

1926.

NEW ZEALAND.

# OFFENDERS PROBATION ACT, 1920

(REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF), FOR THE YEAR 1925-26.

*Presented to both Houses of the General Assembly by Command of His Excellency.*

The Hon. the MINISTER OF JUSTICE to His Excellency the GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

SIR,—

Wellington, 2nd August, 1926.

I have the honour to submit to Your Excellency the report of the Chief Probation Officer on the operations of the Offenders Probation Act for the year 1925-26.

I have, &amp;c.,

F. J. ROLLESTON,

Minister of Justice.

The CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER to the Hon. the MINISTER OF JUSTICE.

SIR,—

Office of the Chief Probation Officer, Wellington, 3rd August, 1926.

I have the honour to present the sixth separate annual report on the working of the probation system under the Offenders Probation Act, 1920, and the Crimes Amendment Act, together with the reports of the principal district Probation Officers for the year ended 31st March, 1926.

This report covers the fortieth year that the system of probation has been in operation in New Zealand. The original Act of 1886 restricted the application of probation to first offenders, and it was not until the passing of the Act of 1920 that the Courts were given powers of general application to all classes of offenders considered likely to benefit thereby. Despite this widened scope, owing to certain scepticism as to its efficacy, this system of treatment of offenders has not been availed of to the extent that the yearly increase in crime would appear to warrant. In this respect it is to be noted that the statistics for the four years ending 31st March, 1924, show that the number of persons admitted annually to probation increased by only 14 per cent., while the average prison population in the same period increased by 27 per cent. However, last year witnessed a considerable increase in the probation figures, and the ratio of increase is now approximately identical with that of the prison population.

In England—according to the latest official reports—since the passing of the Criminal Justice Administration Act, 1925, the system of probation has been widely extended, and has resulted in a considerable decrease in the prison population.

A review of the cases admitted to probation during the year discloses that of the total of 760 offenders granted conditional liberty in this manner, 84 per cent. represented offences against property, and only 8 per cent. offences against the person; 658 offenders were admitted to probation by the Courts, and 102 came under the provisions of the Act on account of having sentence deferred.

It is interesting to note that 33 per cent. of the offenders admitted to probation during the year were under the age of twenty years, and 39 per cent. were between the ages of twenty and thirty years. These figures go to show that the Courts in New Zealand largely follow the principle recognized in Britain and America, that the cases considered most suitable for probation are those of young offenders against property.

In determining the class of persons for release on probation two purposes should be kept in view—viz., the protection of the community, and the reclamation of the offender. Probation is not a panacea for all crime, and it should not be used indiscriminately even for all first offenders. It should be used only where an individual study of the delinquent shows that under proper supervision and guidance, through a definite period, he is likely to become law-abiding. It has been laid down by an authority that probation should not be used for “confirmed habitual offenders, drug addicts, dipsomaniacs, the feeble-minded, the psychopaths, the mentally unstable, and sex perverts.” It is also stated that “premeditated assaults for revenge or gain, criminal assaults on females, and crimes resulting in the corruption of children, are altogether outside the scope of the probation system. Probation is also discountenanced in the case of habitual drunkenness and professional prostitution long continued. The crimes for which probation is most extensively used are for offences against property, such as theft and embezzlement.”

Probation has been found in other countries to be a most effective means for dealing with defaulting or deserting husbands. In these cases imprisonment of the husband usually leaves the family in dire poverty and at the mercy of charity, whereas if the husband were placed under the firm but friendly direction of a Probation Officer, who would see that he works regularly and contributes towards his family's support, the cost of his maintenance in prison and the expense to the Charitable Aid Boards would be obviated.

There is a widespread impression that the granting of probation by the Court is tantamount to letting the offender off; but this is obviously not so, for the granting of liberty subject to the strict observance of certain conditions imposed to meet the particular requirements of the case has a valuable disciplining effect. A further common objection is that the granting of probation exercises very little, if any, deterrent effect upon others. This criticism is natural, but it assumes that there can be no deterrence unless there is some direct penalty imposed. The conviction alone, particularly in the case of first offenders, is a severe blow to prestige, while the imposition of conditions requiring payment of restitution and costs of prosecution, coupled with conditional liberty, impart a definite deterrent influence. On the other hand, many subscribe to the view that publicity in regard to first offenders should be prohibited. To do this would be to emasculate the system, for the fear of publicity is one of the main deterrents, and the present practice of leaving the suppression of offenders' names to the discretion of the Court is the preferable course.

