



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.

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.

HY
8711
B7C
1993

"THIS TIME . . . " *

John Braithwaite
on behalf of the
Life Line Project,
St. Leonard's House, Windsor.

To meet the requirements of
Correctional Service of Canada
Contract No. 21100-2-0985\01-ST.

March 1993

* From the song whose lyrics include the line, "This time, we
almost made it."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. DEDICATION	
2. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	
3. VISION AND QUEST	1
4. REALITY	11
5. REVISION AND REQUEST	29
6. SPECIAL SECTION ON COMMUNICATION STRATEGY	
7. APPENDICES	

Appendix I - In Reach Worker's Statistics,
1992 - 1993

Appendix II - National Roster of Potential
Speakers

DEDICATION

This report is dedicated to the growing assembly of informed Canadians who firmly believe that there are better ways of working with lifers - ways that enhance the reintegration of offenders into society and ways that bring ultimate benefits and optimum protection to that society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Life Line wishes to acknowledge, with gratitude, the provision of resources by the Correctional Service of Canada that made it possible for us to share our hopes and experiences with others across Canada. We are particularly indebted to Brendan Reynolds, Assistant Commissioner Communications and Corporate Development and Irwin Kulik, Deputy Commissioner, Programs, for providing these resources.

We are also very appreciative of the opportunity to work with Dru Allen, Special Advisor Communications. We also appreciate the stewardship exercised by Odette Gravelle-Dunberry, Director Native and Female Offender Programs. Whenever compelling, competing responsibilities permitted, our work was enhanced by the contribution of Christina Power.

We were inspired by the enthusiasm of Rene Pelletier, Chairperson of the National Executive, Citizen Advisory Councils and key members of his National Executive, especially Jessie DesLauriers of the Ontario region.

We were heartened by the sensitivity and support from our colleagues in the non-governmental sector of Corrections and Criminal Justice. Their keen interest and strong support is gratifying for the present and hopeful for the future.

We were also extremely thankful for the courtesy, concern and collegiality demonstrated by our colleagues in the Correctional Service of Canada and the National Parole Board. Wherever our quest took us, they made us feel "at home".

Finally, a very special note of thanks to all of the lifers who made a special effort to contribute to this report. We are particularly indebted to the newly formed community lifers group in Halifax - who have come together in the community to make a unique contribution.

It is the potential contribution of lifers that spurred our interests and it is the manifestation of this contribution that frequently sustains our efforts.

To all, our sincere thanks - your words have made us wiser and your friendship has made us richer.

I. VISION AND QUEST

Concepts for improved programs involving lifers and expectations for their implementation were created by the report, More Than A Matter of Time.

The activities and experiences reflected in these pages represent an account of how the Correctional Service of Canada and Life Line representatives worked to realize expectations arising from that report.

This unique endeavour was made possible due to a relationship with St. Leonard's House, Windsor, the organization originating the Life Line Concept, that extends back over thirty years. Life Line, itself, was the response of St. Leonard's of Windsor to a challenge issued by a Deputy Commissioner of the Correctional Service of Canada to propose more effective and humane programs for lifers.

The initial response to the challenge was a proposal from St. Leonard's Society to the Correctional Service of Canada for the establishment of a halfway house in Windsor to serve lifers. A program model was developed by a team representing St. Leonard's, the Correctional Service of Canada and the University of Windsor.

In 1988, the St. Leonard's Society of Windsor asked the Donner Foundation to finance a demonstration project in the hope that the Correctional Service of Canada would respond favourably to the demonstrated results and provide permanent funding.

The Donner Foundation supported the initiative, in principle, but wanted additional work invested in the program concept in order to ensure that it was truly innovative and also to involve both the National Parole Board and the Correctional Service of Canada as planning participants rather than mere recipients of the plan. To achieve these objectives the Donner Foundation funded a working committee to refine the basic program concept. The work group had equal representation from Federal Corrections and the voluntary sector as follows:

Fred Gibson, then Chairman of the National Parole Board

Andrew Graham, Deputy Commissioner, Ontario Region, C.S.C.

Thomas Townsend, then Director General Offender Programs, C.S.C.

Frank Porporino, Director General Research, C.S.C.

Tom French, Lifer and Past Executive Director Frontier Help, Kingston

Bonnie Diamond, then Executive Director Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies

Edward Graham, Executive Director St. Leonard's Society, Windsor, and;

Alan R. Needham.

The chairperson was the immediate past president of the Canadian Criminal Justice Association and a former Deputy Commissioner. Mr. Roy Evans of the National Parole Board and Mr. Fred Luciani of the Correctional Service of Canada, Regional Headquarters, Ontario served as special advisors.

After visiting several institutions in the Ontario region and meeting with staff and lifers, the group submitted a report in June, 1990. The proposed program concept was innovative yet realistic, reflecting the rich experience of members of the work group and the practical lessons derived by St. Leonard's through working with long-term offenders in both institutions and the community.

The program concept was designed to better meet the fairly obvious needs of lifers. The objective was to better motivate the individual lifer and create better planning and management of the sentence within the institution and at the same time to provide selected lifers supportive reintegration services, including a Community Residential Facility.

In the latter, an individualized community focused program would be implemented that would stress the development of individual responsibility and independence. For example, living accommodation would be phased from two bed shared accommodation, through single bedrooms, to bachelor apartments.

Another unique feature of Life Line was a provision of support to the lifer from the time of his entrance into a penitentiary, through his reintegration into the community as a productive and responsible citizen.

A unique and key element was the use of a successful lifer to provide services to lifers on the inside. In addition to the provision of services and support, this representative of Life Line would serve as living proof that lifers can "make it".

Life Line then has three major components:

1. The In Reach Program . . . Goal - To contact and assist all lifers in institutions. The role of the In Reach Worker is to lend support to lifers and encourage them to use their institutional time as constructively as possible, taking advantage of every positive program opportunity. Advice and encouragement is given as to how best to prepare for both Judicial Reviews and Parole consideration. The In Reach Worker should also assist in

supporting the development of both lifers' groups within the institution and a network of needed resources in the community.

Life Line also encourages lifers to develop community service projects as a means of at least symbolic restitution.

The In Reach Program commenced in Ontario in January of 1991 with the appointment of Tom French as the In Reach Worker. In the course of that first year, some 250 lifers made formal contact with the In Reach Worker. A part from the provision of individual services to lifers, the In Reach Worker also made a constructive contribution to amelioration or resolution of tensions within the institutional milieu and to the development of new program initiatives.

The program was sufficiently effective that the Correctional Service authorized a second In Reach Worker. Russ Elliot came to the program with previous experience working with young offenders with the Ministry of Community and Social Services of Ontario. He commenced his responsibilities in January of 1992.

In terms of program development, the In Reach Workers help lifers to develop program initiatives. Two significant examples include:

- . CONTACT - This is a weekly televised cable program featuring the lifers' group at Joyceville institution.
- . YOUTH PROGRAM - Lifers at Frontenac have established a special program with the cooperation of provincial authorities in which young offenders on probation are counselled and advised to avoid criminal careers by lifers.

However, the greatest contribution made by the In Reach Workers is their availability, sensitivity and concern for lifers. They are motivators, catalysts, entrepreneurs, mediators and promoters - all these roles and endeavours having one ultimate objective - enhanced program opportunities for lifers and greater involvement of lifers in program. *

* For statistical appreciation of the In Reach Workers contribution see Appendix I.

2. The Life Line Community Program . . . Goal - To provide selected lifers the opportunity for gradual and supervised reintegration into the community with public safety as a prime consideration.

A residential facility, the Life Line Community Resource Centre is a residential program to assist in the reintegration of selected paroled lifers who may be in residence for one to three years.

In addition to this role, it also provides a meeting place and source of support for those who have moved entirely into the community but who may still desire assistance from time to time or who may wish to make a contribution by supporting others. St. Leonard's of Windsor is about to become the Ontario Community Residential Facility and Resource Centre for Life Line.

St. Leonard's had to overcome significant obstacles to gain approval of civic leadership and public acceptance.

St. Leonard's initial involvement was heralded in the press under a caption, "Halfway House for Killers to Open . . ." "The local media, especially the print media, was extremely negative claiming that this was an Ottawa inspired initiative which was both ill conceived and insensitive.

St. Leonard's developed a consultation and communication strategy to turn the situation around and gain civic approval. A number of initiatives were undertaken over several months. Both the Executive Director, Skip Graham and Lou Drouillard, long time St. Leonard's and Life Line supporter, worked assiduously to meet with civic leaders, community groups and neighbours.

A public meeting was held to coincide with the annual meeting and many of the ill founded claims and myths around the project were dealt with.

The media gave responsible coverage to these developments.

In addition, specific, direct consultation took place with the Mayor, other civic leaders and the police.

Ultimately, agreement was reached to permit a five bed pilot residential experiment to take place within a renovated section of the existing St. Leonard's House on

the understanding that the community would be involved in the intake process and that no lifers who had been convicted of sexual offenses would be admitted at this time.

This, coupled with the communication endeavour, proved to be highly successful in gaining the support of the community in what one editorial referred to as "... one of the great public relations coups of all time." (The Globe and Mail suggested it might be "... a model for social agencies wishing to preempt the bitter politics that often surround the opening of group homes.")

3. The Application of the Life Line Concept Across Canada
... Goal - To assist the Correctional Service of Canada and interested Voluntary Agencies in considering, adapting and implementing the Life Line concept in their operations. The Life Line concept originated in Windsor and was conceived as a pilot project for consideration and application in all C.S.C. regions.

That the Correctional Service of Canada should support the adoption of the Life Line program in its operations relates to both the philosophy of the Service and the size and nature of the lifer population.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE SERVICE

The Philosophy of the Service is reflected in The Mission Statement: "The Correctional Service of Canada, part of the Criminal Justice System, contributes to the protection of society by actively encouraging and assisting offenders to become law abiding citizens, while exercising a reasonable, safe, secure and humane control."

More specifically, Core Value 2 adds emphasis: "We recognize the offender has the potential to live as a law abiding citizen."

The Guiding Principles supportive of Core Value 2 are not only more specific but they coincide with the essential program elements of Life Line.

For example, "We believe that programs and opportunities to assist offenders in developing social and living skills will enhance their potential to become law abiding citizens. We must ensure that offenders participate in such programs and we will strive to motivate them to contribute to their development."

