



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.

~~VF 665~~

LIBRARY
MINISTRY OF THE SOLICITOR
GENERAL CANADA
JAN 1 1989
BIBLIOTHÈQUE
MINISTÈRE DU SOLICITEUR
GÉNÉRAL CANADA
HALIFAX
CANADA K1A 0P8

ADDRESS BY A.J. MacLEOD, Q.C.
Commissioner of Penitentiaries
to the JOHN HOWARD SOCIETY OF N.S.
Halifax, N.S. - Wed., January 29, 1964

Property of: Dorchester Penitentiary

HV
7431
M26
1964

HV
7431
M26
1964

Notes for an address by A. J. MacLeod, Q.C.,
Commissioner of Penitentiaries, to the
John Howard Society of Nova Scotia, at
Halifax, N.S., on Wednesday, January 29, 1964.

Correcting the Canadian Criminal

A head-on approach to a discussion of the topic for this evening should, I think, require me immediately to define my terms. What is a criminal? What do we mean by "correcting" the criminal?

In every year almost two million summonses are issued to motorists for illegal parking. In every year almost one million summonses are issued for traffic violations in the operation of motor vehicles. In every year some ninety thousand summary conviction offences are committed. In every year some forty thousand people are convicted in Canadian courts of indictable offences, that is, offences for which, in most cases, the court could sentence the convicted person to imprisonment for two years or more. At this moment there are more than twenty thousand people in Canadian prisons - penitentiaries, provincial reformatories and county and municipal jails.

All of these thousands of Canadians are undoubtedly offenders to a greater or lesser degree. The word "offender" describes a person who has offended against some law. He is a person whom the law seeks

to punish by fine, suspended sentence or imprisonment. The law hopes that the punishment will "correct" the offender in the sense that he will not do the prohibited act again.

It seems to me that the word "criminal" is a much stronger word than "offender". It describes, I think, a person who has committed one or more criminal offences, and whose conduct and attitude toward his fellow citizens demonstrates that, unless he undergoes some change, he will not likely conform to the basic rules of conduct that govern human activities in a free society; that he will likely put his own selfish desires above those of his fellow citizens; and that, to achieve his ends, he will have his own way and will have his victims.

It follows that if society proposes to correct the criminal - that is, the offender who poses the greatest threat to society - it will be necessary to take steps to change the criminal's attitude toward society. He will have to undergo some change so that he will tend to conform to accepted legal and moral standards. And it will be necessary for him to learn to control his own selfish desires and to respect the rights of his fellow citizens.

Copyright of this document does not belong to the Crown. Proper authorization must be obtained from the author for any intended use

. . 3

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.

In our Canadian penitentiaries we have 7,500 prisoners. The majority of them would fall within my definition of a criminal. Every year the Canadian courts sentence more than three thousand five hundred convicted persons to the penitentiary. Of these, only twenty per cent are undergoing imprisonment for the first time. Forty per cent have previously served terms in penitentiaries and another forty per cent have undergone imprisonment in provincial jails and reformatories. Every year we open the doors of the penitentiaries to release almost as many prisoners as we have received during the year. It is thus that during every twelve-month period more than three thousand penitentiary inmates find themselves at the end of their sentences and return to the free community.

The important question, from the citizen's point of view is this: Has the prison experience changed these men or are they still criminals?

Who are these men who are leaving the prisons to live in your town and mine, to pass us on the street, to sit beside us on the bus, to stand near us in the theatre queue, to eat at the next table in the restaurant and to wait beside us at the intersection for the light to change so we can walk across?

You certainly cannot distinguish them in manner and appearance from the many hundreds of other people with whom we mingle in public almost every day of the year. There is no typical ex-prisoner. They come from every age group, every occupation, every trade and profession, every ethnic group and every social class.

Nevertheless the ex-prisoners have certain characteristics in common:

nine out of ten were born in Canada;
eight out of ten are under 40 years of age;
eight out of ten say they are Christians;
eight out of ten come from a city or town;
eight out of ten admit that they use liquor;
eight out of ten served sentences of less
than five years;
eight out of ten had been previously
convicted;
seven out of ten can claim no better than
a Grade VII education;
six out of ten are unmarried; and
six out of ten were unemployed when they
were arrested and convicted.