The obligation on the offender to make reparation has a distinctly beneficial and educative effect. During the year under review, £3,479 19s. 11d. restitution-moneys, and £671 19s. 1d. Court costs, were collected from offenders; and it is interesting to note that since the inception of the scheme, up to the 31st March, £29,955 has been collected under the above heads. It will thus be seen that, quite apart from the social aspect, the economic advantages are undeniable, for in addition to this large amount collected the State has been saved the cost of institutional maintenance for the 6,890 offenders who have been placed on probation.

During the year 132 persons on probation committed what were regarded as more serious breaches of the conditions of their release: 33 of these were charged for failure to report, 72 committed further offences while serving probation, and 27 absconded and have not been traced. Owing to the absence of permanent case records, it is impossible to accurately state the percentage of successful cases, but it is certain that a high percentage of offenders do not appear before the Courts again. More statistics have been kept concerning cases of prisoners released on probation under the Crimes Act, and it is possible to quote the percentage. It is reasonable to assume that the results under the Offenders Probation Act would be slightly better. The Department has no record of subsequent convictions of less than one month, but, apart from this, the average number recommitted for breach of the conditions of release was 12 per cent., and the average number of failures—*i.e.*, those who have been either recommitted during probation or reconvicted for a fresh offence after discharge—was 28 per cent.

Despite the apparent success of the foregoing figures—and in considering this it must not be overlooked that the discriminating care exercised by the Courts in according probation contributes largely to the percentage of successes—there is still room for improvement in the organization of the system in New Zealand.

At present there are 181 probation districts and 187 district Probation Officers. Of these, 171 are members of the Police Force, 6 are permanent officers of the Prisons Department, 4 are part-time officers who receive an annual honorarium, and 6 are voluntary officers of the Salvation Army, 4 being women who do duty in each of the four main centres. The Probation Officer at Auckland is also Bailiff and Maintenance Officer, while in Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin the work is done by gentlemen who are linked up with other social-service organizations.

The view is widely held in Britain and America that police and prison officers are not the most suited by training and outlook for probation work; but, quite apart from this, it will be noticed that the whole of the probation staffs may be said to be part-time officers—not one gives his undivided attention to the organization of the work—and these officers are too overburdened to devote the requisite individual personal attention to probationers that is an essential feature of the system, with the result that the work is less effective. Home visitation is rarely practised, and in many instances the probationers report by letter. Perfunctory probation has as baneful an influence as the condonation of wrongdoing. It brings the system into disrepute with the Courts, it negatives the deterrent effect on others, and it has a bad moral influence on the offender. It is thus imperative that an effort be made to place the system on a more constructive basis, as there is no doubt that an effectively administered system offers great possibilities for the treatment of delinquency. A merely negative attitude, such as requiring the probationer to report at specified times and to place certain restrictions on conduct, will accomplish little. A positive and constructive attitude, by assisting and befriending the probationer, is essential to the achievement of the best results.

Failure to observe the conditions of release—which usually include an undertaking by the probationer to conduct himself properly, to abstain from evil associations and habits, to report regularly—should naturally violate the conditions of release and render the offender liable to be brought before the Court, as slackness makes the system merely a “mask for impunity.” The Probation Officer should keep closely in touch with the probationer's mode of living, and he should be his guide, counsellor, and friend. He should act with sympathy and firmness, and endeavour to restore the offender to a proper sense of social responsibility.

The duties of the Probation Officer may be summarized briefly as follows:—

- (a.) To make reports as required by the Courts concerning offenders, prior to conviction.
- (b.) To visit or receive reports from persons under supervision at such times as may be stipulated.
- (c.) To see that the probationer observes the conditions of his license.
- (d.) To report to the Chief Probation Officer on the conduct of the probationer.
- (e.) To advise, assist, and befriend the probationer, and, when necessary, to find suitable employment for him.

The personal touch carries a great influence, but the practice of requiring probationers to report themselves at the Probation Office—which is the usual practice in New Zealand—has several disadvantages. Probationers come to regard such reporting as a mere matter of form, and the fact of reporting at the office once a week is no criterion of conduct at other times. Where probationers are working during the day, reports are arranged for in the evenings, and with several reporting on the same evening there is the objectionable feature that small coterics of a delinquent class are liable to be formed, with the danger of anti-social habits becoming intensified rather than being eradicated.