That Guiding Principle is reflected in the role and responsibilities of the In Reach Worker.

Again, "Accepting that offenders can best demonstrate their ability to function as law abiding citizens in the community, we will provide programs, assistance and supervision to support the gradual release of offenders at the earliest time that such release can be safely effected."

The thrust of this Guiding Principle relates directly to the Community Program.

Again, "The involvement of community organizations, volunteers and outside professionals in program development and delivery will be actively encouraged."

This Guiding Principle would seem to place Life Line well within the orbit of a working relationship with the Correctional Service of Canada.

As to the desirability of having Life Line considered by other regions as a potential program element, Core Value 4 offers the following direction:

"We believe that the sharing of ideas, knowledge, values and experience, nationally and internationally is essential to the achievement of the Mission."

A Guiding Principle relative to Core Value 4 is more explicit: "We recognize that we must actively encourage the gathering, creation, application and dissemination of new knowledge if we are to remain a contributing member of the national and international corrections community."

In addition to the foregoing, the Perron Report or Report of the Task Force on Long-Term Sentences lent further impetus to the development of programs for long-term offenders.

Without reviewing the Report in detail, it can be said that the initiatives proposed in the Perron Report coincide with many of the initiatives embraced by Life Line.

Life Line sees itself as being complementary to, rather than in competition with, the recommendations of the Perron Report. Our interests coincide. So do our concerns. For example, the Report serves to focus attention on the unprecedented number of Judicial Reviews that the Service will experience. A series of recommendations designed to enhance the Service's preparation and presentation of Judicial Review Reports are presented. Life Line is of the opinion that this is most timely. Judicial Reviews are carried out under the critical scrutiny of the media and it is not just the performance of the inmate that is being evaluated it is the perceived performance of the Service that is being both evaluated and publicized.

The Service is on even more tenuous ground than the lifer, himself. The inmate need only be concerned regarding probing questions of the Crown Prosecutor. However, the Service, can receive probing questions and subsequent criticism from the Crown and Counsel for the lifer - and have the end result reported extensively in the media.

Life Line is in agreement with the fundamental approach expressed in the Perron Report and is generally supportive of virtually all of the recommendations.

Finally it was felt that the growth of the lifer population warranted consideration of new programs. The lifer population has grown from 4.6% of the total inmate population in 1976 to 16% as of March the 1st, 1992.

Of particular significance is the fact that there is currently over 3,000 lifers under the supervision of the Correctional Service of Canada. Of these, just over one-third or about 1,100 are on supervised release in the community. The group is growing and will continue to grow. Of particular significance is the fact that 227 lifers were admitted to federal institutions in 1991 - 1992.

Their numbers do not carry the same impact or imperative that similar increases in other categories of offenders might. One of the paradoxes of programming is that lifers are generally seen as welcome additions to the institutional population. The normal profile of a lifer reflects an individual who is not a career criminal; who shares the same values as staff and most citizens and who is committed to a safe and serene environment within the institution. Generally speaking, of all of the elements within the institutional population, lifers reflect the most positive of attitudes. They represent a relatively untapped potential for progressive change if their imagination and energy can be released by the catalytic effect of the Life Line worker.

OTHER ENCOURAGING SIGNS

There were significant related evidence to suggest that this was an opportune time to reach out and attempt to realize the potential of Life Line.

Of most significance was the demonstrated success of the In Reach Program within Ontario. As with all new programs, problems were encountered but all of these were addressed and resolved through the professional relationship and supervision of the Assistant Regional Administrator, Community Corrections.

In addition, the Pepino Report, the Report of the Panel Appointed to Review the Temporary Absence Program for Penitentiary Inmates, March 1992, in presenting its findings, provided support for increased programming for lifers. They observed that lifers were ". . . highly successful on temporary absence programs" with only two of 758 offenders having failed. They noted that most lifers will re-enter the community on parole, at some time, and, therefore, some reintegration programs should be available.

Virtually every person consulted agreed that lifers represented a very low risk; were "filled with remorse" and were a stabilizing influence within the institution. However, the panel also sagely observed that long incarceration with no relief from the effects of institutionalization can render individuals incapable of reintegrating into the community.

Finally, and perhaps the most pertinent observation of all, was the firm conclusion that access to programs should be related to risk - not time to be served. In other words, access to programs should be based on the needs of the offender and risk to society, rather than the individual's availability to be fitted into the program at some future date.

This significant observation was encouraging to those concerned with programs for lifers as Corporate Objective One "reintegrating a significantly larger number of offenders . . . while reducing the relative use of incarceration," had detracted attention from the lifer group. This view was supported by observations within the Pepino Report and the Perron Report alluded to ". . . traditionally neutral attitudes observed among staff with regard to the target group."

Another source of encouragement was the demonstrated success achieved in Judicial Reviews by lifers who had carefully planned presentations and had grasped and/or created program opportunities to demonstrate changes in attitude and behaviour. Of twenty-nine applications, twenty-two or 77% have resulted in the parole eligibility date being reduced from the mandatory twenty-five years. The average reduction in parole eligibility was 8.5 years.

THE QUEST

The cumulative affect of these promising portents led to the decision to share the concept of Life Line and its demonstrated experience in Ontario with the other regions of the Correctional Service of Canada.

This proposal was included in the eight recommendations contained in the report, More Than A Matter Of Time.

These eight recommendations were distilled from the extensive comments contributed during a consultation process with C.S.C. staff, lifers and interested parties in the Ontario region; along with the consideration of major recommendations contained in the Perron Report and significant comments within the Pepino Report.

1. The Correctional Service of Canada should formally identify and assign priority to lifers as a special group of offenders with both a need to participate in, and to a significant extent, a potential to contribute and support both general and specialized programs.
2. Recognizing the significant, demonstrated contribution of Life Line in Ontario, the Correctional Service of Canada should support and facilitate tripartite, i.e. Correctional Service of Canada, National Parole Board and Life Line, consideration of the application of the Life Line program concept, including program development, in Reach program, community resource centres and public education, in each region.

In pursuit of this recommendation, special consultations should be held with Aboriginal organizations providing services to Aboriginal offenders.

3. Life Line should be used as a supportive, educative and promotional resource to enhance the implementation of the Task Force Report on Long Term Sentences - particularly in relation to recommendation 17, the establishment and use of lifers' groups in program development and recommendation 21, calling for an effective, phased community based re-integrative process.
4. An extensive study should be carried out to focus on defining new roles, "careers" and responsibilities for lifers that would take them beyond current assigned institutional roles into supportive and helpful activity that would better realize their potential; meet their need to effect reconciliation and improve the quality of the institutional milieu.

This endeavour could include consideration of residential units housing only lifers.

5. The Correctional Service of Canada should re-emphasize the value and vital contribution of the staff/lifer relationship that enables the lifer to act in a responsible productive manner in both incarceration and community reintegration.

6. The Correctional Service of Canada, working with the National Parole Board and Life Line should develop and implement a coordinated communications strategy with National, Regional and Local application in order to achieve clearer public perceptions, expectations and increased support for realistic, reintegrative programs for lifers.

Much of the work involved in developing such a comprehensive communication strategy will rest with the regional teams defined in recommendation 2 above.

7. Consideration be given to the establishment of a cadre of specialists within each region to prepare and present Judicial Review reports. This consideration should include whether these specialists be staff members or individuals under contract, possibly former staff members.

In any case, those called on to present Judicial Review reports should receive specific training and guidance to increase their competence and gain public confidence.

8. That the Correctional Service of Canada and Life Line carefully consider the inclusion of reconciliation opportunities within the context of proposed new program initiatives to enhance the safe release of long-term offenders in an appropriate and timely fashion.

C.S.C. gave a positive, albeit partial, response to these recommendations by providing the resources to facilitate a combined C.S.C./N.P.B. and Life Line presentation of the program concept, including program development, In Reach program, community resource centres and public education in each region.

In addition, a coordinated communication strategy was urged to achieve clear public perceptions, expectations and increase support for realistic programs for lifers.

Given the opportunity and the resources to mount a "combined operation", with C.S.C. Communication and Program units, and convert the promise of Life Line into program reality, the quest commenced with enthusiasm and high hopes.

II. REALITY

Great expectations and high optimism marked the commencement of bringing the Life Line message to the regions.

It was contemplated that, in keeping with the shared heritage of cooperation, the work would be coordinated by a team representative of the Correctional Service of Canada, the National Parole Board and Life Line.

This team would develop and coordinate all aspects of the consultation and communication with the regions and significant working partners such as the National Liaison Committee, the National Executive of the Citizens' Advisory Committee, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Canadian Criminal Justice Association, the Native Advisory Committee and other appropriate regional or national bodies.

At the regional level an organization or individual reflecting the views of the long-term offender population from both an institutional and community perspective would be identified. Regional teams involving the Parole Board, C.S.C. program and communications functions would be formed. In this way, communication considerations and program development would go forth hand in hand and would reflect the national organization.

These regional teams would identify specific steps in the consultation and public education process and, in addition, would develop an adaptation of a communications plan to be employed within the region and to take into account special regional characteristics.

KEY ELEMENTS FOR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF A LIFE LINE ORIENTED PROGRAM

A tentative sketch of a regional implementation plan had been outlined in the report, More Than A Matter of Time.

According to that outline, the initial and primary step is the recognition of a need and a desire to address the issue.

The next step is a process of careful cooperative planning carried out by the Correctional Service of Canada, the National Parole Board and Life Line.

A communications strategy must be developed designed to, in the long run, provide increased public awareness of the benefits of the program and include a crisis or emergency plan to deal with unplanned, unforeseen but inevitable problems.

The first manifestation of the program should be the introduction of In Reach Workers into the institutions to help enlist staff and lifer support and involvement in the program. This is a highly productive step and a commitment that can be above criticism as an initiative. The introduction of these workers to the institutional environment should proceed on a sequential basis commencing with the administration and following through the applicable unions, case management officers, lifers themselves and, finally, related organizations.

The identification of a community service project to be endorsed and supported by a lifers' group is a potentially helpful element in the implementation process.

As the institutional base becomes operational, it will attract the interest of non-governmental agencies in the community, initiate inquiries and create interest in the provision of community based program elements, including residential resources.

