**"Strong belief proves only its own strength,
not the truth of what is believed."
(F. Nietzsche)**

BILL C-10

Safe Streets and Communities Act

Brief submitted

to the

**Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs
Senate of Canada**

by the

Association des services de réhabilitation sociale du Québec (ASRSQ)

Prepared by

François Bérard, M.sc. Crim.
Chair, Comité politique [policy committee]
ASRSQ

**MONTRÉAL
3 FEBRUARY 2012**

INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 2011, the government of Canada tabled Bill C-10, aimed at enacting a series of substantial amendments to a number of statutes. In particular, these amendments affect the operation of the criminal justice system and the federal and provincial correctional subsystems. After reading these proposed amendments, ASRSQ members consider it important to express their views on this bill.

Generally speaking, ASRSQ members oppose these proposed amendments. The overall thrust of Bill C-10 is likely to cause significant problems that our members will not allow to pass unnoticed. As well, given the extent of these problems, our members unhesitatingly state that these amendments run counter to the **clearly understood interests**, not only of the members of their communities, but also of society generally speaking. In short, in our members' view and in terms of the administration of justice, with this bill the government of Canada is headed in the wrong direction. We shall see why a little later.

This brief has four parts. Part 1 introduces the ASRSQ. Part 2 describes our framework for analysis. Part 3 notes our overall view of the amendments proposed in the bill. Part 4 sets out our recommendations.

I. THE ASRSQ

The mandate of the ASRSQ, founded in 1962, is "to provide collective support for members and volunteers in its network, to promote participation by citizens and community organizations in crime prevention and adult offender rehabilitation, and to contribute to a better criminal justice system". [translation] The ASRSQ brings together 61 organizations with some 110 service points in all parts of Quebec. Its members represent 14 regions and serve 35,000 persons each year. The services provided are diversified, taking individual, social and regional situations into consideration. Services are provided by professional staff, backed by qualified volunteers. For nearly 50 years, the ASRSQ has worked in the field of corrections, actively setting up innovative solutions to address criminal justice issues, and ensuring that these solutions strike a respectful balance among needs of the community, victims and offenders.

II. FRAMEWORK FOR THE ASRSQ's ANALYSIS OF BILL C-10

As is indicated above, the ASRSQ has been in existence for nearly half a century. Over the years, our members have defended community and society interests by promoting and implementing an approach to crime prevention that is both humanist and professional. Realizing the limitations of a repressive method, our members have opted for a judicious method. This inclusive and well-thought-out approach relies on the knowledge, skills, sensitivity and wisdom of the individuals involved, while not ruling out the appropriate use of control where needed. Interestingly, research has shown this approach to be highly effective.

The past half-century has allowed ASRSQ members to learn a great deal about human nature and crime. For example, our members have realized that these issues are much more complex than they appear on the surface. In our members' view, high-quality intervention is necessarily sophisticated: it cannot be based on simplistic claims and knee-jerk responses.

The past 50 years have also allowed ASRSQ members to acknowledge some unavoidable facts. For example, it is an accepted fact that a crime harms more than just one person: it harms the victim, the community, and society. Thus it is important that the criminal justice system seek to respond as judiciously as possible to these persons' needs.

Closer to their immediate concerns, ASRSQ members have discovered another, equally unavoidable fact: by far most sentences are served in the community, and practically all inmates eventually return to the community. In our members' view, this undeniable fact clearly raises the issue of the **clearly understood interests** of members of the community and of society in these circumstances. What might these clearly understood interests be? For the purposes of this exercise, we have identified two.

First of all, common sense, ASRSQ members' experience, and research indicate that **at the end of offenders' sentences, unless members of the community and society want these persons to reoffend, it is in their best interests for offenders to be as well rehabilitated as possible**. Essentially, in our members' view, this means three things: (1) offenders' integration into the community and society is as complete and as successful as possible; (2) offenders are distinctly less dangerous at the end than at the start of their sentence; and (3) offenders' process of reconciliation with themselves and with other persons affected by the offence is as far advanced as possible. Let us see what this might mean in more concrete terms.

For offenders' integration into the community and society to be as complete and as successful as possible, essentially it must be possible for this integration to take place in the community. The saying goes, "Learn by doing," and people are more likely to complete this work successfully in a normal setting. From this perspective, it is entirely reasonable to consider incarceration as a last resort; this societal fact reflects not only human rights in a democratic society but also the principle of incremental sentencing. It also stands to reason, in ASRSQ members' view, that incarceration has proven to be the most appropriate action in certain situations. That said, it should be borne in mind that correctional institutions (prisons and penitentiaries) are artificial settings: often, in these settings, a dynamic is in play that is far removed from life on the outside. Thus it is in society's interest for offenders to return to the community as soon as possible during their sentence, with the sentence providing a working framework that allows their integration into the community and society to proceed in as orderly a manner as possible. It is in no one's interest for offenders to be simply thrown out onto the street and the end of their sentence of incarceration.

