



Association des services  
de réhabilitation sociale  
du Québec inc.

2000, boul. St-Joseph est,  
2<sup>e</sup> étage  
Montréal (Québec)  
H2H 1E4  
Téléphone: (514) 521-3733  
Télécopieur: (514) 521-3753  
www.asrsq.ca  
webmaster@asrsq.ca  
N° charité: 0888669-59

## Bill C-9

### An Act to amend the Criminal Code (conditional sentence of imprisonment)

Comments submitted by the  
Association des services de  
réhabilitation sociale du Québec

Committee on Justice and Human Rights  
September 26, 2006



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

(1) INTRODUCTION	1
(2) SUMMARY	2
(3) BILL C-9	3
(4) CONDITIONAL SENTENCES IN CANADA	3
(5) CONDITIONAL SENTENCES ARE A SEVERE, SAFE, COHERENT AND PREVENTIVE MEASURE	4
(5.1) A CONDITIONAL SENTENCE IS A SEVERE MEASURE	4
(5.2) A CONDITIONAL SENTENCE IS A SAFE MEASURE	4
(5.3) A CONDITIONAL SENTENCE IS A COHERENT MEASURE	5
(5.3.1) Alternative to incarceration and tailoring to the individual	5
(5.3.2) Importance of proportionality between the offence and the sentence	6
(5.3.3) Confusion between seriousness and dangerousness	6
(5.3.4) Public opinion	7
(5.3.5) Empirical experience	7
(5.4) CONDITIONAL IMPRISONMENT IS A PREVENTIVE MEASURE	8
(6) IN CONCLUSION	9
(7) RECOMMENDATIONS	10

### **Annexe**

LES CORPORATIONS MEMBRES DE L'ASSOCIATION  
DES SERVICES DE REHABILITATION SOCIALE DU QUEBEC

## (1) INTRODUCTION

The Association des services de réhabilitation sociale du Québec (ASRSQ) is very concerned about the impact that Bill C-9 may have on the safety of our communities and on the rehabilitation of offenders. In fact, we are worried that **the bill appears to disregard certain fundamental principles of sentencing in Canada** (the use of imprisonment as a last resort, proportionality between the punishment, the seriousness of the offence and the degree of the offender's responsibility, tailoring of the sentence to the individual, etc.).

**We believe that a conditional sentence of imprisonment is a severe, safe, coherent and preventive measure.** In addition to having a punitive aspect, a conditional sentence promotes the rehabilitation of offenders, without jeopardizing the safety of our communities. **Conditional sentences, which are supported by the public, allow for a longer period of supervision than for offenders incarcerated for similar offences.**

We therefore question the appropriateness of the amendment proposed by the government, because conditional sentences do not seem to be a source of any specific problems. Despite the fact that this measure was introduced only recently, **it seems that it is working and is producing the anticipated results.** Why would we want to limit access to it?

While we share the government's concern regarding the importance of ensuring Canadians' safety, we believe that eliminating access to conditional sentences of imprisonment for more than 160 offences will not make our communities safer. On the contrary: in the medium and long term, it may even jeopardize that safety.

Detention, particularly when it is unnecessary, can have a number of serious consequences for the offender and his or her family, including loss of employment, poverty, isolation, exacerbation of social problems, children going into care, the impossibility of meeting responsibilities, loss of autonomy, and so on. **These factors can cause even more problems for offenders and their families, and can increase the chances of recidivism or of offenders becoming enmeshed in a criminal lifestyle.** That is one of the reasons why we must avoid incarcerating individuals for whom less coercive measures could be used, while still acting in a manner consistent with public safety and the general objectives of sentencing (denunciation, punishment, separation, making reparations, promoting a sense of responsibility and rehabilitation).

One major problem with C-9 lies in the fact that it treats a large number of offences of different natures in the same way. **By treating offences like possession of counterfeit currency and incest identically, the bill helps to create confusion between the concepts of seriousness and dangerousness.**

Because we represent people who are concerned about crime prevention, we are pleased to provide you with our thoughts regarding conditional sentences of imprisonment and describe the experience of people who work with the offenders who are the subject of this measure.

The ASRSQ is a non-profit community organization composed of the more than 50 corporations in Quebec (110 points of service) that work with clients involved with the criminal justice system. Its mission is [TRANSLATION] "to provide support for the members and volunteers in its network, collectively, and to promote participation by the public and by community organizations in crime prevention and the rehabilitation of adult offenders, while contributing to improvements in the criminal justice system".