But one thing all of them do have in common. When they broke the law they were acting out feelings of resentment, hostility, fear, aggressiveness, anxiety or guilt. Whence came those feelings? In answer to that question I can do no better than quote some of the remarks of Dr. R. G. E. Richmond, Senior Medical Officer at Oakalla Prison Farm, at the last Annual Meeting of the British Columbia Borstal Association.

Dr. Richmond said:

"The family unit is a fertile field for both love and hate. The child of such a union is not only the recipient of much love, but is at the mercy of the parents' hostilities. Much of this hostility is reflected from the parents own upbringing and is projected on to the children, far more so when they are unwanted. Frustrations, quarrels, spite, disappointments and jealousies are visited upon the children. The closely-knit family is so apt to become a battleground or playground for parental emotions. The child becomes identified with mother and father for better or for worse. So much hostility can be rationalized

in its infliction in the socially acceptable form of unyielding, uncompromising compulsions so often associated with good upbringing. Often the child is subjected to open aggression from poverty-stricken parents, perhaps alcoholic, promiscuous, neurotic or criminal, and violence becomes an accepted symbol of normal behaviour to a child. Rejection, parental indifference and possessiveness also evoke hostility, as does the other indication that the child is being cheated of love or of his being used as a medium for the parents' egocentric anxieties and dependency. Many violent young offenders have been cruelly neglected and viciously treated by their parents, some have had similar experiences in foster homes. I cannot recall one young murderer who had not been subjected to gross insults in infancy and childhood . . . for many other murderers, there has been a classical background of sordid environment, amorality, lack of education, quarrelling, violence and alcoholism.

Most delinquency has an essence of hostility, even if the offences are seemingly passive, as false pretences, cheque writing, insufficient funds, forgery and petty theft. There is no doubt of the hostility in such behaviour as vandalism, fighting, assaults, gang warfare, arson, robbery, violent sex offences, manslaughter and murder. But there is also in much anti-social behaviour including the addictions. Latent hostility may become extremely violent under the influence of alcohol."

How has human society, in its history, attempted to correct the young men who have come from such environment? - for I am sure that such environments have existed in all ages and have produced the great majority of the criminals of every country.

In the very earliest times the problem was solved very simply: everyone who offended against the tribal law was put to death. But the punishment of death was completely out of proportion to the gravity of most of the crimes for which it was imposed. The alternative to death

then became physical mutilation and the handmaiden of mutilation, which was physical torture. Many of us today would doubt that mutilation and torture are more humane than death. Nevertheless the law enforcement administrator of that far-off day came up with the idea of the rack, the screw, the wheel, the branding iron, the iron maiden, the water cure and the cat-o'-nine-tails, to mention only a few of the means that were designed, in their day, for the torment of the human body and the salvation of the human soul.

Inevitably, when death, mutilation or torture for the offender proved insufficient to protect the public against him, a different approach to the question of punishment began to be advocated. Banishment was seized upon as the means whereby the offender should be punished. To banish the offender

from human society to half-discovered continents at the far ends of the world served its purpose for a while. But then, suddenly, the world grew smaller in space and time, and no such continents remained. Another substitute had to be found. That substitute was the prison, as developed early in the nineteenth century and as it has come down to us today.

It is not surprising that the early prisons reflected most of the principles upon which the earlier forms of punishment had been based. The walls and the bars removed the offender from society - at least for a time - as effectively as the earlier punishments of death and banishment had done. There were additional refinements: the leg irons, the rule of silence, the inadequate diet, the useless work, the cold and dampness, and the calculated cruelty of prison officers. All of these subjected the offender to indignities, both physical and mental, readily comparable with those that he might have received when the system of mutilation and torture was in vogue.