The total operation should be supported by a considered communications strategy. The key message of which is that - "One third of all lifers are currently fulfilling their sentence under supervision in the community. Because lifers are among the better risks on parole, more lifers will undoubtedly be coming to the community as time passes.

Life Line enhances Correctional Service of Canada programs and the success of lifers in these institutional and community programs, and this, "ultimately, better protects the community."

Seemingly, there was a reasonable plan and potential teams to mount the initiative.

DETOURS, DISTRACTIONS AND DELAYS ON THE ROAD TO PROGRESS

The overall endeavour was to be a team effort - a high powered vehicle - with four-wheel drive representing Program, Communications, Life Line and the regions.

A bringing together of regional communications and programs representative from each of the regions to a central orientation and planning meeting was planned. Key teams within each region

would establish links with the case management process and would fan out and make the necessary regional contacts and develop accompanying, supportive communications programs. It was anticipated that these regional teams would make presentations to all C.S.C. managers and Parole Board managers and members.

Restraint

As a result of the restraint initiatives undertaken by the government in November, major revisions had to be made to the plan including the anticipated continuous participation by regional personnel.

Travel for government personnel, in general, and C.S.C. program staff, in particular, shut down.

Life Line was having to follow a pattern it had hoped to avoid - That of a travelling medicine show instead of working with the regions in a joint exploration and development of a implementation plan. Life Line was cast into a salesman's role during a time of chilling austerity.

In the midst of restraint, Life Line came down the road urging the Correctional Service and Voluntary Agencies to create whole new programs focusing on a client group causing little concern on the inside and that all too few, on the outside, considered at all.

Distractions

In the face of shrinking resources, C.S.C. managers were preoccupied with other considerations.

Corporate Objective One had entirely captured the imagination and energy of case management staff.

Other units of the organization were committed to developing and implementing effective communication efforts with the public around such issues as proposed Regional Institutions for Women Offenders. In addition to all this, a series of high profile Coroners' Inquests were being carried out in at least three of the regions virtually closing down involvement by the National Parole Board representative and regional communication staff.

With the exception of one region, there was never a full presentation of the Life Line concept to all C.S.C. managers.

Moreover, what had become a lonely selling job to designated regional program representatives had to be carried out without the presence and full participation of a representative of program at the national level. Competing priorities curtailed the opportunity to participate and the "restraint" policy wiped out any opportunity for the program representative to actually appear in the regions.

In addition to the restraint measures, at least one region almost ruled out any consideration of program because of additional fiscal adjustments required by the Correctional Resource Equalization Project.

Looking back, it could be said that the original road map or plan of action as reflected by the contract erred on the side of optimism. The contract called for implementation of the program in all regions by March 1993.

This would have been an exceedingly difficult target to meet under the best of circumstances. Given the unforeseen developments and related problems, it became impossible.

What had started out as a move to implement the Life Line program in all regions became an effort to interest regions in the program; to encourage them to consider moving towards implementation and to establish support for the program amongst our working partners.

These revised targets, while short of the ultimate, represent important, indeed, essential achievements.

Regional Reports

Despite difficulties, overall efforts towards implementation of the Life Line program were considerable. A brief report will be given on regional development from the perspective of Life Line and this will be followed by a summary of related accomplishments; many on a national basis. *

Ontario

Ontario is the home and operational base for Life Line. However, even here it took nine years to develop from a challenge to the entry of the first In Reach Worker into an institution on January the 1st 1991.

* Detailed periodic reports have been submitted as required by the contract. It was not felt necessary to repeat such developmental detail here.

Currently the two In Reach Workers perform an invaluable service by their daily involvement within the institutions. A reoccurring problem seems to be related to the modest number of referrals from case managers. However, this problem has been recognized, in the evaluation process, and cooperative steps have been taken to remedy the situation.

Somewhat surprisingly, there was a report that members of the Parole Board did not fully appreciate the significance of the contribution of the In Reach Worker. It has been difficult to substantiate the statement or the rationale behind it but the issue is being cooperatively explored with Board members of the Ontario region.

In general, the relationship with administration, staff and lifers' groups is extremely good and significant program developments reflect well on the concept.

The Community Residential Resource, will soon be operating in a renovated part of the existing St. Leonard's House, Windsor. An Executive Director is just being sought. This will be immediately followed by a training and orientation endeavour and the first residents are anticipated to enter the program as of June the 1st.

The program, itself, is an extensive, comprehensive, individually oriented process developed over a number of years with the support and assistance of C.S.C., staff of St. Leonard's, the University of Windsor Sociology Department and the work of the Special National Resource Group funded by the Donner Foundation.

It involves individualized programming offering a basic, generic program within the residential facility itself and special contract programs provided through the community.

It is hoped that one staff member of the house could become a qualified, cognitive skills trainer in order to provide that program both to residents and parolees residing in the Windsor community.

As previously mentioned, a great deal of careful consultation and cultivating of community support was required to gain civic acceptance for the residence. A complete media file has been developed and is available as a resource for other prospective community residential facilities. In addition, Life Line is currently developing a case study analysis of the strategies and activities that were employed to achieve the level of public support required for the Windsor initiative. This too will represent a resource for other agencies and other communities.

In a similar vein, an extremely comprehensive and complex Policy Program and Procedure Manual has been developed for use in the residential facility. It too is available as a model or resource for other organizations.

Finally, the Windsor residential initiative has gained the support of the Director General of Correctional Research for the development of an evaluation framework. This effort will involve a control group with assessments being made at distinct intervals. C.S.C. Research will provide funding for the development of the research design and its implementation. The latter will draw on special resources from the University of Windsor.

It is anticipated that a working seminar and orientation session of all key players will take place in May possibly at the University of Windsor to enable all involved to have a full and complete sense of being part of an integrated team in introducing this new research initiative.

This endeavour is in keeping with Life Line's practice of sharing experiences with public and voluntary sector colleagues.

The Ontario region remains a scene of solid, steady progress and achievement accompanied by careful documentation and an open invitation to share experiences. This is of very special importance as Voluntary Agencies in other regions strive to mount In Reach Worker programs. Life Line is a program concept - not an emerging empire nor a closed corporation and Life Line is eager to share hard earned lessons with all interested colleagues.

The Pacific Region

Initial contacts with the Pacific Region resulted in an endorsement of the program concept but no consideration of implementation due to severe budgetary cutbacks. As the Regional Administrator Correctional Programs summarized the situation, "The Life Line concept - in particular Phase One (The In Reach Worker) has a great deal to offer to the effective management of lifers and other long-term offenders serving federal sentences.

Unfortunately, due to other pressing program priorities, we are not, at this time, in a position to fund such an initiative . . . If an external source of funding could be identified, especially to introduce the In Reach program, it is certain that we would take advantage of the opportunity to make Life Line a reality in this region."* This was viewed as a setback of significant proportions coming as it does from a region having the highest percentage of lifers of all the regions, i.e. twenty percent.

Subsequently, suggestions were made to:

- Involve a Life Line In Reach Worker as a member of the proposed inmate peer counselling group that was being established as an innovative program.

* Memo to Deputy Commissioner, John Duggan December 16, 1992.

- . Attaching and/or incorporating the Life Line In Reach Worker element into one of the current existing contracted visiting programs of M2, The John Howard Society and/or Catholic charities.

In any event, it would seem that the funding for the proposed peer counselling endeavour was not forthcoming but funding was made available to contract directly with an individual lifer, Glen Flett, to help establish a community support group and to work directly with lifers in the Sumas Centre.

In addition, we were advised that the region was striving to enter into a contract to provide residential services to long-term and older inmates. (This is not specifically a program for lifers but would meet the needs of some long-term geriatric type offenders.)

Life Line sees these reported developments, especially the involvement of a lifer, as recognition of a particular need. Life Line is willing to share the experience of the In Reach Workers in Ontario with the lifer/contractee in the Pacific and do everything possible to assist in enhancing his potential contribution.

However, we must also reiterate our firm commitment to the concept of an In Reach Worker sponsored by an independent, voluntary community agency capable of providing support and supervision; serving as an intermediary when required; maintaining the image of the In Reach Worker as independent of C.S.C. and, should it be necessary, serving as an advocate.

Prairies

For some time the Prairies apparently considered the development of a regional plan relative to the implementation of Life Line program as contrasted to implementing a pilot project as proposed by Warden Jim O'Sullivan of Saskatchewan Penitentiary. After careful consideration within the region, it would appear that the Regional Management Committee will be presented with a proposal to activate a pilot In Reach Worker program at Saskatchewan Penitentiary. This initiative follows two visits to the region by Life Line representatives.

Because Saskatchewan Penitentiary has the highest concentration of lifers in the region, the Warden is sponsoring the initiative and community correctional staff also seem to be supportive. There is an optimistic attitude around the forthcoming submission to the Management Committee.

Interestingly enough, correctional staff are of the opinion that the selection of an In Reach Worker does not represent as large a challenge as the designation of a sponsoring community based agency. Because of this difficulty a very imaginative approach is being taken and consideration is being given to such relatively novel possibilities as the Council on Multiculturalism, Ministerial Association or the Citizens' Advisory Committee. The latter suggestion met with considerable enthusiasm.

Two lifers who have had considerable experience as addictions counsellors are amongst the possible candidates for the position of In Reach Worker.

The correctional staff who participated in the planning session identified a number of potential benefits of an In Reach Worker program. These included:

- . A greater stability within the institutional scene.
- . A means of giving energy and focus to the work of lifers' groups.
- . A positive impact on the inmate culture.
- . Assistance in bringing greater continuity to the case management process.
- . Enhanced communication.
- . Reduced anxieties related to Judicial Reviews and parole appearances.

Aboriginal Offenders

Aboriginal offenders are most highly and disproportionately represented in the Prairie inmate population. As a result, a special effort was made to reach out to two major providers of services to Aboriginal offenders, the Native Counselling Services of Alberta and the Native Clan of Manitoba. There were two objectives in mind in consulting with these groups. They were:

1. Provide them with the opportunity to offer their services as sponsoring agencies for Life Line; and
2. Urge them to encourage C.S.C. to implement Life Line programs.

During the course of discussions it was pointed out that 115 of the 370 incarcerated lifers on the Prairies were Aborigines. At the same time, 38 of the 175 lifers on parole were Aborigines.