(2) SUMMARY:

- ▶ The conditional sentence of imprisonment is a severe, safe, coherent, rigorous and preventive measure. It is a measure that works well. The evidence that the problem this bill seeks to solve is a significant one has not been shown;
- ▶ When a judge sentences an offender, he or she must have regard to the relative seriousness of the offence;
- ▶ Dangerous individuals may not be given a conditional sentence of imprisonment;
- ▶ Bill C-9 is not consistent with fundamental Canadian sentencing principles. To be more coherent, it should have provided for the use of minimum sentences for specific offences. We would note immediately, however, that we do not recommend adding minimum sentences for certain categories of offences;
- ▶ Public opinion approves of the use of conditional sentences, while the public is at the same time legitimately concerned about dangerousness and certain serious crimes of violence;
- ▶ The effect of the bill will be to reduce the supervision period for some offenders ;
- ▶ By treating offences such as possession of counterfeit currency and incest identically, the bill helps to create confusion between the concepts of seriousness and dangerousness;
- ▶ Reducing the use of conditional sentences will not ensure that our communities are safer. On the contrary: in the long term, it may jeopardize that safety;
- ▶ For a more accurate determination of the impact and effectiveness of conditional sentences, thorough studies would have to be done. What needs to be determined is not only the recidivism rate, but also the social and economic impacts.

### (3) BILL C-9:

The bill amends section 742.1 of the Criminal Code to provide that persons convicted of indictable offences for which the maximum term of imprisonment is ten years or more may be not be sentenced to a conditional sentence of imprisonment. The bill will have an impact in cases involving over 160 offences under the Criminal Code.

By introducing this bill, the government hopes to ‘ensure a cautious and more appropriate use of conditional sentences, reserving them for less serious offences that pose a low risk to community safety’.<sup>1</sup> The reforms proposed would strengthen the law by preventing offenders who have committed serious and violent crimes from being given conditional sentences. The information leaflet published by the Department of Justice of Canada also says that the bill will improve public confidence in the use of conditional sentences, by ensuring that criminals receive sentences that reflect the seriousness of their crimes.<sup>2</sup>

By the combined impact of Bill C-9 and Bill C-10, the government estimates that about 400 more offenders per year will be placed in federal penitentiaries (an increase of about 3%) and that nearly 4,000 more offenders will be placed in provincial prisons (an increase of about 20%).<sup>3</sup> Another estimate by government officials says that there could be about 5,500 more offenders incarcerated in Canada. As a result, Canadian taxpayers will have to pay out astronomical amounts of money to provide for the incarceration of people who could have been sentenced another way without jeopardizing the general objectives of sentencing or community safety.

### (4) CONDITIONAL SENTENCES IN CANADA

A conditional sentence of imprisonment allows an offender who is sentenced to imprisonment for less than two years to serve the sentence in the community. The judge may impose this type of sentence only if the individual is not a danger to the community and if the following two criteria are both met:

- the offence must not be punishable by a minimum term of imprisonment;
- the imposition of a conditional sentence is consistent with the general objectives of sentencing (denunciation, deterrence, separation, making reparations, promoting a sense of responsibility and rehabilitation).

An individual who is given a conditional sentence must comply with a number of mandatory conditions and with other optional conditions, depending on the offender’s situation and the circumstances of the offence. If the offender does not comply with the conditions imposed by the court, the terminate the conditional sentence and the offender may be incarcerated for the balance of the sentence.

In Canada, 5% of cases that resulted in a guilty plea were dealt with by imposing a conditional sentence. In 2003,<sup>4</sup> conditional sentences represented 13% of all custodial sentences imposed in Canada, and the people involved made up 11% of all individuals under supervision in the community. Individuals who had committed offences against the person accounted for 27%<sup>5</sup> of all conditional sentences.