The penitentiary was, in truth, designed to make men "penitent". Consistent with the earlier philosophy it was intended to keep the offender out of the sight of the public and therefore out of the mind

of the public. Paradoxically enough, the prison regime under which the prisoner was treated like an animal was supposed, in the course of time, to return him to society as a human being.

And so, with Confederation, we adopted a penitentiary system based on the principle that the offender was to be punished physically, spiritually, emotionally and psychologically.

Although Canadians had been operating penitentiaries since 1835, when Kingston Penitentiary was established in Ontario, here are some of the almost medieval practices that still persisted one hundred years later in Canadian penitentiaries, in the mid-1930's:

1. Daily exercise for inmates consisted of one-half hour a day in what was known as the "bull run". This was a procedure in which the inmates, in single file, walked in complete silence in the prison yard.
2. Every inmate was required, during all of his term of imprisonment, to have his head "close cropped" or shaved.

3. No news of the outside world was permitted to be given to prisoners.
4. Very few diversions were permitted to the inmates during the long hours when they were locked in their cells. Indeed, it was only in the mid-1930's that inmates were permitted, while in their cells, to study, read, write, draw, do jigsaw puzzles or play solitaire.
5. Prisoners were allowed to write only one letter a month.

For disciplinary offences - sometimes of an extremely petty variety - there continued to be extraordinary punishments until relatively recent years: the "hosing" of inmates - whereby they were subjected to a powerful stream of cold water for substantial periods of time - was not abolished until 1913; the "ball and chain", whereby the inmate was required to carry about with him an iron ball, affixed to his leg by a stout chain, even while he worked, was not abolished until 1933; the handcuffing of an inmate to the bars of his cell, where he was required to stand continuously from 8.00 in the morning until

noon and from 1.00 p.m. until 5.00, was not abolished until the 1930's; the so-called "cure" for mental defectives, whereby the prisoner was dunked continuously in a trough filled with ice and slush, was not abolished until the 1930's.

In the 1930's the changes that I have mentioned were regarded by some prison administrators as being formidable concessions indeed to the welfare of the inmate. But the fact that these were regarded as concessions suggests to me that until a relatively few years ago our Canadian penitentiaries were operated for the purpose of punishing the prisoner physically, mentally, spiritually and in every other possible way, until he was free to return again to society.

Since the end of World War II there certainly have been ameliorations in the treatment of inmates in our penitentiaries. During those years,

from time to time, new privileges, of one kind or another, were granted to inmates. For example, food was improved, canteen privileges were extended, inmates were paid a few cents a day as working pay, sports activities were organized and the weekly showing of movies was introduced. Certainly this constituted a more humane form of treatment of inmates. However, one searches in vain through the annual reports for those years to find the principle or philosophy upon which these privileges were granted. Certainly the inmate himself does not seem to have been required to apply himself or to work to improve himself in return for the privileges that he received. One is therefore driven to conclude that the underlying reason for the more humane treatment was humanitarianism itself, that is, to make the period of imprisonment less burdensome for the inmate but not necessarily to make of him a better man.

Punishment alone has never changed the attitude of a criminal toward society. Far from removing his feelings of resentment or hostility or fear or aggressiveness or anxiety or guilt, punishment has tended usually only to accentuate them. Let us not think, however, that such feelings are peculiar to the criminal. Each one of us has them, in greater

or lesser degree. The trouble is that the criminal, far more than most people, expresses those feelings in ways that cause physical and mental hurt to others and bring him before the courts.

What then is the alternative to punishment alone as a means of correcting the criminal? I would suggest that the best alternative is a program of inmate training. The philosophy of inmate training can be stated very simply:

First, the sentence of imprisonment to a penitentiary is undoubtedly to be considered as punishment for the offender and he is to be kept in custody until he is released in accordance with law. However, the punishment should consist of the loss of freedom that the offender suffers and should not consist of the physical, mental or spiritual indignities that can be inflicted upon him.

Second, the time during which the inmate is in the penitentiary should be used, as far as possible, for the purpose of preparing him for the day of his release from prison, when he will be expected to live in the free community as a law-abiding citizen.

