

to follow suit in the autumn. Miss Demers is now working on a nutrition programme to educate parents.

Junk foods banned from the cafeterias include any food made mostly of sugar such as candy, pastries rich in sugar and fat, biscuits or cookies with more sugar than dough, carbonated or soft drinks, peanuts, chewing gum, potato chips and deep fried foods, fish and chips, and doughnuts.

Favourites such as hamburgers, hot dogs, pizza, smoked meat and submarine sandwiches are permitted, but only as alternatives and only two or three times in a six-week period. Ice cream, milk and chocolate are allowed. Many parents have inquired why and in reply Miss Demers quoted the Order of Dentists research which, she said, proved that foods leaving particles in the teeth contribute most to tooth decay. Therefore ice cream and chocolate, which melt quickly in the mouth, are allowed while peanuts are banned.

At first children mourned the disappearance of sugar-laden foods, but after five months most of the schools seemed to have accepted it. Miss Demers says that "only the teachers are asking for soft drinks now!" The principal of one school participating in the programme says that children have been given permission by their parents to go out to "junk food stores around the corner" for lunch. He commented; "Now what we need is a good, strong nutritional education programme for parents."

This is just what Miss Demers is working on with the Catholic Board. Three other school boards are also looking into ways of enlightening parents.

Movement helps to mend bones

Methods of treating broken bones in human beings may be revolutionised by Canadian experiments with rabbits which cast doubt on century-old theories that rest hastens healing. Studies at Toronto's Hospital for Sick Children point to the need for motion rather than rest.

The experiments showed that damaged knee joints of rabbits did not heal properly when the rabbits were totally immobilised. But when the limbs were kept in motion, healing was much more rapid.

The new methods were discussed at a clinical research society in Toronto by Dr. Robert Salter, surgeon-in-chief at the Hospital for Sick Children. He said sustained motion appears to stimulate certain fledgling cells in bone marrow. Further study was needed before such methods could be used with human casualties, Dr. Salter said. But the principle of motion rather than rest appeared feasible providing broken parts were set with metal screws.

Crime

Project proves value of supervised bail

The controversial Bail Reform Act brought in by the Canadian Government in 1972 has been praised or blamed for a variety of problems in different cities.

In Toronto, for example, it has been criticised by police as providing new opportunities for bail abuse and absconding, and for allowing potentially dangerous persons to roam loose when they should be locked up. One Ontario police chief said recently career criminals account for over two-thirds of all criminal activities in Canada, and the Act allowed these criminals to "be at liberty to prey on society."

But from Vancouver comes word of a pilot project for bail supervision that seems to be turning the legislation to good effect.

The Act took the somewhat radical step of reversing the traditional onus for bail from the accused to the accuser. Except in cases of murder charges, the prosecution now must show the courts why an accused person should be held in custody instead of being at liberty until a trial is held. If the police cannot convince the court that the accused is either dangerous to society or not likely to appear for his trial, the right to remain free on bail or personal recognizance is automatic. Previously, the accused had to convince the court that he was worthy of bail.

Now a pilot project in Vancouver has shown that the legislation can be made to work at a considerable saving to the taxpayer. The answer, it appears, is to supervise people who are remanded on bail in such a way that they find supervision helpful rather than intrusive.

During the first six months the scheme was in operation, the failure-to-appear rate for persons released on bail — varying between 30 and 45 per cent before its introduction — was brought down to nine per cent for those persons the courts assigned to the bail supervision project.

Hank Matthias, a former probation officer who helped to conceive the project, says: "We're making the Bail Reform Act work. Not only is our failure rate only nine per cent, but of the first 130 persons assigned to us who have completed their court process, only two committed subsequent offences while out on bail."

Why does it work? Al Radcliffe, Mr. Matthias' partner in setting up the project, says they can give no "objective" answer; but they do get "good vibes" from their clients. "My own feeling is that it's the personal interest we take in them that makes the difference. They just come

in and talk to us and we try to help them see their own problems and learn to handle them responsibly — but we don't lay the heavies on them."

With many of their clients, old hands at bail-skipping, it may be the first time anyone in the court custodial establishment has taken time to listen to them.

"We've had lots of clients come back after their cases to thank us," Mr. Radcliffe said, "and we have several who still drop in to say hello when they're in the neighbourhood."

The team say that the nicest part of their success is the saving in social cost of bail-violations. But there is secondary saving in cost to the taxpayer: it costs about \$28 a month to supervise a person on bail as compared with \$25 a day to keep the same person in custody. The cost of supervision is met jointly by the federal Justice Department, the provincial Corrections Branch and the provincial Justice Development Centre.

Results like probation

The project was set up in 1973 by the Corrections Branch because of concern about remand facilities and procedures. They asked Mr. Matthias, a social worker by training, and Mr. Radcliffe, formerly an officer in a custodial remand centre, to see what they could do.

Mr. Matthias explained: "The pre-trial situation has always been an in-or-out thing — either you were behind bars or totally free on the street — and what we've tried to do is provide a third thing, free but supervised."

How does this differ from probation?

Mr. Matthias says that where the probation officer has to come up with a plan for the parolee and enforce it, "the people we're working with are only accused, not convicted, so there is less of a casework attitude for us. We don't view ourselves as the guiding direction in their lives. We're interested in tying them back into the community — putting them in touch with other agencies and employers who can give them direction. The end product may be the same as in probation but the process is qualitatively different."

What do the supervisors do?

First, they hang around the courts listening to individual cases and telling the judge how they might be able to help the