## (5) CONDITIONAL SENTENCES ARE A SEVERE, SAFE, COHERENT AND PREVENTIVE MEASURE

### (5.1) A CONDITIONAL SENTENCE IS A SEVERE MEASURE

**Conditional sentences are a useful measure that ensures that an individual is severely sentenced.** The Supreme Court of Canada has said that this is an intermediate sentence, in terms of severity, falling between imprisonment and probation. The Court also recognizes that the supervision of persons subject to conditional sentences is more intensive than for persons on probation. In fact, since *Proulx*, it has been observed that conditional sentences have got longer<sup>6</sup> and that the conditions imposed are more stringent.<sup>7</sup>

In addition, the term of imprisonment in the case of conditional sentences is often longer than the term imposed for similar offences.<sup>8</sup> This is explained by judges' desire to ensure that the two types of sentences are equivalent in terms of punishment.<sup>9</sup> In fact, the need to punish and denounce an offence is taken into account when a judge assesses the appropriateness of a conditional sentence, in determining the term and the conditions to be imposed.

**While the desire is to punish individuals who commit certain types of offences more severely, the effect of the bill will be to reduce the period of supervision for a number of offenders.** It must be noted that for a sentence of less than two years, an offender is no longer under supervision after 2/3 of the sentence. For example, for a sentence of 12 months' imprisonment, an offender can hope to be free from supervision after eight months. If the same offender had received a conditional sentence of 12 months, he or she would have been under rigorous supervision for the total term of the sentence. When we know that, for identical offences, it is sometimes the case that a conditional sentence is longer than a sentence of imprisonment, Bill C-9 will reduce the period of supervision to which some offenders are subject by a substantial amount.

### (5.2) A CONDITIONAL SENTENCES IS A SAFE MEASURE

**Before imposing a conditional sentence, a judge must be sure that the offender does not represent a danger to the community.** This is one provision that helps to ensure that a conditional sentence is a safe measure, but it is not the only one. The monitoring and supervision to which the offender is subject helps to ensure that the sentence is served in safe circumstances. In fact, an individual who is subject to a conditional sentence must comply with numerous conditions, non-compliance with which may result in incarceration until the end of the term of imprisonment ordered by the judge.

In empirical terms, it is surprising to note that there are very little data that can be used to ascertain the effectiveness of this measure as it relates to supervision and recidivism. The few statistics available, however, show that conditional sentences are effective and safe, because recidivism is low, for all types of offences.<sup>10</sup>

In 2000, the Supreme Court of Canada held that a conditional sentence may be an option not be considered in the case of violent crimes provided that certain criteria (in particular, protection of the public) can be met. While one of the important objectives of conditional sentences is to take into account an offender's dangerousness and tailor sentences to individuals to some degree, the bill does not necessarily respond to those concerns, because it focuses solely on the maximum possible sentence and disregards individual circumstances. Just as it may be risky to leave an individual who is considered to be dangerous in a community, incarceration may, in some cases, make rehabilitation more difficult and promote deviant behaviour.

It seems to us that before making major changes to conditional sentences, **it is essential that we encourage research in order to determine the actual effectiveness of conditional sentences.**

### (5.3) A CONDITIONAL SENTENCE IS A COHERENT MEASURE

Conditional sentences are consistent with the fundamental principles of sentencing in Canada. They promote the use of alternatives to incarceration and encourage the tailoring of sentences to individuals. They ensure proportionality between the sentence, the relative seriousness of the offence and the degree of the offender's responsibility. While the use of conditional sentences is supported by the Canadian public, Bill C-9 creates confusion between the concepts of seriousness and dangerousness. In empirical terms, there are no data to suggest that there are any flaws in the way that conditional sentences are currently applied.

#### (5.3.1) Alternative to incarceration and tailoring to the individual

In imposing sentence, judges have an obligation, before considering imprisonment, to examine the possibility of using less restrictive sanctions where circumstances warrant. Incarceration must therefore be used as a last resort only. This precaution is particularly important when we see that imprisonment cannot be used to reduce crime. This is the finding made in one of the most important studies yet done on the impact of imprisonment on recidivism. After reviewing numerous studies covering over 300,000 offenders, the authors of that Canadian study warned that **servicing a custodial sentence might increase the risk of recidivism by comparison with community sentences.**<sup>11</sup>

In addition not a philosophy that focuses on using incarceration as a last resort, "Canada's approach ... emphasizes fairness, effective protection of public safety, [and] flexible and individualized approaches to sentencing. ... Canada's system recognizes that offences are committed by a wide variety of persons in widely varying circumstances, and therefore judges are given the discretion to determine individualized sentences."<sup>12</sup>

To limit incarceration where it is not necessary, and to ensure that sentences are suited to the offender, it is important that judges have available as many tools as possible. Those tools will make it possible for them to choose a sentence that is adapted to the offender, rigorous and appropriate.