It is not my intention tonight to describe in any detail the steps that we have taken in Canadian penitentiaries to put those principles into effect. To do so would be a speech in itself. But I should mention our new types of institutions.

It is important to keep in mind that not all prisoners are alike in their habits, hopes, desires, intelligence, education, trade skill or social consciousness. In these respects they differ individually from each other as much as do the individuals whom you see passing and re-passing at the main intersection of your city on any fine day. In our prison population there are those who are dangerous men, who would employ almost any means to escape from prison to freedom and would use almost any means to retain that freedom. There are those who would not use force or violence to obtain freedom but would take the open road if it lay before them. Such men would probably not use violence to resist recapture nor would they be likely, while at large, to use violence in relation to the citizens whom they might encounter. Finally, there are those who accept the fact of their sentences and can reasonably be expected to stay where they are told to stay and are not likely to walk away even though there is neither fence, nor wall nor armed officer to prevent them.

The criminal, as I have described him, may fall into any one of the three categories of security risk: maximum, medium or minimum. Five years ago

some 5,700 inmates were confined in federal penitentiaries. All were kept in eight maximum security institutions across the country. Each of these institutions was surrounded by a wall; on all of the walls there were towers; in the towers there were guards armed with rifles; inmates who passed through the gates in their gangs to work outside the wall were accompanied by officers carrying revolvers; inside the walls the buildings were equipped with a multitude of locked doors; no person, whether inmate, officer or visitor, could pass through these doors without waiting for it to be unlocked and then, after he had passed through, hearing it locked shut again behind him; inmates were locked in their cells some seventeen or eighteen hours a day; during the remaining portion of the day went on the ceaseless and unvaried procedure of counting, recounting and counting again.

In the course of the last five years two new medium security prisons have been opened and two of the eight maximum security institutions have been transformed into medium security institutions. In these penitentiaries the towers are no longer manned by guards; the officers who escort inmates outside the walls are no longer armed; most of the doors inside

the wall that formerly were locked now remain unlocked, and the business of counting inmates has been cut to an absolute minimum. It is this type of institution that we shall be building at Springhill this year.

During the past five years the emphasis has been on the development of minimum security institutions. This has been necessary because during that period the inmate population has increased from 5,700 to 7,500, an increase that could not possibly be accommodated in maximum security institutions that were already overcrowded. Across the country we have opened four correctional work camps, each designed to provide accommodation and training for 80 inmates who will be engaged in public works projects such as land drainage, forest clearing, reforestation and the like. These are projects that would not be commenced within ten years if they had to be paid for out of tax moneys at the going rates of civilian pay. In addition, we have opened six minimum security farm camps, one at each of the institutions that operate farms. These also are designed for 80 inmates who will carry on all of the work that must be done outside the wall. Thus, at these main institutions, the practice of gangs of inmates being escorted outside the wall to work has

ended. Moreover, the Penitentiary Service now operates four minimum security institutions where inmates receive vocational training in a variety of useful trades.

The flood of prisoners from the courts these past few years forced us to develop these minimum security institutions, which could be brought into being in short order. Happily enough the minimum security institution is sound in principle as part of a comprehensive prison program as well as being expedient as a means of relieving the immediate inmate population problem. For a criminal who lives up to the trust that is placed in him when he is confined in medium or minimum security has taken the first step in learning to live up to trust that the community will place in him when he is released.

Buildings, in themselves, will never reform a criminal. His mind and actions will only be improved by the minds and actions of better men.

In the past few years, therefore, we have embarked upon a program of career planning for penitentiary officers. We feel that this will create new enthusiasm on the part of penitentiary officers because they will see before them the possibility of advancement through transfers to other institutions. What is even more important, it will permit the Penitentiary Service, at any given time, to find the right man to do the job that has to be done.

We have taken steps to improve both the quantity and quality of staff training that is provided for penitentiary officers and have provided new staff colleges for the purpose.

We have placed special emphasis upon building up our professional and semi-professional counselling staff in our institutions but, in common with all other organizations engaged in correctional work, we find that the supply of psychologists and classification officers never seems to catch up with the demand.