In Britain and in America it has been found that the most effective probation work lies in home visiting. An English authority states: "Where considered practicable, the Probation Officer should visit the home, where more information may be gathered in one visit than from a dozen reporting in groups. The officer should make personal visits to the home . . . he can consult and perhaps secure the co-operation of the parents, wives, relatives, and neighbours, or others whom he may induce to take an interest in the probationer. These visits furnish an opportunity of studying the environment and conditions under which the probationer is situated. By doing constructive work in the home he can remove or better the conditions which are dangerous to his probationer's welfare."

In advocating personal visitation by the Probation Officer, care must be taken to ensure that the probationer is not prejudiced in the eyes of his employers or associates through the Probation Officer visiting the probationer at his daily work. There should be no objection, however, to discreet inquiries being made as to whether the nature of the occupation which the probationer is following is such as to hinder his development along social lines. Care should always be exercised to ensure that the probationer is neither humiliated nor embarrassed in the eyes of his fellow-workers or associates.

It is important that full use should be made of existing social agencies. The Probation Officer is but a passing agent in the probationer's life, not a permanent one. He should therefore endeavour to put his charges in touch with such permanent social and religious agencies as are appropriate to their individual needs, in the hope that these agencies will continue to influence the probationer's life long after the probationary period has terminated.

As it is impossible for the present part-time officers—particularly in the four principal centres of the Dominion—to give the close individual attention that the foregoing method of treatment would involve, it will be necessary to seek the aid of suitable voluntary workers, and form a committee to co-operate with them.

It would be an improvement if the Dominion were divided into four special probation districts, and if a full-time Probation Officer were appointed for each district, to be located in the four principal centres, and each responsible for the organization of his particular district. It should be the duty of the Probation Officer to form associate committees of suitable social workers, representative of all classes of the community and the various religious denominations, so that appropriate individual attention can be given to each offender and ensure that he be subject to the influence and guidance of one of his own faith. This proposal would obviate certain objections that now exist, and would make for the permanent linking-up with social organizations, and constitute a tie that would no doubt lessen the likelihood of future lapses into crime. In this connection a prominent cleric stated: "If you can arrange things so that as soon as the child—or the adult, for that matter—is put upon probation he is to be in accord with the proper religious authorities, you will have done much towards the solution of crime in our time."

A committee would relieve the Probation Officer of a considerable amount of personal work. It is generally agreed that sixty cases are the maximum that one man can effectively deal with and permit of thorough individualization (*i.e.*, personal study of the offender), but by working through a committee defects incurred through overburdening would be overcome. Voluntary organizations have been found to work satisfactorily in other parts of the world, and there is no reason why successful co-operation on such lines should not be secured in the Dominion. This branch of social work—the restoration of the offender to a sense of normal citizenship—is of the nature that should appeal to all who have a high sense of public duty.

The following statement by Sir E. Ruggles Brise, in regard to the operation of the system in England, shows convincingly that the probation system is worthy of whole-hearted support: "Definite probation results are impossible to ascertain, but it is possible to declare that there has been through its operation a large financial saving in the maintenance of penal institutions, for the cost of maintenance of the probation system is but a small fraction of the net cost to care for the same number in confinement, while prevention of waste in productive power, and the public burden of supporting dependants of imprisoned convicts is of still greater economic value; and the results to society by reformation of offenders in a large proportion of cases are better than the results obtainable through prison sentences."

I desire to place on record appreciation of the ready and whole-hearted co-operation of the district Probation Officers, who in many instances have laboured long hours under difficult conditions. Considering all the circumstances under which the work is at present conducted, the results achieved must be regarded as satisfactory.

B. L. DALLARD,  
Chief Probation Officer.

## REPORTS OF DISTRICT PROBATION OFFICERS.

W. J. CAMPBELL, General Probation Officer, Auckland.

I have the honour to submit my fourth annual report as Probation Officer of the Auckland District. I have pleasure in recording that the measure of success attained under the working of this beneficial Act has been more than maintained in this centre, as the appended figures, showing the numbers dealt with, &c., will show.