As conditional sentences are currently defined, they contribute to making the justice system more effective. Conditional sentences promote the use of alternatives to incarceration.<sup>13</sup> They make it possible for individuals who do not need monitoring as intensive as prison to be supervised rigorously in the community, without jeopardizing public safety. They also allow for a substantial reduction in the costs associated with incarceration.

When using conditional sentences, judges are probably more likely to choose a sentence capable of reflecting the general objectives of sentencing (punishment, denunciation, separation, making reparations, promoting a sense of responsibility and rehabilitation). We believe that it is essential that judges' discretion not be reduced.

#### (5.3.2) Importance of proportionality between the offence and the sentence

On the question of the fundamental principles of sentencing, Bill C9 presents another major problem: the matter of proportionality. In Canada, the sentence imposed on an offender must be proportionate to the seriousness of the offence and the offender's degree of responsibility.<sup>14</sup> Eliminating conditional sentences for over 160 offences undermines that principle. We would simply point out that the exclusion criterion set out in the bill refers solely to the maximum sentence possible. The appropriate sentence imposed by a judge may be considerably less. In the process by which a judge determines an appropriate sentence for a particular offence, the judge must consider the relative seriousness and circumstances of the offence. Bill C9 makes no distinction between individuals who would be sentenced, for example, to six months'

imprisonment and individuals who would be sentenced to 15 years. One might well think, of course, that the two offences are not of the same seriousness.

### (5.3.3) Confusion between the concepts of seriousness and dangerousness

By prohibiting the use of conditional sentences for offences punishable by a maximum sentence of 10 years or more, the bill identifies the serious and dangerous crimes that are to be punished more severely. We find it difficult to understand how Parliament has happened to choose this criterion, which covers over 160 widely varying offences. If Parliament regards the seriousness of the offence and the dangerousness of the offender as important, we do not understand this proposal. To respond to this concern, the existing law already provides that no offender may be given a suspended sentence if the term imposed is more than two years' imprisonment, if the offender presents a danger to the community and if a minimum sentence is provided for the offence of which the offender has been convicted.

**By dealing with offences such as possession of counterfeit currency and incest on an identical basis, the bill helps to create confusion between the concepts of seriousness and dangerousness.**

We believe that the criterion set out in the bill (offences punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more) is not necessarily a factor that can be used to assess the seriousness of an offence or the dangerousness of an individual, or the individual's capacity for rehabilitation. On that point, the opposition Liberal justice critic, Sue Barnes, rightly said: "The bill appears to use the equivalent of a legislative sledge hammer where perhaps what is required is the equivalent of a legislative scalpel: fine tuning and amending where necessary and where effective."<sup>15</sup>

To respond to Parliament's genuine concerns (eliminating the use of conditional sentences for serious and dangerous offences), **we believe that the bill should have provided for the use of minimum sentences for specific offences** (as provided in Bill C-10). That proposal is also set out in a recent study<sup>16</sup> relating to the appellate judges' opinion of conditional sentences: "If an offence is so egregious by nature then Parliament can impose a minimum sentence of custody, as it has done for other offences."

The purpose of minimum sentences is to denounce certain offences more strongly and ensure that offenders are required to serve a portion of their sentences in custody. This is the best way of ensuring that conditional sentences are not available for certain types of offences. We would point out immediately, however, that we have questions about the appropriateness and effectiveness of minimum terms of imprisonment. **We therefore do not recommend that minimum sentences be added for certain categories of offences.**

### (5.3.4) Public opinion

Some have argued, in seeking to legitimize Bill C9, that the public believes that conditional sentences are too widespread and that they are not a rigorous sentence. While some Canadians do not support the use of this measure for serious crimes of violence and for individuals who are considered to be dangerous, they do "favour the imposition of a conditional sentence for property offenders and the less serious cases of violence".<sup>17</sup>

That significant support for conditional sentences is found in a number of studies that have recently shown that most Canadians underestimate the actual severity of sentences imposed. What is important to them, however, is that the conditions imposed be meaningful and that the measure provide for rehabilitation.<sup>18</sup>

We therefore note that **the public approves the use of conditional sentences although people also express a legitimate concern about dangerousness and certain crimes of serious violence.** It must be noted that these concerns can be addressed under the existing law. An individual may not be given a conditional sentence if he or she is considered to be dangerous, if a sentence of two years of imprisonment or longer is imposed or where a minimum sentence of imprisonment is provided.