Chester Cunningham, Executive Director, The Native Counselling Services of Alberta indicated his personal support for the program and will discuss it in detail with his program managers on April the 28th. He has no difficulty at all in predicting that his organization will encourage the Service to introduce Life Line.

Indeed, he was sufficiently enthused to strive to have the topic of Life Line placed on the agenda for the next meeting of the Native Advisory Committee - hopefully in May.

He also commented that a review and revival of a program concept of approximately ten years ago - that of remote correctional communities for lifers might well be considered again. While this concept is not without its difficulties, it may well have special considerations relative to the Aboriginal offender. In any event, further developments, await Dr. Cunningham's review.

The meeting with Curtis Fontaine, Executive Director of the Native Clan of Manitoba and Neil Joyce, Board Member, resulted in an enthusiastic endorsement of the concept. In particular, the In Reach aspect held a particular attraction for them. Moreover, they have a current valued employee who is a lifer who could easily be channelled into the In Reach Worker role.

They indicated that a full Board meeting would not normally take place until later in the year but a special sub-committee of the Board would be identified to give the Life Line concept further consideration with a possible view to a meeting with Life Line representative(s) early in June.

We were heartened by the fact that both these organizations were promptly and enthusiastically supportive of Life Line. The ultimate form of this support will be a matter of their determination in consultation with Life Line and C.S.C.

The Quebec Region

The Quebec Region has always been regarded as a promising scene for the Life Line concept since the Regional Director, Jean-Claude Perron provided the leadership for the Long-Term Offenders Task Force Report and was seriously concerned about improving programs

for lifers. Because of our interest and desire to create the most positive of impressions, Lou Drouillard was selected to represent Life Line meetings within the Quebec region.

Lou was chosen because of his demonstrated experience in working with halfway houses as an Executive Director and also having been an Executive Director of the St. Leonard's Society of Canada. In addition, Lou had carried out much of the on-site work in turning around public opinion in Windsor and had also been directly responsible for the development of the Policy Program and Procedural Manual for the Windsor residential program.

Meetings were held to introduce the Life Line concept and encourage the incorporation of that concept in the total regional plan being developed to deal with long-term offenders, especially lifers.

St. Leonard's House of Montreal had already made a specific submission to provide residential services dedicated exclusively to lifers. This is known as "Le Projet Nouvel Elan". More recently, a further submission had been made by Michel Gagnon, the Director General of St. Leonard's House, to the Regional Deputy Commissioner to use Nouvel Elan as an alternative to the establishment of a community correctional centre which would appear to be more costly, more provocative, and controversial. The specific proposal involves a request of the region to authorize housing 12 to 15 inmates on day parole in a former location at 4121 rue St. Antoine West for which St. Leonard's already has an occupation permit.

This proposed Life Line residence would enable more lifers to obtain parole; would be program intensive and would offer an array of individualized programs much of what would be drawn from community agencies.

An evaluation design would be part of the overall endeavour.

The Life Line group would be most willing to enter into consultations with victims' groups, for example, Plaidoyer Victimes, to enhance their understanding of the project and to consider some possible projects focused on reparation.

More recently, Life Line has encouraged St. Leonard's House Montreal to emphasize an In Reach Worker initiative to serve as a precursor and complement to the residential program.

The Association of Social Rehabilitation Agencies of Quebec and the Quebec Church Council for Justice and Corrections have both expressed their continued support for Life Line. These supportive expressions were also shared by Paul Williams, the Executive Director of The John Howard Society of Montreal. In addition, the A.S.R.S. newsmagazine is publishing an article by Michel Gagnon on the Life Line program which will enhance understanding within correctional circles.

It is noted that there is some concern regarding public acceptance of a major C.C.C. for long-term offenders to be established within the Montreal community. Lou Drouillard and others strongly urge that a total communications plan be developed in order to reduce the risk of alienating the community and arising unnecessary controversy. That advice is sound and Life Line offers whatever experience and resources that were developed in the Windsor arena that might be of potential assistance.

It is felt that consideration of the Life Line program at this time is most appropriate because of the region's development of an overall strategy for dealing with the long-term offender. While, we have not been informed of the outcome, it is anticipated that the document should be forthcoming very soon and the hope is that it will include a component of Life Line.

The Atlantic Region

The Atlantic region has been extremely responsive to the Life Line appeal. Indeed, this is the only region in which we have had an opportunity to make a presentation to the full senior management committee. As a result of that meeting, we were assured that, Terry Hatcher, in developing a comprehensive regional strategy for long-term offenders, would include a Life Line component.

It would appear that the major institutional interest is centered in the Atlantic Institution. Certainly the Warden and staff, especially the Assistant Warden, Program, is anxious to incorporate an In Reach Worker program. Of course, there would also be a need to provide In Reach Worker services to lifers in the other institutions but certainly a start could and should be made in the Atlantic institution.

Discussions with C.S.C. and Parole staff would suggest there are several possible candidates to serve as the In Reach Worker. There has also been an expression of interest from the John Howard Society of Moncton. This organization has demonstrated their continuing interest in long-term offenders, including a previous contract to respond to the Task Force Report on Long-Term Sentences.

A most interesting development has occurred in the Halifax district under the leadership of the District Director, Vince MacDonald along with Gerry Smith in charge of the Carleton Centre Annex. They managed to interest a group of lifers from the community in exploring the Life Line concept. This group initially gathered to meet with Life Line representatives but subsequently agreed to have further meetings to explore the possibility of assessing the needs of lifers from a community perspective and preparing a paper for the consideration of the Atlantic region of C.S.C. Three of the

participants, Jerry Bezanson, Moe Parsens and Dave Larder had been mentioned in prior discussions as examples of potential In Reach Workers. Life Line is very appreciative of the imaginative initiative undertaken by Vince MacDonald, Gerry Smith and all involved. We are especially encouraged by lifers giving generously of their time and energy to participate in meetings designed to develop a community perspective to the Life Line concept. This community support group is a unique, positive, developing experience. Members meet approximately every two weeks to consider needs of lifers; possible programs and means of assuming more responsible roles in helping each other and lifers still within the institutions.

They have not overlooked the communications side of their endeavour; having created a newsletter which is sent to all supervising staff of C.S.C. and all lifers within the region. Life Line is proud of their initiative and they should also be justifiably proud.

The Executive Director of St. Leonard's of Nova Scotia, Janet Everest, has offered her agency as a support base and meeting place for this work group.

That organization has also expressed interest in providing accommodation within a special facility for lifers. St. Leonard's Halifax has a potential to accommodate ten residents in apartment style accommodation. This potential, coupled with the expressed commitment to support Life Line would indicate that, if the residential initiative was pursued, this agency could be almost immediately responsive.

OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS

While the regions were the focal point of activity, other important and even essential endeavours were successfully conducted.

Establishing a Base

The commencement of the work related to this contract coincided with a crucial need to gain acceptance for the Life Line residence in Windsor. This was seen as an essential and exemplary achievement to serve as a symbol and possible model for other communities and regions in Canada.

It would be embarrassing, if not impossible, to attempt to sell the concept of residential services for lifers to other communities if, after thirty years of demonstrated community service, St. Leonard's Windsor was not able to proceed with the residential initiative.

Communications Strategy

A major Communications Strategy has been developed and is included as a special section following this general report.

The Strategy proceeds from the valid assumption that while the general public is fearful of convicted murderers, there is also a degree of fascination.

The media, in general, is sympathetic to positive endeavours to help lifers help themselves. While Canadians want people to be punished for their crimes, they also wish to be fair minded and provide the opportunity for reparation and reintegration into society.

One of the key elements in the Communications Plan is to provide opportunities for lifers to be depicted as remorseful, responsible individuals who wish to contribute to the correctional process and to society - rather than merely be a charge against that society.

The Strategy then goes on to address how the key implementation of the In Reach Worker concept in the region can set in motion a series of events that will drive and give meaning to the Communication Strategy as it focuses on:

Four major publics -

- . C.S.C. Staff
- . Lifers
- . Voluntary Agencies
- . The General Public

The Communications Strategy represents a general outline which regions can develop to meet their unique characteristics and needs.

If accepted, a coordinating planning effort should be undertaken involving the regions and national headquarters to ensure that developments relative to more effective programming receive appropriate public attention.

Interest in lifers and the Life Line concept is such that media coverage can virtually be obtained at any time. The key is to ensure that that coverage is part of a coordinated, constructive, shared endeavour with C.S.C. and the regions.

Finally, it is submitted that by building public confidence through successful, responsible programs conducted with lifers, we can do a great deal to restore confidence in the correctional process and reduce the impact of the Not In My Backyard Syndrome.

While the focus is on lifers, the ultimate benefits can cover the whole correctional scene.*

Communication Resources

Related to the Communication Plan has been the development of key ancillary resources. These include:

1. A draft national brochure.
2. A video cassette recording to educate the public about the needs and potential of lifers and the Life Line concept.
3. A slide presentation used successfully with groups in the Windsor area.
4. A national roster of potential speakers. *(See Appendix II.)

The Continued Development of an Aware, Sensitive and Supportive Network

A great deal of activity has been invested in reaching out to various community based groups to increase their awareness in relation to lifers and Life Line and to gain their continued support for the implementation of the program.

In all of these endeavours and encounters, we have always come away richer for the experience and singularly rewarded by the positive response.

We have been particularly heartened by the expressed support of close working partners of the Correctional Service of Canada. This would, of course, include the National Parole Board. Meetings have been held with each of the regions and efforts are being made to have Life Line presented once again at their next National Training Conference.

Contact has also been made with the Correctional Chaplains and we are indebted to the Director General of Chaplaincy Services, Pierre Allard and his colleagues for ensuring that Life Line benefits from the continued support of the working Chaplaincy and their access to spiritual leaders in communities across Canada.

* International interest is emerging in the form of a request for an article for The Key, the journal of the Commonwealth Correctional Administrators.

The opportunity to participate in the Fourth Annual Research Forum provided access to a community of professionals concerned with high standards of programs and evaluation of those programs. Here again, new alliances were formed and these will be enhanced as we move into the evaluation of the residential program in Windsor and share those results with our colleagues.