*Court Probationers.*

During the year 178 males were admitted to probation for varying periods ranging from one year to five years. The following are the complete figures for the period under review:—

Probationers on register at 1st April, 1925	..	..	..	251
Probationers received from Auckland Courts	..	..	..	178
Probationers received on transfer from other districts	..	..	..	56
				234
Total dealt with	..	..	..	485

Of these there were—

Probationers discharged by Prisons Board	..	..	..	1
Probationers completed probationary term	..	..	..	82
Probationers transferred to other districts	..	..	..	86
Probationers left the Dominion by permission	..	..	..	9
Probationers sentenced for fresh offences	..	..	..	10
				188
Total on register at 1st April, 1926	..	..	..	297

It has to be recorded that, besides the 10 probationers who were sentenced to terms of imprisonment for fresh offences, there were 30 who came before the Court and were sentenced or fined for minor offences and breaches of the probationary conditions. With the exception of 2 who appeared twice before the Court, these 30 reverted to probationary conditions after release from prison, and continued to carry out in a satisfactory manner the conditions imposed.

The above figures show that the total of those who defaulted amounts to 40, this number being approximately 8 per cent. of the total dealt with during the year.

This result, while showing failures—the actual measure of which can be gauged only by the Probation Officer—is eminently satisfactory, in my opinion particularly so, as, due to the increased numbers dealt with, it has been difficult to maintain in all cases the supervision, advice, and guidance so essential to the successful issue aimed at. In this connection the following figures give an indication of the increase during the past three years: At the period commencing 1st April, 1923, there were 162 probationers on the register at Auckland. Comparison with the figures at 1st April, 1926—*i.e.*, 297—shows an increase of 135 probationers.

The sum of £942 7s. 2d. was received as restitution and £137 3s. for costs of prosecution, a total amount of £1,079 10s. 2d. This shows a decrease on the amount received during the previous year, due to some extent to the difficulty experienced by some probationers in meeting their liabilities in this respect, and for various other reasons largely beyond their control.

As I have mentioned in my previous reports, the obligation of making restitution has a very salutary effect on the conduct of many probationers whose previous conduct showed small appreciation of the necessity for thrift.

Much credit is due to those many probationers who by their good conduct and consistent reporting throughout the year have contributed to the successful operation of the Act in Auckland. In many respects this work can be likened to an “honour system,” and it has been gratifying to note the responsive attitude of so many probationers. On the other hand, there are probationers who, while their conduct does not warrant a charge of breach of probation, often require to be reminded of their obligations. The number of these is, I am pleased to record, small.

*Crimes Amendment Act Probationers.*

The average number reporting monthly during the year was 42. Of the number of those released from prison on probationary license, 34 completed the term of probation, 4 received their discharge from the Prisons Board, and 1 left the Dominion by permission. Two probationers whose terms have since expired absconded and failed to report as required, while 8 probationers had their licenses cancelled, 7 of this number by reason of further offences committed while on probation, and 1 for failing to report. Those who completed the term of probation did so satisfactorily, and the majority of them are now to my knowledge in steady work and doing well. Of those whose licenses were cancelled, 5 were in the habitual-criminal class and had served more than one previous sentence. The 4 probationers who were granted their discharge by the Prisons Board were also in the habitual-criminal class, and it is pleasing to record that over a lengthy period on probation these men behaved and worked in a creditable manner. Contrasting those who again offended with those who earned their discharge, I find that the failures can be largely attributed to bad associations and habits persisted in after release from prison. It is difficult to find or create a new environment for these offenders, their previous record being all against them; but in the case of at least three of those who were discharged from probation this new environment, sought of their own volition, was largely the means of their rehabilitation.

Rev. FRANK RULE, Probation Officer, Christchurch.

I have to submit my report of the working of the Offenders Probation Act in the district of Christchurch for the year ending 31st March, 1926.

No one can deal with the complex problem these delinquents present without becoming increasingly familiar with the sordid side of life. I regret that so many in the community are not educated up to a right standard in their attitude toward the unfortunates who come before our Courts. To make it difficult for a man to earn his living because in a foolish moment or in a drunken freak he did something that brought him within the clutch of the law is surely not a good policy for the citizens of this Dominion to pursue. That a man should find it so difficult to make good because average humanitarianism is not abreast of legislative enactment makes the task of the friend of the struggling much more difficult than it might be. To keep in touch with the homes of these probationers without in any way making their struggle harder is certainly not easy, and considerable time has been given to that problem during the year. Experience has shown that not much can be done for the class who, in the nature of things, must earn their living in the distant parts of this province. To keep in touch with these men by letter falls far short of seeing them personally each week.

