

months or four months following his first release. It is there that we see, all told, that nothing has been done in the institutions. They have taken a chance. They have released the prisoner, and he comes back to us. Why? Because there is no coordinated work between the paroles and the institutions, in order to really accomplish something effective. Then, if you wish, for State funds, and for the citizens, who could be the future victims, and for the offender himself who is imprisoned, at that time, in a vicious circle, I wish to say that he will perhaps not leave it for a long time: he starts at 18 years old, he will finish perhaps at 35 or 40 years. We had them sent to the institutions only in order to try to establish after that whether, on parole, he would not operate somewhat better, and we take a chance. Therefore, it is somewhat by chance, after all, that decisions are taken and risks are undertaken.

We speak of the role of other organizations. We really see the role of other organizations as necessary and important, for the moment, that is, even before the prisoner is released, during what can be called the pre-release period, but also at the very time when the prisoner is on parole; I am thinking of social work organizations; I am thinking of post-penal assistance services, and even of the police. Those people, after all, should even be brought into the institution at the beginning so that, when the guy leaves, they are already familiar with the individual with whom they worked, and they really know what he is, what he can do, what are his weak points, because we can use his strong points, and when the prisoner is released, I think he can rely on that. It is on the weak points that we can really help him. We see the role of organizations in this way. It is important that the work begin before release and that the services between institutions, the organizations that are not part either of institutions or of the parole service, that those organizations and the parole organizations are co-ordinated in an effective work, and not that each should exist separately. There is a sort of peaceful coexistence, a sort of contact which is much more a contact by letter. For example, "Would you send me a report, I do not know this person?" Things like that. I do not call that working in common with someone who exists in actual fact and who must face a challenge when he leaves the institution, and especially in the first months following his release.

Reflections on release. What we see is that what I was previously saying must continue, that sentences must take account of the need of individuals for treatment. The example that I was giving of the jealous murderer, for example, who does not need ten years of treatment in an institution. This does not take account of his need for treatment, whereas it is possible that an armed robber will perhaps need it, we sometimes give 15 year sentences to armed robbers, but perhaps, if we worked with them, they would require only 8 years. It is perhaps necessary to have a much longer sentence, for the same automobile thief, who was given two years, because he stole five automobiles, because after all he will get out only after four years, so that he will have to respect, if you wish, this need for treatment, and it will be necessary for him to respect also a period of time that will be necessary for him to situate himself in time. If you give an indefinite sentence, he panics. We suggest, therefore, that which is done in the United States, namely to give minimum and maximum sentences. We could very well see an automobile thief, for example, receiving a minimum sentence of

two years and a maximum of five years. Everything depends on the work done with him within the institution and, if he cannot leave after two years, because not enough work was really done with him, I think that it is our duty and that of parole to get him to accept that view and, for example, not to think of release, even by end of sentence. That goes further than parole. Under the Penitentiaries Act, repeating what I said earlier, the first goal is certainly the protection of society, and the second is really the rehabilitation of the prisoner. It is often indicated, in writing, that the rehabilitation of the prisoner must be envisaged, but, in fact, we observe that it is often only a beginning, and the rehabilitation of the prisoner is not really put into practice. If we took as much care to organize, in the institutions, at the parole level, services for the rehabilitation of the prisoner as we devote to the protection of society, I believe that there would probably be a revolution within the institution.

On the subject of the Parole Act, what we are proposing is that we request that the individual, within the institution, follow a program. It is from the knowledge that we have of the prisoner within the institution, and from the development that he presents, that we will be able to release him, give him a date when he will be eligible. I think that that can secure him from the point of view of time. Well, he will say: I have so much time to do. There from the point of view of rehabilitation, I think that it is not effective because the guys can say: I have a two year sentence, I have a minimum of nine months to do, and then I am eligible. This permits him to put in, as the offenders say, to put in his time, simply, to commit himself to nothing, because he knows that, if it takes nine months, he is not committing himself, and he will perhaps not be, at a given moment, the smartest person, but he will be a person who does not want to commit himself at all, and the French expression we use for that is "that he does not want to know anything" about the program. At the end of nine months his eligibility date arrives. We are thus playing a nasty trick on him, because the date would arrive, and the people who work with him would say: listen, you are not ready to leave for your release. Thus, we gave him false hopes. I think that at that time, this is to play with him, to play with his health, with his morale.

Senator Flynn: With his nerves.

Mr. Thomas: Next, we propose another change in the Parole Act. We request that the Act be changed so that services and regional parole offices also become assistance clinics. However, what we observe is that the services are often surveillance services. After release, the prisoner is often left to himself to consult a specialist, if he feels the need at a given time. If that offender has a family problem, it often happens that for a certain type of offender, the offence is connected very, very closely with a family problem, therefore, if we send him back to his family rather than leave him within the institution, we send him back to his family, he leaves, and we return him to his family. The same situation is repeated. He needs someone, once he is outside, he needs someone who is present and who is capable of solving this problem with his family. There is something else, we perhaps spoke of it earlier, but I will deal briefly with it. There are cases where the individual has been treated within the institution for a particular psychological problem, and he can only really develop if we put him in contact with persons