It was also possible to initiate a beginning exploration of the development of Career Paths for lifers in discussion with Thomas Townsend, Director General, Corcan. This is an endeavour that everyone agrees should be pursued. Life Line is interested in pushing the concept of using lifers in non-traditional roles in order to harness their positive attributes and provide them with an opportunity to make constructive contributions and symbolic reparation. A commitment was made to support such an endeavour including the provision of some modest resources to mount such a study.

Of particular significance to Life Line, was the increased vigour of Citizens Advisory Committees and the expressed interest of their chairperson, Rene Peletier and Jessie DesLauriers, Vice Chairman of the Ontario region in the Life Line program. As a result, a special submission has been made to the National Executive of Citizens Advisory Committees to:

- . Endorse and encourage C.S.C. to develop programs for lifers in general and Life Line in particular.
- . Monitor commitments of the Correctional Service of Canada, lifers and sponsoring community agencies.
- . Sponsor, if necessary, specific initiatives.

The Citizen Advisory Committee National Executive is currently, actively considering this request presented by Life Line at their last meeting and a helpful response is anticipated.

In the meantime, Life Line has been invited to participate in the Ontario Regional Conference and a general but positive response has been given to the program.

The expressed support of the members of the National Executive is entirely in keeping with their newly articulated goals to:

- . participate in developing community resources designed to support correctional programs; and
- . to act as independent observers, contributing skills and expertise and providing advice toward an effective correctional system.

Native Advisory Committee

Life Line views this Committee as having singular importance in regards to the application of the Life Line concept for Aboriginal lifers especially in the West. Since the Native Advisory Committee did not meet during the course of our endeavours, a consultation with the total group was not possible. However, key participants have been contacted including Noel Knockwood, Special Advisor to the Commissioner; Chester Cunningham, Executive Director, Native Counselling Services of Alberta; and Curtis Fontaine, Executive Director, Native Clan of Manitoba. All endorsed the basic program concept. In addition, the topic of Life Line has been placed on the agenda for the next meeting of the Committee.

Contact With Voluntary Agency Partners

Effective working relationships have been established with the National Liaison Committee and with the Member Agencies represented on that Committee. These include the Association des Services de Rehabilitation Sociale, the John Howard Society of Canada, the National Association of Friendship Centres, the Canadian Training Institute, the Salvation Army, the Church Council on Justice and Corrections, the Seventh Step Society, the Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies, St. Leonard's Society of Canada, the Allied Indian and Metis Society of British Columbia and the Canadian Criminal Justice Association. All of these organizations individually as well as collectively within the Liaison Committee, support the Life Line concept.

The support and involvement of the Canadian Criminal Justice Association is particularly helpful in enhancing communication endeavours. They have already carried informational articles in their publications such as The Justice Report. In addition, it is anticipated that Life Line will once again be given an opportunity to make a presentation at the forthcoming Canadian Criminal Justice Congress in Quebec City in early October. This presentation would be of special significance in relation to the theme, The Human Face of Justice.

The contact and support of this community of organizational peers is more than encouraging. It is sustaining. Such a network of support will be invaluable as the program moves forward.

Federation of Canadian Municipalities

A continuing liaison was established with this key organization through J. Louis Theoret on special assignment to the F.C.M. from Correctional Services.

The most significant contact was when the Standing Committee on Urban Safety and Crime Prevention met in Windsor. A tour of St. Leonard's House and a dialogue with staff and residents was

provided. The tour and the information contributed significantly to the Committee's growing understanding of community based corrections.

This significant contact and channel of communication will be of increasing significance as the Life Line concept spreads out across the country. It is reassuring to note that it is based on a positive foundation.

Senator Hastings

Senator Hastings has long been a concerned and involved participant in Canada's Criminal Justice System. No stranger to Life Line, he has always been a stalwart supporter and we are greatly indebted to him for his continued faith in the organization. We are also greatly indebted to him for the extensive mailings he has carried out to assist Life Line and to bring information on Judicial Reviews to all interested parties.

Summary

These promising contacts and subsequent alliances with related organizations have resulted in a growing community of agencies that share common concerns with Life Line and support both the implementation of Life Line concepts by the Correctional Service of Canada and that organization's efforts to enhance community corrections.

This community offers encouragement in the pursuit of Life Line objectives today and will be called upon to demonstrate more tangible forms of support in the future.

In all of our presentations to organizations, it has been made very clear that this is a C.S.C. supported and funded endeavour. In this regard, Life Line has served to project an image of an innovative, progressive program. Acceptance of Life Line has also brought deserved credit to C.S.C.

Hopefully, by continuing to work together, we can move on to greater accomplishments.

Minor Footnote

The accomplishments and achievements related here may seem to be modest. However, when one considers that they were achieved by two or three individuals working part-time with a large client

organization with compelling distractions, experiencing budgetary revision, and major public inquiries into some aspects of its community programs, it is easier to assess the current value of these gains.

We humbly submit that the potential value of these new or strengthened relationships can only be truly assessed as the program is further implemented - especially in the community.

III. REVISION AND REQUEST

The vision on which we embarked on this quest was not fully realized.

This frank admission requires no accompanying apology because the goal was pursued in a strenuous and sincere fashion.

Perhaps the defined target was, in retrospect, unrealistic. The implementation of Life Line programs in four distant regions across this country over the short space of five months . . . ! Add to this the distractions of other pressing issues such as controversy over sensational incidents in the community and the seeming "paralysis" created by restraint measures and the progress that was made seems considerable and - in some instances - even remarkable.

A Viable Vision

In the contacts with community organizations directly involved in or concerned about corrections we found a surprising sharing of basic views and values.

Community groups, victims' groups, Aboriginal groups, civic leaders all seem to be seeking a reasonable degree of balance within the Criminal Justice System.

What seems to be sought is aptly described in the words of Chief Justice T. Alexander Hickman of Newfoundland: "The concept of justice is not easily definable but it is nonetheless distinguishable from the alternatives.

Justice in criminal law seeks to maintain a delicate balance among the legitimate interests involved; the interests of the accused, the victim, society and the state. Failure to maintain this balance benefits one at the expense of the other, and imbalance will not lead to just decision making. From the beginning of the investigative process to the end of the adjudicative function, and beyond, each facet of the Criminal Justice System must be, and be generally perceived to be, balanced. No system can be balanced if individuals in similar circumstances do not have equivalent access to the protections afforded by the system. Neither will balance be achieved if mistakes cannot be acknowledged and rectified on a timely basis.

The search for what is right and just is a journey into infinity, but not to make the journey would be unthinkable."

Life Line suggests that this is the vision we should pursue and present to the Canadian public. Life Line agrees the offender should be punished but at the same time sustained and encouraged to contribute to reintegrative efforts; to take responsibility for the development of better programs and, wherever possible, seek ways of making at least symbolic reparation. Reconciliation should be pursued if feasible and desired by the victim's survivors.

The majority of lifers share the predominant values of our society and are not career criminals. For many, this is their first and only offence. Society and Correctional Services should cease to view them as merely takers or charges and begin to consider tapping their potential to contribute to their own integration; to the assistance of their peers and ultimately contributing to the broader society.

Life Line further believes that ". . . it makes good sense to help them towards rehabilitation as soon as possible in their sentence and, for the good risk, to plan their release via supervised programs that will increase the likelihood of them becoming productive, law-abiding citizens.

Such a plan is not only practical, cost effective and humane - it is also - and from our point of view this is by far the most important consideration - the one that provides the best long-term security for the public."*

This, then, constitutes the Big Picture or total vision that should be pursued over the ensuing years.

However, it is a vision that goes beyond Life Line and it is one that Life Line, alone, can only contribute towards and will be created only by similar contributions from many other sectors of the Criminal Justice System.

However, Life Line can make a significant contribution.

In doing so it can gain the support of the general public for similar progressive programs for all categories of offenders. The lifer has a symbolic impact and to the majority of Canadians, success with a lifer translates into increased respect and acceptance of the correctional process.

Towards a Renewed Effort

If Life Line is to move towards a significant contribution to this vision of a balance Criminal Justice System, then we should carefully weigh the past experience and realize the ultimate benefit from it.

* National Resource Committee Report on Life Line Project, June 1990.

"There is a need for clearer direction. There is a need for additional resources. There is a need to tap the potential for program enhancement represented by increased opportunities for lifers to contribute . . ."* These words were written to summarize the perceived needs of staff and inmates following extensive consultations.

In retrospect, they would seem to have real application to the current effort to implement Life Line programs.

In terms of clear direction, the challenge to implement Life Line programs brought forth a complex concept of:

- . the In Reach Worker,
- . residential resources; and
- . efforts to increase public awareness and support.

This was an extensive assignment involving both the communications and operational programs.

It was made further complex by Life Line having an operational base in Ontario and having to relate to the unique characteristics of four regions across Canada.

The situation was made even more difficult by virtue of the fact that, at the Headquarters level, Communication and Corporate Development had the most consistent involvement but at the regional level, it was the program sector that needed to be addressed and activated. Add to this the involvement of outsiders and the relationships and lines of communications become further muddled.

Moreover, the question of resources seems to loom larger in some regions than others. Some seem to be able to assess the potential contribution of Life Line against existing programs and resources and feel there is some purpose to be served by careful consideration of the project. Other regions seem to feel that everything that is in place is good and worth preserving and that any additional program must come about only with an increase in total resources.

This is a dilemma that C.S.C. must grapple with and probably each region is doing just that. There are only two observations from a Life Line perspective:

1. Both the In Reach Worker concept and the Residential Facility concept could be grafted onto existing

* More Than A Matter of Time, p. 29

contractual relationships with aftercare agencies. Thus, it becomes a refinement or development of a program rather than the introduction of a totally new program.

2. Efforts to achieve greater public awareness and, ultimately, participation in program are not unique to Life Line and undoubtedly C.S.C. is taking advantage of every opportunity to pursue these worthwhile objectives.

Life Line provides the opportunity, the manifestation of effective programming, around which community support can be mustered. Indeed, it would be our submission that if efforts were devoted to realizing the full potential of many lifers then there would be an overall benefit and contribution to programs and programming.

In addition to problems related to clearer understanding of the concept and efforts to realize it and the need for additional resources, further work needs to be done to increase the awareness of the contribution made by an In Reach Worker.

Indeed, the In Reach Worker can give purpose and meaning to lifers and their positive initiatives within the institution. He can be a focal point for the development of community resources. He can serve as a tireless supporter of initiatives and programs that will give hope and meaning to lifers as they strive to make the most of their shrunken world and meagre horizons.