One case this past year goes a long way to justify the leniency provided by this Act. A youth, less than twenty years of age, a member of a respectable early-settler family, got into trouble. After inquiries, it was arranged to give the Probation Officer authority to send him to his own family; and from far beyond the seas he writes to thank the Probation Officer for the kindness that gave him this new start in life.

Rev. F. G. CUMMING, General Probation Officer, Dunedin.

I have pleasure in submitting another annual report for your consideration and approval. The year has in every way been most satisfactory both with regard to the conduct of probationers and also in the way of payments of restitution and costs of prosecution moneys. The costs of prosecution collected amounted to £39 10s. 4d., and of restitution to £329 5s. 9d., a total of £368 16s. 1d.

The number of probationers dealt with during the year was 78. There have been lapses during the year, several being brought before the Court for failing to comply with the conditions of release. During the period under review 7 were sentenced to short terms of imprisonment, 4 to reformatory detention, whilst 2 had their periods of probation extended. It is a most inspiring thing to see men make an heroic effort to make good under the humane system of probation. I am able to say with certainty that the men not only struggle, but really win, and become most respected citizens. In the City of Dunedin and district there are many ex-probationers who have become re-made men, doing well, in excellent positions, and carrying the full and respected confidence of their employers.

*Crimes Amendment Act.*

The number of probationers dealt with under this heading during the year was 7. I have no hesitation in stating that the men who are liberated by the Prisons Board really make a determined effort to rehabilitate themselves. The more I see of this humane probation system in real operation, the more I become convinced of its usefulness as an instrument of true reform. I may again repeat that, on the whole, the men stick fairly well to any positions found for them, and, further, the year has been very satisfactory.

Mr. C. G. L. POLLOCK, General Probation Officer, Invercargill.

I have the honour to submit the following report on the operations of the Offenders Probation Act for the year ended 31st March, 1926 :—

There has been a slight decrease in the number of cases dealt with during the past year, but full advantage has been taken of the provisions of the Act by both the Supreme and the Magistrate's Court, and any recommendation made by me has invariably been acted on. When the ages of offenders are taken into consideration an appreciable drop is to be noted in the number of those under the age of twenty years, but an increase between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-five years. With regard to the nature of the offences, an analysis discloses that those charged with theft predominate. From the information gathered in the course of investigations it would appear that the desire to live above means and station in life is a fruitful cause of the lapses in this category. There is an entire absence in this district of offenders preying upon society in gangs, the offences being of an isolated nature.

It is now invariably the practice for first offenders to apply to the Court for the suppression of their names. During the past few months this matter has received a good deal of prominence from the Press throughout the Dominion, and on many sides the fear is entertained that a certain amount of abuse has arisen in connection with this privilege granted by the Courts. To those who have first-hand opportunities of knowing it is evident that before making such an order the Court very carefully considers the matter.

During the year the sum of £29 16s. 3d. was collected as costs of prosecutions and paid into the Public Account; while the sum of £102 16s. 6d. was collected as restitution-moneys and paid in accordance with the orders of the Court.

*Crimes Amendment Act Probationers.*

The number of offenders dealt with during the period under review is considerably less than was the case the previous year. Without exception those whose term of probation expired complied satisfactorily with the conditions of release, and are now doing well in their respective positions. The results of the year's work have been gratifying indeed, as in no instance was it necessary to make application for the cancellation of a license, which would have involved the lapsed unfortunate being returned to prison.

It is found that the best results are obtained when offenders are sent into the country districts immediately on release; only in special cases where the individual has a home to return to, or has a suitable situation awaiting him, is it desirable to permit residing in town, where the temptations are too alluring. Instances are known where probationers under these circumstances were reverting to vicious ways, when a change of environment proved a deciding factor in rehabilitation.

No branch of the work calls for greater consideration and patience than dealing with the individual who has been cut off from the outside world for some time and has regained his liberty. Standing on the threshold of a new life, he is generally desirous of retrieving his career, but the situation is fraught with risk, and success or failure is generally determined at the outset. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that careful preparation, anticipating every need, should be exercised, especially with regard to the nature of the employment the emancipated person is to engage in. The best results are obtained where it has been made a special condition of release that certain employment must be entered into. Where this is not done there is danger that, on the slightest pretext, the probationer gives up the situation and starts moving about, becomes restless, and is disinclined to settle down again to steady work. That way leads towards downfall.