(5.3.5) Empirical experience

We regret to note that no study has been produced to confirm that the measures proposed in the bill might be effective in preventing crime,<sup>19</sup> and to determine the impact of C-9 on the judicial and correctional systems. Given the major social and economic costs that the bill will involve, we believe that a study of that kind is needed. Given that such data are always required when measures promoting alternatives to incarceration and offender rehabilitation are being implemented, we expect the same rigour when it comes to making sentences more severe and restrictive. **In empirical terms, there are no data to show that there are flaws in the present application of conditional sentences.**

P

(5.4) A CONDITIONAL SENTENCE IS A PREVENTIVE MEASURE

The Supreme Court of Canada has said that conditional sentences promote rehabilitation as well as punishment and denunciation. The highest court in the land has said that this sentence represents a solution that promotes both supervision and improved conduct. An offender who serves his or her sentence in the community is able to maintain social connections and continue to meet his or her obligations. [TRANSLATION] “In addition, this sentence gives offenders the opportunity to show that they are capable of functioning properly in society, of taking responsibility for their conduct and of complying with the mandatory and optional conditions in the order.”<sup>20</sup>

A recent study by the Canadian Safety Council indicates that this kind of sentence (more than incarceration) promotes participation in programs that may, for example, lead to drug and alcohol treatment. Conditional sentences allow offenders to put some order in their lives, to change paths, to participate in appropriate programs so that they can work on problems like addiction. It should be noted that when an individual serving a conditional sentence is supervised by a community-based service, the offender can access other services provided by the community agency if necessary. The quality of the guidance provided is therefore better.

Because incarceration can jeopardize the things that are needed (job, health services, family ties, treatment programs, etc.) for any rehabilitation efforts, some offenders find themselves in an unstable situation when they return to the community. It must not be forgotten that Bill C-9 proposes to incarcerate individuals who do not present any danger and who could be given another type of sentence that would still provide for the protection of the public and meet the general objectives of sentencing. Accordingly, **reducing the use of conditional sentences in favour of imprisonment may promote recidivism or criminal behaviour.**

## (6) IN CONCLUSION

Our Association believes that Bill C-9 is not necessary to respond to the government's concerns while at the same time adhering to the principles and objectives of sentencing that are applied in Canada. In our opinion, the bill is an attempt to deal with a problem that does not exist. The existing law and the provisions and criteria that apply to conditional sentences are sufficient to ensure that the most serious offences, and offenders who threaten the safety of our communities, are not able to take advantage of this measure. As well, it is apparent that the public supports conditional sentences as long as they are not applied to individuals who have committed serious crimes of violence (such as sexual assault against children, serious sexual assaults, or manslaughter<sup>21</sup>).

It is apparent that conditional sentences are a valuable alternative to incarceration and encourage the tailoring of sentences to the individual. It is clear that conditional sentences are regarded by the courts as a severe sentence that provides for denunciation of an offence but also promotes rehabilitation. This is also a safe sentence, since it allows an offender to be rigorously supervised and monitored. Unlike the monitoring that generally ends after 2/3 of the term of incarceration (for a sentence of less than two years), conditional sentences ensure that offenders are supervised and monitored until the end of the sentence, and allow for incarceration in the event of non-compliance with conditions.

In Canada, minimum sentences are used to denounce certain offences more strongly and to ensure that offenders must serve a portion of their sentence in custody. By treating offences such as possession of counterfeit currency and incest in the identically manner, Bill C-9 creates confusion between the concepts of seriousness and dangerousness.

Because the bill runs counter to some of the fundamental principles of sentencing in Canada (use of incarceration as a last resort, proportionality between the sentence and the seriousness of the offence and the degree of responsibility, tailoring the sentence to the individual, etc.) and because it involves substantial social and economic costs, we are amazed that no impact study has been presented, to evaluate the effectiveness of the measures proposed.

After a thorough study of the situation, we believe that this bill must be abandoned; it will do nothing to ensure that Canadians can count on having safer communities.