In all of our travels, in all of our contacts we encountered nothing but support for the concept. Realization would seem so close at hand.

And so, our request is - let us try - ONE MORE TIME!

Future Considerations

In seeking a continuation of the working partnership with C.S.C. to establish Life Line, we would hope to set in motion a process in which the C.S.C. would enable and empower Life Line and lifers both within institutions and in the community to become involved and initiate program development. This process would provide Voluntary Agencies with the opportunity to implement, support and sponsor aspects of the Life Line program resulting in communities gaining greater understanding of the reintegration efforts and, hopefully, a willingness to facilitate these efforts.

In considering the next phase of a combined operation, we should strive to ensure that our endeavours benefit from our previous experience. There are several significant considerations that must be addressed:

1. Clarity of Purpose

As has been indicated earlier, we set out to implement the Life Line program in its full presentation. Life Line is an extensive and sophisticated endeavour. During the course of this consultation, it has become even further sophisticated by the development of a community based initiative composed of a support group of lifers and a proposed "out reach" worker.

Nevertheless, it should be clearly understood that the fundamental initial step towards the implementation and development of the Life Line program is the activation of an In Reach Worker to work with the growing number of lifers inside.

This is not to detract from the importance of other aspects of the program but rather to identify the key, initial, strategic ingredient - the In Reach Worker.

With the establishment of the In Reach Worker, communications efforts have a focus; programs can be developed; and a focal point is established.

Future efforts should give priority consideration to the establishment of In Reach Workers.

2. Commitment

The reference to commitment relates to commitment in terms of policy; in terms of priorities and, if possible, in terms of resources. In the initial consultations with staff leading up to the agreement to promote the Life Line program, an Assistant Warden suggested that, "Lifers don't have a priority - they're not even on the agenda!"

Unfortunately, there is not too much evidence that this has changed.

The achievement of Corporate Objective One and the priorities assigned to women and Aboriginals plus

the shrinking availability of resources have all conspired to keep lifers off any priority list.

As a senior headquarters administrator commented, "Unfortunately, it's the squeaky wheel that gets the grease and lifers are always pretty cooperative."

At the same time, the Service has for years used lifers to help maintain peace and security within the institutions.

As their numbers increase, surely the time has come when C.S.C. should specifically address this group; develop a policy or incorporate them into one of the existing policies; assign some priority and provide some minimal resources to ensure the provision of Life Line In Reach Workers within the regions. (In this regard, it is interesting to note, that liaison workers services are available to the approximately 1,700 Aboriginal offenders. It would not seem a disproportionate allocation of resources to provide In Reach Workers to the over 2,200 offenders serving life or indeterminate sentences.)

3. Champions

Recently the Chairman of Automatic Data Processing Incorporated advocated the use of full time champions to lead innovative projects. He went on to emphasize that "biggest" is not necessarily "best" in this regard. In his view, the best people should be working on the toughest projects and one of the toughest projects is starting something new that is relatively small. "Frequently a company will tuck a new project under a capable manager who aspires to an ever bigger project. But then the tough new project has but a part-time manager.

. . . full-time champions are absolutely necessary for your most difficult jobs; these jobs usually aren't the one with the most employees or the biggest level of revenue."*

* Inside Guide, February/March 1993, Volume 7 No. 1, p.24

But they are full of challenge. Interestingly enough, recently, John May, an Area Manager in Her Majesty's Prison Service responsible for eight prisons had the opportunity to visit American Correctional programs including the Federal Bureau of Prisons. He commented that, "The outstanding feature of all the successful programs I saw was the existence of what I call a 'champion'. It may be true for the introduction of any change in an organization.

It certainly seems to be true for the introduction of a program . . . There needs to be one person or a small group that is committed to it and will drive it through or around the manifold obstacles that beset it."

These observations are true for any future endeavour in relation to the implementation of Life Line. While Life Line has a good relationship with the Correctional Service of Canada and has enjoyed a partnership relationship from the beginning, there is a need for a clear designation of an in-house 'champion' for Life Line who is prepared to provide the direction, support and represent C.S.C. in a clear, consistent manner.

4. Continuity

The original proposal called for the establishment of a team at the national level that would represent communications, programs and the National Parole Board as well as Life Line. Team players were identified but competing priorities reduced the team to but two members. All too often, these members represented only communications and Life Line. What they were trying to initiate required the involvement of program personnel in the regions and the understanding and support of regional parole boards. A future endeavour requires not only the development of a team at the national level but similar teams within the regions. Here again, there is a need for commitment to continuity of participation and a consistent course of action.

5. Communication

Many administrators now say, "If you don't think you're 'overkilling' communications, you're probably not communicating enough!"

Closer to home, Fred Luciani, A.R.A., Community Corrections Ontario stated, "In developing Life Line, we must not let the communication side slip . . . this has occurred and it has caused us problems."

A Communications Plan has been developed. It has been developed exclusively from the perspective of Life Line. It could benefit greatly from being shared, revised and refined through the deliberations of both national and regional communications staff.

Hopefully, it would result in the development of national and regional Communications Plans which would precede and support initiatives related to lifers' programs.

6. Cooperative Endeavours

The development of the Life Line program, even the initial provision of an In Reach Worker should proceed within the concept of a cooperative partnership. While the Correctional Service of Canada is responsible for effective programs, Life Line has a significant contribution to make to the partnership. It represents, through Board and volunteers, a dedicated commitment and involvement of the community. As a manifestation of community interest, it has ready access to other community based organizations such as community residential facilities and aftercare agencies. It can and has effectively promoted the development of a supportive network. While working with the Service it retains a capacity for advocacy and promotion of other necessary initiatives.

Above all, it represents to the lifer an expression of continued community interest.

In addition, as a sponsor the Voluntary Agency can provide moral support and supervision to the In Reach Worker who has to . . . "walk the line" within the institution and needs an accepted outlet to share difficulties and to help overcome obstacles.

It is for all these reasons that we would urge that all contracts for In Reach Workers be entered into with a sponsoring agency - rather than directly with the individual offender.

7. Community of Support

Much effort has been expended by both Life Line and C.S.C., especially the communications unit, to develop the support of community organizations. These relationships have been carefully sought out and they should, with the same care and concern, be nurtured to enhance the promise of future developments.

8. Consultation

The exercise of the past several months has in effect been a form of consultation . . . "an interactive process . . . which permits and promotes the exchange of ideas and information . . ." We welcome both the spirit of consultation and the opportunity to have participated in it.

This report relates to two of eight recommendations presented earlier in More Than a Matter of Time. This report focuses on two of these recommendations; bringing the Life Line concept to the regions and the development of a Communication Plan.

Hopefully, the deliberation of these future considerations might also include a review and response to the remaining earlier recommendations.

In addition, we are particularly impressed by the statement that, "Whenever possible, when consultation does lead to agreement, participants should hold themselves accountable for implementing/supporting the resulting recommendations."

Life Line certainly feels that this has been amply demonstrated by the Communications and Corporate Development sector and we sincerely hope that this example will be reflected throughout the Service.

Closing Thoughts

It would seem surprising that such a modest list of requirements - a designation of a clearer, simplified objectives; commitment; a champion; continuity; consistency; communication and consultation could result in the realization of a dream that has been pursued by proponents of Life Line for over a decade.

Much has been done. Some more must be done. But surely the challenge is not insurmountable and just as surely the rewards are abundantly worth the efforts - ranging from renewed hope for a single lifer that prevents a suicide to the enhanced acceptance of the public of reintegrative programs.

Alliances have been forged; consultations have occurred; much consensus has been reached - all that is required is a little extra effort and further commitment.

We are asking that additional support be provided, ONE MORE TIME, in the hopes that the last report in this emerging trilogy of reports starting with "More Than a Matter of Time", might aptly be entitled - "For the Good Times".

COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

Communication includes consultation, "an interactive process which . . . promotes the exchange of ideas and information by identifying relevant issues and options, with the objective of enhancing the decision-making process." Public education, or the provision of actual information that helps shape public opinion, is essential and even prerequisite to both processes.

The ensuing Communications Strategy or Plan attempts

- . . . to identify issues related to long-term offenders in general and lifers in particular
- . . . to anticipate the impact of program development; and,
- . . . to inform and enhance the implementation of these programs.

Basically, the Strategy, if implemented, would constitute a campaign to change public attitudes; improving the acceptance of progressive programs for lifers and raising public awareness and appreciation of these programs.

CURRENT PUBLIC ENVIRONMENT AND ATTITUDES

To the general public, lifers are not a preoccupation nor a spontaneous topic. However, once attention is drawn to them, everyone has an opinion. Within the C.S.C., lifers do not seem to be a priority consideration except where unusual and uncharacteristic behaviour may draw some special attention. In short, lifers are neither a priority nor a preoccupation by either the public or the Correctional Service of Canada.

When the public does consider lifers, FEAR permeates most of their thinking about those serving life and any thought of their possible reintegration into the community.

Most citizens believe that offenders should be punished but they also feel there is a responsibility to help the offender return to society. They are prepared to see their tax dollars used in this way, providing that they, the citizens, are protected. They are most likely to support these types of programs for property and what they construe as lesser offenders and have growing reservations about the more dangerous and/or sexual offenders. Lifers, or murderers, are seen as being extremely dangerous. This despite overwhelming evidence that most homicides represent a first and only offence involving close family members or friends.

Victims' groups express the strongest support for severe sanctions. These expressions seem to have the most impact during the trial and at the time of sentence. It would appear that the same views have significantly less impact at the time of Judicial Review.

Partly because the Judicial Review is focused on the program activities and efforts the offender has made to change, most Judicial Reviews have resulted in decisions favouring an earlier Parole Eligibility Date.

JUDICIAL REVIEW DECISIONS
(13 April 1993)

Eligibility Reduced to 21 years	1	
" " to 20 years	2	
" " to 19 years	1	
" " to 18 years	1	
" " to 17 years	4	
" " to 15 years	12	21 (73%)
	--	
Reapply in three years		2 (7%)
Rejected		6 (20%)
		--
	TOTAL	29 (100%)
		==

* average reduction 8.5 years

But even within these total numbers there would seem to be some regional variations. So far, Quebec has had the most Judicial Reviews and has been fairly consistent in reducing the Parole Eligibility. The other regions of Canada have had very little activity in terms of Judicial Reviews so regional trends have not yet been established.