Next, for offenders to be distinctly less dangerous at the end than at the start of their sentence, it is important to create conditions to ensure that they are more fully developed and safer for themselves and others. This means that we must seek to foster their personal development by assisting them, firstly, to expand their sense of responsibility and, secondly, to liberate themselves from various personal problems. To achieve these objectives, we will rely on a helping relationship in a context of authority, and on various rehabilitation programs.

Then, for offenders' process of reconciliation with themselves and other persons affected by the offence to be as far advanced as possible, it is important to create conditions that are conducive to reconciliation. This means, firstly, motivating, accompanying and guiding offenders in their efforts to avoid reoffending, to become integrated into the community and society, and to develop as a person. Secondly, it means assisting offenders in having these efforts recognized. Thirdly, it means guiding offenders to make reparation (concrete or symbolic) for harm they may have caused. Lastly, it means preparing offenders to ask the persons affected for forgiveness. As well, the other parties need to be persuaded to be open to offenders, to recognize their efforts and, where appropriate, to forgive when they feel ready to do so. In short, we need to try to create a positive cycle by means of mediation, if we are to re-establish a sustainable societal peace.

Along other lines, if we rely on common sense, ASRSQ members' experience, and research, it is in the clearly understood interests of members of the community and of society for the **inherent cost of achieving these objectives to be as reasonable as possible** and not, for example, for this cost to burden budgets that may be allocated to other crime prevention initiatives.

III. COMMENTS ON BILL C-10 AS OMNIBUS LEGISLATION

As omnibus legislation, Bill C-10 covers a very broad range of topics. Generally speaking, the government of Canada has made no secret of its intention to toughen up legislation on situations it considers undesirable. Since the ASRSQ is not an expert on all topics covered by Bill C-10, its comments will focus on the topics related to its expertise.

The ASRSQ also notes that, because the time allowed by the government of Canada to review this bill has been very limited, we have had very little time to react to it. Thus it will be understood that our comments here will be general in nature.

(A) Background

For more than 20 years in Canada, we have witnessed a **significant drop in crime**, including violent crime. This fact suggests that we are on the right track. However, the current government is not only attempting to conceal these facts, but also suggesting an approach that runs counter to everything that has been accomplished in crime prevention over the past 50 years. Thus it is bucking the trend of an evidence-based approach that is based on respect for human rights and dignity, societal progress and economic development. As one former senior federal official put it, unfortunately this government appears to be looking for problems to justify its ideological solutions, rather than looking for judicious solutions to real problems.

As well, Bill C-10 has been tabled at a time when the current government has expressed determination to eliminate the federal **budget deficit** quickly, by substantially reducing public spending. In this context, where efficiency has become the watchword, we find it inconsistent – to say the least – that this government is preparing to waste billions of its own and the provinces' money on building and administering new correctional institutions. In the ASRSQ's view it is clear that this choice, the most punitive option and the most expensive correctional solution, cannot help but affect both federal and provincial budgets for crime prevention initiatives. Federally, this can already be seen, in the idea of requiring offenders to cover all costs of applying for a pardon. Provincially, the comments by Michael Patton from the office of the Honourable Vic Toews, federal Minister of Public Safety, are telling: "He is asking the provinces to make cuts to social assistance, postsecondary education and social services so that they can fund prisons" [translation] (*Le Devoir*, October 8 and 9, 2011). The government does not just favour repression over prevention; it actually intends to cut prevention to fund repression, thus paving the way for society to regress, not to progress.

Furthermore, Bill C-10 has been tabled at a time when the government of Canada policy has focused on **open federalism** and **partnership with the provinces**. However, it seems clear that at present the provinces have no idea of how much these proposed amendments would actually cost them. Like the Canadian public and parliamentarians, the provinces are confronting either the government's casual disregard, or its intention of knowingly concealing this information. This situation is particularly worrisome since it is the provinces that will have to administer – and thus cover the costs of – many of the measures set out in Bill C-10. In our view, once the provinces realize this situation, a whole new round of acrimonious federal-provincial debate will begin.

(B) Form

In the ASRSQ's view, the way the government of Canada has chosen to table this bill is of very great concern. Granted, given its democratic plurality and its parliamentary majority, the government is free to come back to topics of its choosing. Doing so is entirely legitimate; but we **question** coming back with practically the same content as in previous bills. We note that a number of these provisions have already been the subject of parliamentary hearings and proposed amendments.