Mr. T. P. MILLS, Probation Officer, Wellington.

During the year just ended 230 probationers passed through my hands: this exceeds last year's total by almost 40. At the beginning of the year there were 99 offenders, 80 were placed on probation during the year, 51 were transferred from other districts. The removals were made up as follows: 63 completed the period of probation, 68 were transferred to other districts, 2 left the Dominion permanently, 1 was discharged by the Prisons Board, 5 were committed to the Borstal Institution, 6 were imprisoned, leaving 85 on the register at the end of the year.

The failures were numerically the same as last year, but with a slightly improved percentage. This, which works out at about 5 per cent. of those dealt with, must be regarded as satisfactory. The tendency has increased to extend probation, which has, of course, multiplied the difficulties of the Probation Officer; but in the majority of instances the response has been good, and the action of the Courts justified. This more than compensates for the many problems that arise; and do not the difficulties rather tend to produce efficiency?

It will be noticed that several who failed were committed to the Borstal Institution. In two instances there was no actual offence committed other than persistent failure to report, and an otherwise defiant attitude towards other conditions of release. In those cases where it has been found necessary to prosecute for breach of probation an exemplary sentence is productive of much good. Several defaulters will at once report or make an effort to pay an instalment of moneys due. In this latter connection there was over £420 paid during the year. When it is considered that the amounts collected vary from 2s. 6d. per week upwards, it may easily be seen that this involves a certain amount of trouble. These weekly payments, however, act as a very wholesome corrective, and bring the Probation Officer more into contact with these men than anything else. And it is that which gives the system its success.

The personal touch is the only thing to raise the moral standard in any walk of life, and it is very gratifying to see such a large proportion of the incipient criminal class steadied and remodelled by the reception of better ideals of life.

## STATISTICS.

### OFFENDERS PROBATION ACT.

AGES AND TERMS OF PROBATION OF THE OFFENDERS ADMITTED TO PROBATION DURING THE YEAR 1925.

Age, in Years.	Six Months or under.	One Year.	Eighteen Months.	Two Years.	Three Years.	Four Years.	Five Years.	Total.
10 and under 15 ..	..	6	..	3	2	..	..	11
15 „ 20 ..	12	72	6	71	46	3	2	212
20 „ 25 ..	2	57	3	66	26	2	3	159
25 „ 30 ..	3	31	1	45	16	..	2	98
30 „ 40 ..	5	48	1	31	19	1	1	106
40 „ 50 ..	4	14	1	21	5	..	2	47
50 „ 60 ..	..	5	..	11	1	..	..	17
60 „ 70 ..	3	2	..	2	..	..	..	7
70 and over ..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1
Totals ..	29	235	12	250	116	6	10	658

## SUMMARY OF CASES DEALT WITH DURING THE YEAR 1925.

	Admitted to Probation.	Deferred Sentence.	Total.
Number reporting on 1st January, 1925 .. .. .	981	77	1,058
Admitted to probation during the year 1925.. .. .	658	102	760
<b>Totals .. .. .</b>	<b>1,639</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>1,818</b>
Completed probation during the year .. .. .	455	79	534
Deceased .. .. .	2	2	4
Left the Dominion .. .. .	6	2	8
Committed to industrial schools, Salvation Army homes, &c. .. .. .	5	1	6
Serving terms of imprisonment .. .. .	51	2	53
Discharged by Prisons Board .. .. .	8	..	8
<b>Totals .. .. .</b>	<b>527</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>613</b>
Number reporting on 31st December, 1925 .. .. .	1,112	93	1,205

## BREACHES OF CONDITIONS OF RELEASE COMMITTED DURING 1925.

Failed to report, &c. .. .. .	33
Committed further offences .. .. .	72
Absconded and not traced .. .. .	27
<b>Total defaulters .. .. .</b>	<b>132</b>

## COSTS OF PROSECUTION AND RESTITUTION MONEYS COLLECTED DURING THE YEAR 1925.

	£	s.	d.
Amount of costs-of-prosecution moneys collected by Probation Officers .. .. .	671	19	1
Amount of restitution-money collected .. .. .	3,479	19	11
<b>Total .. .. .</b>	<b>£4,151</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>

