13.9	35	48.6	72	100.0
Minimum	2	8	5.3	11	7.2	10	6.6	13	8.6	13	8.6	97	63.8	154	100.0
TOTAL	2	10		15		24		35		25		137		248	

\* Not Reported

TABLE 11

NUMBER OF ESCAPE-EVENTS BY TIME OF ESCAPE

Security Class of Instit.	N.R. *	0001- 0400 hrs		0401- 0800 hrs		0801- 1200 hrs		1201- 1600 hrs		1601- 2000 hrs		2001- 2400 hrs		TOTAL	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Maximum		1	5.9	0	-	3	17.6	8	47.1	2	11.8	3	17.6	17	100.0
Medium		1	2.1	2	4.2	7	14.6	8	16.7	7	14.6	23	47.9	48	100.0
Minimum	2	6	6.1	9	9.1	8	8.1	9	9.1	9	9.1	58	58.6	101	100.0
TOTAL	2	8		11		18		25		18		84		166	

\* Not Reported

SOL GEN CANADA LIB/BIBLIO



000001113

HV  
8657  
55  
C.3

12056