## (7) RECOMMENDATIONS

- ▶ As set out in the bill, the criteria for eligibility for a conditional sentence should not be changed. Bill C-9 must therefore be rejected.
- ▶ In order to determine the impact and effectiveness of conditional sentences more accurately, thorough research needs to be done. The issues to be investigated include not only the recidivism rate but also the social and economic impacts.

---

## Notes de fin de texte

- <sup>1</sup> Parti Conservateur du Canada, Réforme de l'emprisonnement avec sursis tel que consulté le 15 septembre 2006 sur Internet à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.tacklingcrime.gc.ca>.
- <sup>2</sup> Ministère de la Justice du Canada, Projet de loi de réforme de l'emprisonnement avec sursis, tel que consulté sur Internet le 15 septembre à l'adresse suivante <http://www.tacklingcrime.gc.ca> :
- <sup>3</sup> Division du droit et du gouvernement, Projet de loi C-9 : Loi modifiant le Code criminel (emprisonnement avec sursis), tel que consulté le 15 septembre 2006 à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>.
- <sup>4</sup> Division du droit et du gouvernement du Canada, La peine d'emprisonnement avec sursis, 2005.
- <sup>5</sup> Division du droit et du gouvernement du Canada, La peine d'emprisonnement avec sursis, 2005.
- <sup>6</sup> Le Devoir, (2005), Les peines avec sursis fonctionnent, Édition du samedi 26 et dimanche 27 février.
- <sup>7</sup> Paciocco, D.M. ; Roberts, J. (2005), Sentencing in Cases of Impaired Driving Causing Bodily Harm or Impaired Driving Causing Death With a Particular Emphasis on Conditional Sentencing, Canada Safety Council, Ottawa.
- <sup>8</sup> Paciocco, D.M. ; Roberts, J. (2005), Sentencing in Cases of Impaired Driving Causing Bodily Harm or Impaired Driving Causing Death With a Particular Emphasis on Conditional Sentencing, Canada Safety Council, Ottawa.
- <sup>9</sup> Manson, A. (2000), L'emprisonnement avec sursis : l'approche canadienne à la réforme pénologique ou un autre saut dans l'inc onnu, dans *Le nouveau visage de l'emprisonnement avec sursis*, ministère de la Justice du Canada.
- <sup>10</sup> Roberts, J.V. ; LaPrairie C. (2000), Rapport de recherche concernant la condamnation à l'emprisonnement avec sursis au Canada : aperçu des résultats de recherche, Division de la recherche et de la statistique, Ministère de la Justice du Canada, Ottawa, tel que consulté sur Internet le 14 septembre 2006 à l'adresse suivante : [www.canadajustice.ca](http://www.canadajustice.ca).
- <sup>11</sup> Gendreau, P. ; Goggin, C. ; Cullen, F.T. (1999), L'incidence de l'emprisonnement sur la récidive, Ministère du Solliciteur général du Canada.
- <sup>12</sup> Ministère de la Justice (2005), Détermination de la peine équitable et efficace – Approche canadienne à la politique de détermination de la peine.
- <sup>13</sup> Statistique Canada (2005), Le Quotidien.
- <sup>14</sup> Division du droit et du gouvernement du Canada (2005), La peine d'emprisonnement avec sursis.
- <sup>15</sup> Barnes, S., Loi modifiant le Code criminel (emprisonnement avec sursis), tel que consulté sur le 7 septembre 2006 sur le site Internet à l'adresse suivante : <http://suebarnes.parl.gc.ca>.
- <sup>16</sup> Roberts, J.V. ; Manson, A. (2004), L'avenir de l'emprisonnement avec sursis : point de vue des juges, Division de la recherche et de la statistique, Ministère de la Justice du Canada, tel que consulté le 14 septembre 2006 à l'adresse suivante : [www.canadajustice.ca](http://www.canadajustice.ca).
- <sup>17</sup> Ministère de la Justice du Canada, Fiche d'information #2 : la condamnation avec sursis et l'opinion publique, tel que consulté le 14 septembre 2006 sur le site Internet suivant : [www.canadajustice.ca](http://www.canadajustice.ca).
- <sup>18</sup> Ministère de la Justice du Canada, Fiche d'information #2 : la condamnation avec sursis et l'opinion publique, tel que consulté le 14 septembre 2006 sur le site Internet suivant : [www.canadajustice.ca](http://www.canadajustice.ca).
- <sup>19</sup> Division du droit et du gouvernement du Canada (2006)12, Résumé législatif, Projet de loi C-9.
- <sup>20</sup> Ministère de la Sécurité publique du Québec, La condamnation à l'emprisonnement avec sursis, tel que consulté sur Internet le 14 septembre 2006 à l'adresse suivante : [www.msp.gouv.qc.ca](http://www.msp.gouv.qc.ca).
- <sup>21</sup> *R.c. Proulx* (2000), tel que cite par Healy, P. (2000) Le caractère punitif de l'emprisonnement avec sursis dans *Le nouveau visage de l'emprisonnement avec sursis : Compte rendu du symposium*, Ministère de la Justice du Canada.