## OFFENCES FOR WHICH OFFENDERS RECEIVED THE BENEFITS OF THE PROBATION ACT DURING THE YEAR ENDED 31ST DECEMBER, 1925.

	Admitted to Probation.	Deferred Sentence.	Total.
Theft .. .. .	399	30	429
False pretences .. .. .	58	9	67
Breaking, entering, and theft .. .. .	33	2	35
Unlawful conversion of property .. .. .	24	4	28
Vagrancy .. .. .	16	8	24
Wilful damage .. .. .	10	8	18
Forgery .. .. .	18	1	19
Carnal knowledge .. .. .	15	3	18
Receiving stolen property .. .. .	15	2	17
Obscene language .. .. .	10	6	16
Offences against Postal Regulations .. .. .	13	..	13
Common assault .. .. .	9	4	13
Attempted suicide .. .. .	5	5	11
Indecent assault .. .. .	7	1	8
Sheep and cattle stealing .. .. .	5	..	5
Offences under Bankruptcy Act .. .. .	4	1	5
Playing a game of chance .. .. .	1	4	5
Indecent exposure .. .. .	3	1	4
Stowaway .. .. .	..	4	4
Failing to maintain .. .. .	1	2	3
Bigamy .. .. .	1	1	2
Manslaughter .. .. .	1	1	2
Breach of prohibition order .. .. .	..	3	3
Arson .. .. .	2	..	2
Assault causing actual bodily harm .. .. .	1	..	1
Drunk whilst in charge of a vehicle .. .. .	1	..	1
Incest .. .. .	2	..	2
Attempted rape .. .. .	1	..	1
Unlawfully on premises .. .. .	1	..	1
Desertion of child .. .. .	1	..	1
Drunkenness .. .. .	1	..	1
Bookmaking .. .. .	..	1	1
<b>Totals .. .. .</b>	<b>658</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>760</b>

*Approximate Cost of Paper.*—Preparation, not given; printing (700 copies), £10 10s.

Summary of Cases Being Tried in Year 1933

Number reported on in January 1933	Admitted to probation during the year 1933	Number reported on in January 1934
1,008	77	1,085
100	101	201
1,818	178	1,996
284	73	357
4	7	11
8	1	9
8	1	9
34	1	35
2	1	3
1,813	281	2,094

Number reported on in January 1933	Admitted to probation during the year 1933	Number reported on in January 1934
33	13	46
12	31	43
133	44	177

Cases of Probationers and Parolees Being Collected During the Year 1933

Failed to report, etc.

Committed further offenses

Expelled and not traced

Total

Quarters for which Offenders Received the Benefits of the Probation Act During the Year 1933

Quarter	Number of Offenders	Number of Offenders	Number of Offenders	Number of Offenders
1	34	38	41	45
2	32	36	39	43
3	30	34	37	41
4	28	32	35	39
5	26	30	33	37
6	24	28	31	35
7	22	26	29	33
8	20	24	27	31
9	18	22	25	29
10	16	20	23	27
11	14	18	21	25
12	12	16	19	23
13	10	14	17	21
14	8	12	15	19
15	6	10	13	17
16	4	8	11	15
17	2	6	9	13
18	1	4	7	11
19	1	3	5	9
20	1	2	4	7
21	1	2	4	7
22	1	2	4	7
23	1	2	4	7
24	1	2	4	7
25	1	2	4	7
26	1	2	4	7
27	1	2	4	7
28	1	2	4	7
29	1	2	4	7
30	1	2	4	7
31	1	2	4	7
32	1	2	4	7
33	1	2	4	7
34	1	2	4	7
35	1	2	4	7
36	1	2	4	7
37	1	2	4	7
38	1	2	4	7
39	1	2	4	7
40	1	2	4	7
41	1	2	4	7
42	1	2	4	7
43	1	2	4	7
44	1	2	4	7
45	1	2	4	7
46	1	2	4	7
47	1	2	4	7
48	1	2	4	7
49	1	2	4	7
50	1	2	4	7
51	1	2	4	7
52	1	2	4	7
53	1	2	4	7
54	1	2	4	7
55	1	2	4	7
56	1	2	4	7
57	1	2	4	7
58	1	2	4	7
59	1	2	4	7
60	1	2	4	7