Much of the public's fear about lifers and their involvement in community programs is based on the unknown. Much of it is also fashioned by the more violent crimes depicted on American television in both fact and fiction.

In response to this expressed fear and concern, the government has placed greater emphasis on community protection. The Corrections and Conditional Release Act refocused the Criminal Justice System on public protection as a priority.

Bill C-90 proposes changes to the entire sentencing scheme to reinforce societal protection.

A great deal of thought has been given to considerations of how to provide long-term protection against repeat offenders.

Much has been written about the growing problem of dangerous, violent and sexual offenders, particularly those who attack child victims. Sensational tragedies have led to a consideration of steps that might involve both correctional and mental health systems leading to a consideration of sexual predator laws.

At the same time, the public's faith in trusted institutions has been seriously threatened. The list of institutions that have fallen in repute includes the church, the school system, the police and parents themselves.

At the same time, given appropriate safeguards, Bill C-90 calls for intermediate sanctions enabling more offenders to be dealt with in the community.

In addition, some parliamentarians, like Derek Blackburn, M.P. are quietly beginning to question mandatory sentences of fifteen years for those convicted of second degree homicides.

Traditionally, Canadians believe that helping the offender return successfully to society is good - provided public safety is not threatened and offenders have . . . "paid for their crimes".

While most Canadians support community based programs for non-violent offenders, they suffer from the Not In My Backyard Syndrome.

Regional variances to these generalizations are frequently related to the recency and incidence of sensational tragedies. As a result, resistance to community programs is extremely high, at least at present, in certain locations in the Prairies and Atlantic regions.

However, across the country we sense that Canadians have grown less accepting of assurances and reassurances from the system and are now more interested in ACTION and RESULTS.

TARGET AUDIENCES

There are basically four target audiences:

1. The Correctional Service of Canada

Since internal support and commitment are not yet fully manifest for significant programs for lifers or for Life Line, C.S.C. Senior Management and Line Staff must be included in any effective communication plan.

The potential contribution of C.S.C. is to enable and/or empower program developments.

2. Lifers

The program will ultimately be evaluated on the performance of lifers themselves. They must respond to opportunities provided with enthusiasm and exercise responsibility throughout their sentence. Their primary contribution is to take responsibility and initiate new endeavours.

3. Voluntary Agencies

Voluntary Agencies will be called upon to sponsor and/or support initiatives such as In Reach Worker Programs, Community Residential Facilities and Community Support Groups.

4. The General Public

The role of the general public is, hopefully to better understand, increasingly accept and ultimately participate in programs reflecting the Life Line concept.

OBJECTIVES

Objectives relative to the above target audiences are:

1. Correctional Service of Canada - gain full support of C.S.C. program staff for the basic Life Line concept involving:
 - . In-Reach Programs
 - . Community Residential Services
 - . Community Support Net
 - . Continuing Public Education and Involvement
2. Lifers - enhance programs of lifers' groups and increase their involvement in developing effective programming for lifers - both in institutions and in the community.
3. Voluntary Agencies - ensure support from voluntary aftercare agencies for Life Line activities and gain specific commitments, where appropriate, to serve as sponsors.

Reach strategic related groups and gain their acceptance and support.

This would include the Federation of Canadian Municipalities - Victims' Organizations, Aboriginal Communities and Organizations as well as other Non-governmental Organizations in related fields.

4. The General Public - achieve greater understanding and, hopefully, support of the media and, subsequently, the public for community based reintegrative programs in general and Life Line in particular.

STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS

The greatest obstacle to gaining public acceptance is FEAR of the unknown.

The greatest attribute is FASCINATION.

We must use the latter to provide the opportunity to overcome the former.

All efforts should emphasize that the majority of lifers - certainly those on parole - have the same values as most citizens.

The critical public - especially victims or those sympathetic to victims groups - want to see success - not hear promises. The two most graphic images of Life Line are - a visible victim - Sandy Atkins (attractive, intelligent, victimized woman) and Tom French - big, rugged, ex-biker, one-legged. Together the visual impact is impressive and immediate.

Every effort should be made to bring "successful" lifers into clearer focus - even into mutual relationships with community groups.

Majority of media is encouraging - wants program to work - finds subject intriguing and will give positive coverage and follow up to new developments and human relations stories.

Regional Communications Plans should be sequential and coincide with the implementation of Life Line program within the region. Prepared in advance, they should probably best flow from the introduction of an In Reach Worker into the institution. This is a safe and positive step in program development.

As the media focuses on the contribution of the In Reach Worker and the successful interaction between the Worker, lifers and C.S.C. staff, credibility and acceptance is gained. This growing acceptance and credibility can be invaluable as the program moves into its implementation in the community.

The normal sequential development of the Life Line concept would be the introduction of the In Reach Worker; followed by the identification of a sponsoring agency or agencies to provide residential services and the possible appointment of a coordinator working with a community based support group of lifers.

Based on our experience in Windsor, early efforts should be made to reach out to the community in a quiet but planned approach sharing information designed to make them more knowledgeable and then seek their involvement. As Life Line stated in a letter to the citizens of Windsor, "We want your support - but first - we need your understanding."

The public's concern with protection is not unrealistic. It could however be exacerbated if G.T.O.s (Get Them Outs) take precedence over sound planning and end in tragic results. All of the Coroners' Inquests related to Fredericks in Ontario, Lebouthillier in Atlantic and Leach in Regina came out, not opposed to community corrections, but, insisting on developed plans implemented with adequate resources.

Communication activities must accompany, if not precede, implementation of the program. It must be a considered and consistent reaching out to make informed and influential contact with community groups to develop a growing alliance. As this alliance develops, it is helpful to consider and define roles in the event of controversy or crisis. These endeavours go a long way towards reducing the likelihood of unwelcome surprises. Most important of all, everyone knows what is expected of them should a crisis arise. A far superior situation to having to frantically search for friends in the midst of flak!

THEMES

Virtually all lifers will return to society some day - Life Line strives to encourage them to be involved in, and help develop, institutional programs and subsequently lead a productive, responsible life on parole.

This is done by the provision of In-Reach workers, community support groups and Community Residential Resources.

This type of program is less costly, demands much more than does mere incarceration and, yet, provides the best long-term protection for the public.

The majority of lifers share the prevailing values of our society and have a strong commitment to community service.

Most are full of remorse and seek ways of approaching some form of reconciliation, real or symbolic.

All are destined to be under sentence in institutions or on parole until death.

THE BROADER OBJECTIVE

To the extent that effective programs can be developed to successfully and responsibly reintegrate murderers into society, a significant step will be taken towards restoring public confidence in the correctional process.

This may well enable us to encourage a more responsible and responsive attitude on the part of communities and citizenry towards corrections.

In all communication activities, continuous stress must be placed on informing the public that:

- . we all have a responsibility for corrections and criminal justice
- . each community has a role to play and a share in assuming that responsibility
- . the ultimate success depends on effective working relationships between citizens, Correctional Service of Canada staff and offenders
- . complete delegation from society to the Correctional Service of Canada for the offender is unproductive and deluding.

Growing numbers of lifers are accumulating in institutions. Incarceration is the most costly correctional program available but not the most productive nor promising. It currently costs almost \$70,000 a year to keep an inmate in maximum security. (1991 - 1992 figures) Punishment, per se, is necessary to a degree but it is also a very expensive indulgence.

Gradual supervised release with adequate controls and support is a more promising and effective means of reducing the public cost of maintaining the offender and protecting society.

Life Line's primary objective is protection of the public - but in a way that the offender takes a greater responsibility for his past actions, current situation, and future success.

In several significant ways, life on parole in the community is more demanding, difficult and disciplined than living as an inmate in an institution.

Each community has its share of murders and murderers. Each community should face its responsibilities in relation to them. This means the provision of adequate programs to help in re-establishing the offender, enhancing protection of the community and the likelihood that the lifer will "make it".

While the original crime cannot be undone, efforts towards general and symbolic reparation should be promoted.

PLANS FOR ANNOUNCEMENT

While this is an attitudinal campaign, it is not necessary to promote and pursue national attention and create possible polarization on the issue. However, it is also highly desirable to give status to the endeavour by the demonstrated leadership of the Minister and the Commissioner of Correctional Service of Canada and Chairman of the National Parole Board.

This could be achieved by orchestrating an announcement or commentary on developments by the Standing Committee on Justice and/or S.G. commending C.S.C. and Life Line on initiatives undertaken.

This could then be responded to and elaborated on by the Minister, Commissioner, Chairman, and R.D.C.s across country. The R.D.C.s could give the necessary regional "flavour" or - "perspective" to the disclosure.

In lieu of a national announcement - we could focus on a prominent pioneer in the organization and, through media coverage, obtain national attention.

Indeed, public interest and fascination is such that Life Line guarantees access to a major national media outlet within a week after receiving the request of the Service.

The best single person for this role is Tom French - ex biker, convicted killer and now successful parolee and Life Line worker - Skip Graham, Ex Director Life Line, would be next best focal person and the best tableau would be Tom, Skip and Sandy Atkin - a recognized and highly recognizable victim.

The initial national focus should quickly be moved to the specific activities in the regions and a pre-determined Regional Communication Strategy; co-authored by C.S.C., National Parole Board and Life Line, should quickly come into play.

The initial launch and follow-up activities should be carefully planned on a team basis by C.S.C., N.P.B. and Life Line sponsors - at a minimum.

News releases, background documents, brochures and all print and audio-visual material should be prepared in advance; distributed to key groups and supported by well prepared spokespersons.

Other supporters - knowledgeable leaders or opinion setters - should be identified, briefed and alerted to play significant roles as required and requested. The roster for the Speaker's Bureau can serve as a reference resource for this group.

Other Developments

- Regional Initiatives - e.g. commencement of In Reach worker in Edmonton institution
- beginning of Out Reach Program in Halifax
- opening of residence in Montreal as part of Le Nouvel Elan

warrant announcements prepared primarily by Region. These can be reported as significant events in the evolution of a National Program.

Special Media Briefings should precede all such initiatives.