But granted that it is desirable to have modern buildings and that it is mandatory to have a skilled and highly trained staff, what of the program of training that, hopefully, will correct the criminal, that is, fit him better to live in the community when he returns to it?

There has been, I think, significant progress. The most outstanding feature has been the development of an evening program of activities. Three years ago, in almost all of our institutions, the inmate's day ended at 4.30 in the afternoon when he was locked in his cell, there to remain until released at 7.00 o'clock the following morning. We have been able to institute a program of evening activity for inmates in all of our institutions but one. The one exception is St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary where the seriously overcrowded conditions and the disturbance of 1962 have made it impossible to put the new program into effect.

Let me say at once that the program of evening activities cannot, as yet, be described either as extensive or sophisticated. The important thing is that what many people concerned with prison work said could not be done has now been done and inmates are out of their cells, engaged in communal activities, from 6.30 in the evening until 9.30 or 10.00 o'clock. Inmates can, during the evening period, engage in team sports and other group activities. At all of our institutions, with the exception of St. Vincent de Paul, they can, during the evening hours, watch television, play bridge, take part in choir or orchestra practice, play table tennis, browse in the library or watch educational films. In some of our institutions interested and qualified citizens from the community come into the institution at night to conduct art classes, book club activities, public speaking groups, Alcoholics Anonymous and other activities of a comparable nature. In some of our institutions, we have been able to start a program of evening visits by relatives and friends.

In keeping with our thinking that the inmate should be encouraged to maintain contact with his family and with friends who can be of assistance to him, inmate letter-writing privileges have been

expanded substantially. Where formerly the inmate was permitted to write only four letters a month to a selected list of correspondents, he may now write as many letters as he wishes to whatever persons he wishes, except those with whom the Warden feels it is not in the inmate's interest to correspond.

We are trying to get away from the old-fashioned idea that, when an inmate receives a visitor, the meeting must take place in cold, bare, austere surroundings and that no word may pass between the inmate and his visitor unless it is overheard by a prison officer. In several of our institutions we have been able to remove the long table at which the inmate sat on one side and the visitor sat on the other. We have removed also the screen of glass or mesh that was designed to prohibit the slightest physical contact between inmate and visitor. The visiting rooms at these institutions are now fitted with small square tables, with comfortable chairs, at which the inmate and his visitor sit to discuss their problems. Their conversation is not overheard by the single officer who sits at the far end of the room. In the room there are pictures on the wall and potted plants. The atmosphere is informal and, as far as it is possible to make it,

homelike. I should add that we have extended greatly the amount of outdoor family visiting that is carried on in summer at our institutions.

We have extended further the program of inmate activities in the community. For example, a small group of inmates from one of our institutions attended night classes at a university to study advanced techniques in the printer's trade. These inmates, dressed in civilian clothing and accompanied by two prison officers, also in civilian clothing, mingled freely with and were accepted readily by the other students attending the courses who were, of course, responsible citizens of the community.

Inmates of other institutions, who are graduating from public speaking courses given at their institutions, travel in civilian clothing to nearby cities and hold their graduation exercises on private premises. These functions are attended by civic officials and interested citizens.

At a number of our institutions we have started programs under which, during the season of certain religious festivals such as Easter and Christmas, relatives of the inmates come to the institution to take part in religious services with inmates and remain thereafter for a social hour in surroundings of complete informality and lack of restraint.

There are many examples to be given of community involvement in the prison program. However, I shall content myself with this: the extent to which responsible citizens can take part in our inmate training programs is limited only by our imagination, on the one hand, and the degree of interest of the citizen, on the other.

It should not be thought that this new program is based on an attitude of softness toward the prisoner or on some sentimental concern for his welfare while he is a prisoner. Quite the contrary.

The new program is positive and requires the inmate to put forth substantial efforts on his own behalf in order to fit himself for his return to freedom. It is in sharp contrast to the traditional system that I have described earlier. Under that system few, if any, demands were made on the inmate. The result was - in most cases - that he returned to freedom even more ill-equipped to live in it than he was when he left it.

