

of losing their jobs and the relationships that they may have initiated with significant people.

—*reception centre*: for the person arriving from court. During that stage, the person will be assessed and a program of treatment will be established, after which he may be sent to an institution where such a program can be implemented.

—N.B. Adjustments will probably be necessary based on future observation that can be made of the individual's actual adaptation to the established program or based on the positive or negative evolution of the individual during his rehabilitation.

4. That each individual program should be staged progressively; each stage should be another step towards rehabilitation. For instance, after a stay at the Reception Centre, an individual would be sent to a control institution where he would go through the various stages of the program and reach a status. This status would make him eligible to become member of a participation institution, then of a semi-open house, and finally to become a parolee.

(c) *Role of the Court*

Rehabilitation must be the objective for the time spent in an institution. When rehabilitation is considered as having reached a proper stage, it is contrary to rehabilitation to maintain someone in an institution. This raises the problem of the length of sentences. The length of a sentence, and also the eligibility date set accordingly, are primarily based on the type of offense and on whether the individual has recidivated; rehabilitation, on the other hand, takes into account the evolution of the individual's personality.

Because of the present situation, it happens that some individuals are released at the end of their sentence and constitute a real danger to society; moreover, other persons are placed in revolting situations, as they have to wait the eligibility date (for parole) in order to go through another stage in reintegrating society.

We propose a drastic change in the philosophy of the Criminal Code in order that change brought into the fields of rehabilitation be also reflected at court level and that there be some coordination between those who deal with delinquency. We therefore suggest:

1. That justice be re-adjusted on the basis of new knowledge and discoveries concerning the deviating individual and rehabilitation.

2. That sentences take into account the objective of rehabilitation and that in this respect an individual be released when he has reached an acceptable socialization level (when he is able to respect others sufficiently for what they are or have).

3. That an individual be eligible for parole when he is ready, that is when he has gone through the various stages deemed necessary for him. Therefore, there should no longer be any eligibility dates, as is the case now.

(d) *Roles of other agencies*

The aim being social rehabilitation of the individual, participation of any agency and service dealing with social problems becomes extremely important. More-

over, it is of paramount importance that people from outside the institutions be interested in helping and rejecting those who, for one reason or another, have rejected or attacked the society into which they must return. We propose:

1. That these agencies make their commitments known and be accountable for their work.

2. That these agencies should pay for more attention to the family and the milieu where the individual will return after serving time in an institution.

3. That these agencies help the person who leaves the institution in getting organised socially and give him the fullest support.

4. That these agencies start their work from the moment the individual is put in an institution, in co-operation with the personnel, in charge of treatment and that they increase their efficiency by finding new ways of involving more citizens from outside.

II *Reflections on the Law*

A change in the principles and philosophy which are to govern the establishment of a new treatment system for individuals defined by the Law as criminals involves a deep change in the spirit of present Acts and their implementation.

(a) *The Criminal Code*

Courts establish the guilt of the individual who departs from standards defined by society. However they are not qualified to establish a program of treatment and to decide when an individual is ready to adequately function inside society. We propose:

1. That sentences take into account the need for treatment and not the punishment that an individual would deserve. For this purpose, the institutions need to have more latitude as to whether they should release an individual or not.

2. That sentences be given by judges in terms of a minimum and a maximum and not in a fixed and determined way as is the case now. As stated earlier, it is impossible to determine in advance the length of treatment.

(b) *The penitentiary Act*

1. That penitentiaries be redefined in the Act as Institutions providing treatment for individuals having social behaviour problems.

2. That penitentiaries prepare the complete release of an individual by working in co-operation with his family or his milieu.

(c) *The Parole Act*

1. That the decision to grant parole be based on the response of the inmate to his program. It is primarily those living close to the individual who are in a position to know whether such an individual is ready to function in society. We ask that eligibility dates as they now exist be removed, but that an individual become eligible after he has gone through the various stages of his treatment.

2. That the regional parole offices become assistance clinics instead of being supervision offices as is now the case. This involves that parole officers should have a