## Annexe

### LES CORPORATIONS MEMBRES DE L'ASSOCIATION DES SERVICES DE RÉHABILITATION SOCIALE DU QUÉBEC

- ▶ Association canadienne pour la santé mentale (Chicoutimi)
- ▶ Association de rencontres culturelles avec les détenu(e)s (Laval)
- ▶ Atelier-meubles de la Société St-Vincent de Paul de Montréal (Montréal)
- ▶ Auberge sous mon toit (Granby)
- ▶ Centre Booth (Montréal)
- ▶ Centre d'action bénévole de Sept-Îles (Sept-Îles)
- ▶ Centre d'action bénévole du lac (Alma)
- ▶ Centre d'aide et de traitement des troubles de comportements sociaux (Roberval)
- ▶ Centre d'entraide sociale du bas de la falaise (Québec)
- ▶ Centre d'hébergement l'Entre-toit (Montréal)
- ▶ Centre d'intervention en violence et abus sexuel de l'Estrie (Sherbrooke)
- ▶ Centre de bénévolat de la Rive-Sud (Longueuil)
- ▶ Centre de bénévolat de Laval (Laval)
- ▶ Centre de placement spécialisé du Portage (Gatineau)
- ▶ Centre de ressources pour délinquants (Sherbrooke)
- ▶ Centre des services communautaires justice et foi (Québec)
- ▶ Centre femmes aux 3A de Québec (Québec)
- ▶ Conseil des églises pour la justice et la criminologie (Montréal)
- ▶ Continuité famille auprès des détenues (Montréal)
- ▶ Corporation Maison Charlemagne (Montréal)
- ▶ CRC Curé-Labelle (St-Jérôme)
- ▶ CRC d'Abitibi-Témiscamingue & du Nord du Québec (Amos)
- ▶ CRC Joliette-Lanaudière (Joliette)
- ▶ CRC L'Arc en soi (Rivière du Loup)
- ▶ CRC La Maison (Granby)
- ▶ CRC le Pavillon (Québec)
- ▶ CRC Roberval (Roberval)
- ▶ Expansion-Femmes de Québec (Québec)
- ▶ Fondation Carrefour Nouveau-Monde (Montréal)
- ▶ Groupe Amorce (Montréal)
- ▶ Groupe de défense des droits des détenus de Québec (Québec)
- ▶ La Maison Painchaud (Québec)
- ▶ Les CRCs de l'Outaouais (Gatineau)
- ▶ Maison Jeun'aide (Montréal)
- ▶ Maison l'Intervalle (Montréal)
- ▶ Maison Radisson (Trois-Rivières)
- ▶ Maison St-Léonard (Montréal)
- ▶ Maisons de transition de Montréal (Montréal)
- ▶ Programme d'encadrement clinique & d'hébergement (Québec)
- ▶ Programme Intervention & Recherche Psycasues (Montréal)
- ▶ Regroupement des organismes communautaires de référence du Québec (Gatineau)
- ▶ Réhabilitation de Beauce (Vallée Jonction)
- ▶ Résidence Carpe Diem (Laval)
- ▶ Service action communautaire outaouais (Gatineau)
- ▶ Service Relance (Alma)
- ▶ Services d'aide Bruno Dandenault (Sherbrooke)
- ▶ Société Élisabeth Fry du Québec (Montréal)
- ▶ Société Emmanuel-Grégoire (Montréal)
- ▶ Transition Centre-Sud (Montréal)
- ▶ Via Travail (Montréal)
- ▶ YMCA du grand Montréal (Montréal)