The new program will require all inmates to work from seven to eight hours a day. In the past, most have worked only three to four hours a day. The work will be constructive, and calculated to inspire pride of workmanship in the inmate. In the past, many inmates have been engaged in useless, unproductive labour that was emotionally unrewarding in many cases and certainly soul-destroying in some. Recreation will be designed to develop social consciousness in the inmate, and not merely make it possible for him to put in his time more comfortably. He will be expected, through correspondence and visits, to keep up his contacts with the outside world to which he will return. He will be reminded of his responsibilities in relation to his dependants, and will be counselled and trained to assume those responsibilities when he is released.

In sum, then, the penitentiary that we hope will correct the criminal will not be a place where he can hide from the public and forget his responsibilities as a citizen. It will be a place where he must always be conscious of the world and what he is missing because of his imprisonment; and where he will learn the skills and develop the self-control that he must have before he can expect to be accepted as a free member of that world.

This, I suggest, cannot in any sense be considered as a program designed to pamper or mollycoddle prisoners.

This new program cannot, of course, become fully developed over night. We still have a grievous problem of overcrowding in all of our maximum security penitentiaries which can only be resolved by the construction of new institutions. That program of construction is now under way. Many penitentiary officers, who came into the Service at a time when the penitentiary served only as a storehouse for human bodies, will require training in their new role as builders of men. Finally, and probably most important of all, there is the need for acceptance, by the public at large, of this new role of the penitentiary in the work of human salvage.

No matter how much we try, in the prison setting, to train the inmate to live properly in free society, the differences between freedom and imprisonment are too great to permit the transition from imprisonment to freedom to be made without difficulty. Ninety-nine out of every hundred penitentiary inmates invariably come to the day when they are to leave the prison. Some leave as parolees under supervision of a parole supervisor. The remainder - and they are the vast majority - are free men because their sentences have expired. In any event the prison experience is bound to have left its mark. The length of time that the ex-inmate has served will determine how much he has forgotten of the social graces that he ever knew. To him the simple operation of buying a package of cigarettes or ordering a cup of coffee in a restaurant is fraught with difficulty. He is highly conscious of his table manners -- or rather the lack of them. He has forgotten how to go about buying his own clothing. He is nervous about meeting strangers. Assuming that his thinking has changed while in prison, with what trepidation must he approach a prospective employer for a job!

It is at this point and in this connection that I should like to say a few words about the role of the private after-care agency, of which the John Howard Society of Nova Scotia is an excellent example.

Ninety-nine per cent of federal prison inmates sooner or later return to the community. I have said that a primary function of the institution is to prepare the inmate to take up law-abiding life in society. It is a fact, however, that the work of the institution will be of little avail if the inmate does not have a reasonable chance to readjust. Readjustment involves the associations of the inmate with his family, his employer, his friends and members of the community generally. It is in this field - that of helping the inmate to bridge the gap between the institution and free society - that I feel that the private after-care agency has its most important role to play. It is a role that cannot be fulfilled nearly as effectively by any government agency that might be established for the purpose.

Many inmates will benefit from constructive guidance and planning for their future freedom. Without it they will tend to plan badly or not at all. Most inmates have personal or domestic problems

of one kind or another that they are not likely, without help, to resolve in the institution; and these are problems which, if they are not resolved will remain to impede if not to frustrate the inmate's readjustment in society when he is released.

I consider, therefore, that the primary function of the after-care agency should be to act, in effect, as the prisoner's friend, available to give guidance, counsel and assistance to the inmate from the earliest days of his sentence until he is discharged from prison, whether on parole or at the end of his sentence. Indeed, it should be the function of the after-care agency to provide guidance, counselling and assistance at any time to a former inmate if that will assist in preventing him from returning to criminal activities.