In all of these it is of singular importance to identify supportive spokespersons from ranks of Police, Victims, Parents Organizations, Women's Groups and the Aged.

Strong support should be expected from voluntary correctional organizations - and in some instances, possibly the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. However, this should be determined in advance as should consultation and coordination with National Headquarters, C.S.C. and Life Line.

There should be "NO SURPRISES" - All activities and endeavours should reflect consistency in concern for and commitment to the community; reconciliation and protection of victims; and successful reintegration of the offender as a law abiding citizen.

FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

Follow-up activities normally relate to in-depth expositions of original announcements or initiatives.

In relation to Life Line, they will probably follow the developmental trail - that is - visits to and, accounts of programs covered in original announcement and - opportunities to visit or become acquainted with new initiatives as they arise.

The follow-up should also involve reaching out to key groups e.g. victims, parents, women and seniors to raise understanding and gain support.

A modest array of resources needs to be developed and/or duplicated to assist this endeavour.

This should include at least:

- Slide presentation on Life Line
- V.C.R. presentation - especially on role of Life Line In Reach Worker
- National Brochure on Life Line
- Resource List/Speakers Bureau Roster

Each local or regional manifestation of the Life Line concept will require a careful and unique communication package taking into account special characteristics of the community and its concerns.

Efforts devoted to these special plans will pay dividends and while centrally developed resources may be employed, it must be stated, in strongest possible terms, that the initiative in this specific community is unique and is locally inspired and initiated.

Sponsorship by recognized reputable agencies, with Board members permanently active in the community, goes a long way towards developing trust and helping citizens identify with the initiative.

ADDRESSING THE PUBLICS

It is essential to the expansion of Life Line concept and the development of more effective programming for C.S.C. to recognize lifers as a growing challenge and major priority.

It can be argued that lifers are included in Corporate Objective One but this is not how line staff see it - It is just a little too subtle. A bolder, clearer message is required. The Perron Report didn't quite capture deserved widespread support and implementation - due in great part to the number of recommendations involved - originally almost fifty and subsequently reduced to thirty-seven.

A major effort needs to be focused on a presentation to the Executive Committee that will result in acceptance of a commitment to the Life Line concept and support for its manifestation, initially, with implementation of In Reach worker to serve all inmate lifers.

This would transmit a strong message to staff, endorsing the current efforts of many and encouraging others to pick up the slack.

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Non-governmental organizations are key to the implementation of the Life Line concept at its most basic minimal level, i.e. the introduction of the In Reach Worker within the institutional community.

We strongly believe that the role of the In Reach Worker is sufficiently sensitive and demanding that a source of support, supervision and guidance is necessary for the worker in the form of a sponsoring, voluntary organization. Such an agency, with its community based board, can provide the local identification that enhances acceptance. Most importantly, in times of difficulty or criticism, it is not just C.S.C. alone against a storm of criticism or protest - it is the C.S.C. and a local community based voluntary agency.

Finally, in relation to furthering the program, the involvement of the voluntary agency ensures a continuity of concern and even advocacy.

A determined reaching out to the voluntary sector in each of the regions should be carefully orchestrated to ensure that all involved voluntary agencies have an understanding and awareness of the Life Line program and that specific, specially suited voluntary agencies are encouraged and enabled to serve as sponsors.

It is absolutely essential to the provision of services that specific agencies become involved and yet maintain their separate identity. A clear and obvious example are organizations such as The Native Counselling Services of Alberta and The Native Clan of Manitoba.

A commitment by the Correctional Service of Canada to implementing the Life Line program, at least to the extent of supporting Life Line workers within the institutions, would have a marked effect on voluntary agencies in offering their services as sponsors of In Reach Workers.

Efforts should be made by proponents of Life Line and C.S.C. to reach out to voluntary agencies in all of the regions and at the national level to build on the existing support base. An initial

endeavour would be to revisit the National Liaison Committee and through C.C.J.A. and its publications, The Justice Report and On The Line, make specific appeals for potential sponsors to come forward.

A joint statement from C.S.C. and Life Line regarding the opportunity for sponsorships would receive much consideration and an "encouraging" response.

LIFERS' GROUPS

Lifers' groups would be greatly heartened by a commitment from C.S.C. to the implementation of the Life Line program.

Lifers' groups have a much more pragmatic evaluation of the process of program development than almost any other definable group. It was best expressed in the form of a question during a consultation at Millhaven Institution. A lifer asked, "This is an interesting idea but a year from now, what difference will it make in my situation?"

Life Line has been over a decade in its conceptualization, refinement, tentative acceptance and trial application. It is still seen as a pilot project. The only way to speed the process is to endorse the concept, place the In Reach Worker, with the support of a voluntary agency, in touch with the lifers - help support and promote the process and - ultimately - benefit from the results that will flow out of the endeavour.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the introduction of the In Reach Worker is like the introduction of a catalyst into a relatively dormant mixture. Developments will occur. Benefits will accrue. Staff will find work more rewarding and long-term offenders will experience new hope.

The Canadian public is pragmatic. Canadians want wrong doers punished but they also wish to be fair. They believe in giving offenders "a second chance".

But they do expect results. Their faith has been shaken by many cherished institutions in the recent past. Now, more than ever, results count.

The convicted murderer is viewed as having committed the most heinous crime of all. If C.S.C. and voluntary agencies, employing the Life Line concept can demonstrate success in working with convicted murderers, then the public's faith in corrections, would improve considerably.

Each lifers' group is encouraged by the In Reach Worker and by Life Line to have a community service component to provide at least a form of symbolic restitution to the community. This facet of the program should be sustained as an essential element.

A careful but continued effort should be made to identify those lifers who have been "successful" and who are willing to share their experiences with the public. Corrections is one of those relatively few human endeavours where success, in the form of those who have "made it", is not demonstrated. This must change if we are to maintain public trust and the opportunity to develop community programs. (Otherwise we will be drowned in the ink used to cover scarce but sensational accounts of "screw-ups".)

EVALUATION

The usual monitoring of articles and newsletters, journals and newspapers and the electronic media will, of course, be employed. However, in addition, as the program develops and as manifestations of the Life Line concept are introduced it should also be possible to monitor the reactions of the key publics especially staff and inmates. This of course will be enhanced by contacts with lifers' groups. One of the most significant criteria will be the hoped for presence of In Reach Workers in major institutions.

The ultimate criterion will be the public reaction: initially, hopefully one of acceptance and willingness to see the program attempted, and, subsequently, encouragement and participation to sustain and develop the program.

APPENDIX I

LIFE LINE IN REACH PROGRESS REPORT

APRIL 1, 1992 - MARCH 31, 1993

A. One on one, interviews, between inmate and In Reach Workers. Conducted in the institution interview rooms, Monday to Friday.....	1294
B. Telephone calls placed from pay phones within maximum and medium institutions to an In Reach Worker, by inmates requiring immediate assistance, during evenings and on weekends.....	954
C. total case load served in fiscal year.....	458
MEETINGS.....	100
GROUPS ATTENDED.....	25
PAROLE HEARINGS ATTENDED.....	23
JUDICIAL REVIEWS.....	3
SPEAKING ENGAGEMENT AND PUBLIC RELATIONS.....	19
CASE CONFERENCES.....	22
MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITY.....	23

NOTE: It is impossible to gauge the following:

- telephone contact, correspondence regarding inmates, incoming-outgoing. 3926
- paperwork

(i.e. letters of support to penitentiary staff, National parole Board. Letters of introduction, or recommendation, or intervention to Halfway Houses on behalf of inmate.)

Answering general correspondence from inmates. The approximate, but fairly accurate number of letters sent out in the '92 - '93 fiscal year.

APPENDIX II

SPEAKER'S BUREAU ROSTER

A list of significant, informed supporters capable of presenting and promoting Life Line to select publics.

NATIONAL

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Spokesperson</u>
. Correctional Service of Canada	Brendan Reynolds Andrew Graham Frank Porporino Thomas Townsend Drury Allen Christina Power\$ Jim Siberry Noel Knockwood
. National Parole Board	Roy Evans
. Federal Court	Fred Gibson
. Canadian Criminal Justice Association	Paul Williams Gaston St. Jean
. Citizen Advisory Committees	Rene Peletier
. Life Line	Edward Graham Lou Drouillard John Braithwaite Tom French Sandy Atkin
. Senate	Senator Earl Hastings

REGIONAL

<u>Region</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Spokesperson</u>
Atlantic	Correctional Service of Canada	Rev. Alfred Bell Claudine Daigle Terry Hatcher Don LeBlanc Vince MacDonald Lori McGinn Art Robson Gerry Smith
	Citizen Advisory Committee	Rene Peletier Joanne Goodrich
	National Parole Board	Helene Charboneau Gerry Greene
	John Howard Society of New Brunswick	Wendy Amos
	St. Leonard's Society of Nova Scotia	Janet Everest
Quebec	Correctional Service of Canada	Luc Garrigey Jean Paul Lupien
	Association of Social Rehabilitation Agencies of Quebec	Johanne Vallee
	Church Council on Justice and Corrections	Marie Beamon
	John Howard Society	Paul Williams
	St. Leonard's House, Montreal	Michel Gagnon
	St. Leonard's House, Windsor	Lou Drouillard
Ontario	Correctional Service of Canada	Jim Blackler Sharon Hogan Fred Luciani Mike Provan Bruno Schincariol

Citizen Advisory Council

Jessie V. DesLauriers

REGIONAL

<u>Region</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Spokesperson</u>
Ontario	Life Line	Tom French Russ Elliot
	Solicitor	Josh Zambrowsky
	University of Windsor	Dr. Janice Dra ^o loich Dr. Mary-Lou Dietz
Prairies	Correctional Service of Canada	Gerry Cowie Jan Fox Jim O'Sullivan Fred Peyton Bill Rooksby Keith Sampson
	National Parole Board	Sue Schigol Norm Fagnore ^u John D. Bissett
	Native Clan - Manitoba	Curtis Fontaine
	Native Counselling Services of Alberta	Chester Cunningham
	Seventh Step Foundation	Pat Graham
	Victim	Sandy Atkin
Pacific	Correctional Service of Canada	Dennis Finlay Harold Golden
	Legal Service Society	Paulah Dauns
	Neil Libby House	Wilma Dungey
	Seventh Step Foundation	Tommy Gordon