As the prisoner's friend the agency, through its representatives, should be in frequent contact with the inmate in the institution. It should assist the inmate in the solution of whatever problems he may have involving the outside world, whether they are matrimonial, financial, emotional or otherwise. The agency should be frequently in touch with the inmate's family in the community, helping to keep alive

or, if necessary, to restore the family ties which otherwise would tend to deteriorate during the inmate's absence from the home. The agency should participate, with the prison and parole authorities, in planning for the inmate's release. The agency, being familiar with the community to which the inmate will return, is in a position to anticipate and help to resolve problems that otherwise might make it difficult for the inmate to make a successful readjustment. I have in mind such matters as social life and companionship, living conditions and suitability of employment. The wife of the inmate may very well require counselling in relation to specific problems that arise directly from the fact of her husband's imprisonment. So may the inmate's children.

The rehabilitation or re-establishment of an offender can only take place under normal conditions in the normal society to which the offender belongs. I should hope that more and more we can develop a program whereby the inmate is permitted, toward the end of his period of custody, to have periods of relative freedom in the community. Under such a program the inmate is given an opportunity to be absent from the institution during stated periods

for proper rehabilitation purposes such as interviewing prospective employers, visiting with friends and relatives, attending appropriate social functions and sporting events and generally re-learning what life in the free community is like. It is essential, however, during those periods for the inmate to be accompanied by a sponsor who can assist him in this re-learning experience. I think that the after-care agency member or worker, who is a representative of and is familiar with the community and who is prepared to assist voluntarily in the rehabilitation of the inmate, is the proper person to act as a sponsor in such cases. This is a function that would, of course, be perfectly consistent with the agency representative's role as the prisoner's friend. Such a program would enable the agencies, through their professional workers, to give professional help where it will do the most good in rehabilitating the prisoner, but it would also enable the non-professional members of the agencies to take an active part in correctional work.

Tonight I have been trying to answer the question: Can Canada correct its criminals? I think that Canada can correct large numbers of them and that an emphatic effort should be made to do it.

But I am sure that the social salvation of the country, in terms of crime, is not primarily the correction of the criminal. The most effective course for future years is indicated by what a prisoner in a penitentiary said to a rehabilitation officer:

"Why didn't you reach us before we started here? If a section dropped out of the river bridge, would you just stay there and try to pull out great masses of the population after they drove into the water? Or would you go back and direct traffic into a safe route?"

It is all too clear that the criminals who plague Canadian society today were the young delinquents of yesterday. And it is equally clear that many of the young delinquents of today will be the criminals of tomorrow.

We know that the rate of juvenile delinquency is increasing at a faster rate than is the general population. The increase between 1957 and 1961 should cause us to reflect. Between those years - a 5-year span - the number of juvenile convictions for breaking and entering increased by seventy per cent.

The number of convictions for theft and similar offences also increased by seventy per cent. Two out of three of the offences for which juveniles are convicted in Canada in juvenile court involve breaking and entering or theft or the possession of stolen property. They do not involve violence. But if the usual pattern is followed, violence will be the next step in most cases.

A little more than a decade ago, in 1951, we had in this country 1.1 million boys between the ages of 10 and 19 years. Eight years from now, in 1971, we shall have at least 2.2 million boys between 10 and 19 years of age. This will mean that, within a span of twenty years, we shall have seen a one-hundred-per cent increase in the number of boys in that particular age group. The formidable statistic is this: in all of Canada today we have in penitentiary almost 400 boys under nineteen years of age. Eighty-seven of them are in Maritime penitentiaries, and of the eighty-seven, one is only 15 years old and seven are only sixteen.

Forty-five per cent of the inmates we receive in penitentiary in any year are under 25 years of age. Translated into numbers it means that this year almost 2,000 young men, not yet 25 years of age,

will go to penitentiary to serve terms of two years or more. When we look at the incidence of juvenile delinquency today - that is in the age group 10 to 16 years of age - we can only contemplate with foreboding the number of young adult criminals we shall have ten years from now.

We have much to learn about the prevention and cure of delinquency in the young. We must learn much, do much and do it quickly. Only thus can Canada avoid, in the future, an infinitely greater problem in correcting the criminal than it faces today.