With regard to arguments justifying its bill, the government of Canada has had no hesitation in engaging in demagoguery and pettiness. Granted, one might object that politics always involves a little **demagoguery**; but here the government's ideological bias is such as to demean the very concept of justice. The purpose of justice is to re-establish balance that has been upset by the commission of a crime, not to keep victims and offenders opposed to each other indefinitely.

As well, the ASRSQ can only deplore the fact that the current government is **using** the misfortune of certain **victims** to sell its bill, thus casting its net much wider than is apparent. For example, are people aware that the proposed amendments on pardon or record suspension mean that a person serving four concurrent two-year sentences on four counts of breaking and entering the sheds of private homes, committed on the same evening, will no longer be eligible for pardon? In our view, leaving thousands more persons in limbo will not help improve crime prevention. On this point, we invite readers of this brief to consult the ASRSQ's position on former Bill C-23, attached.

(C) Substance

If we want to prevent offenders from reoffending, at optimum cost, by ensuring that they are as well rehabilitated as possible at the end of their sentences, it is important to create favourable conditions for that to happen. What are these conditions? For the purposes of this exercise, we have identified five. In the ASRSQ's view, the operation of the criminal justice system should be humanist, professional, appropriate, effective and efficient. Let us now analyze the bill in light of these five criteria.

1. More humanist?

The first condition for facilitating offender rehabilitation is to ensure that the operations of the criminal justice system are as **humanist** as possible. In fact, an approach based on an insensitive, harsh, pitiless kind of justice has long proven to be ineffective. If the criminal justice system is to be effective, it must be sensitive to the fate of all persons with whom it deals: offenders, victims and witnesses alike.

In the ASRSQ's view, a humanist approach to justice means that individuals are each considered to be full human beings. Thus they cannot be reduced to what they own, where they belong, or how they behave. Individuals are both unique and alike: although they each have their own identity, different from that of others, they also have needs that are similar to those of others. Individuals are each sentient and aware. They are each capable of self-examination and thus of self-awareness and awareness of their actions. Individuals each have inherent value, which calls for respect for their dignity, rights and freedoms. They need to be invited to develop a constructive plan for their life and to be supported in carrying it out. In short, individuals are each an actual or potential societal asset for the community, an actual or potential source of enrichment for others. They need to be assisted in their development. Thus the criminal justice system should see offenders as persons, members of the community and citizens who are having difficulty assuming their full autonomy and responsibilities.

But what does Bill C-10 do? First of all, it contributes to dehumanizing offenders by reducing them to their criminal behaviour. They are no longer persons but criminals. How can they be rehabilitated using

this reasoning, which attacks, not their problem behaviour, but their very personhood? This bill is a far cry from the spirit of the charters of rights, which call for respect of individuals' dignity and rights.

As well, the discourse underlying Bill C-10 fuels not only fear and distrust but also – and most importantly – public resentment of offenders. This point is particularly true for certain offender groups such as persons having committed pedophilic acts. Far from encouraging people to find better ways to prevent people from committing these acts or from reoffending, this discourse opens the door to ever-escalating meanness toward this offender group.

2. More professional?

Secondly, the operation of the criminal justice system must be **professional** if its objective really is to help rehabilitate offenders. In the ASRSQ's view, this means that the system must adopt a more objective, methodical and strategic approach that is the hallmark of professionalism. In this regard, the criminal justice system should first be able to step back from the situation that arises when an offence is committed and assess the actual extent of the situation. Next, it should be able to conduct a systematic review of all the ins and outs of the situation. Then, it should be able to identify the soundest aspects aspects of the situation and propose the most likely means of judiciously changing the course of events.

But what does Bill C-10 do? First of all, it instills in the public mind a distrust of the professionalism of persons working in the criminal justice system, such as judges. The government unhesitatingly questions the quality of these persons' work, attempting to reduce them to partisan labels, such as liberal judges. Next, these persons' decision-making latitude and professional responsibility are restricted. This is particularly true for sentencing judges, who in many cases will no longer have discretion to order a conditional sentence of incarceration and in many other cases will be obliged to order an automatic minimum sentence of incarceration.

In terms of professionalism, then, the criminal justice system is losing ground: there is a tendency to make the professionals working in the system into mere technicians, a societal step backward that will be costly in the medium and long terms.

3. More appropriate?

If the operation of the criminal justice system is to make the best possible contribution to offender rehabilitation, it must also be **appropriate**. If the operation of this system is to be judicious, it is important that it take into account the objective seriousness of the facts, the surrounding circumstances, and the persons involved. Thus it matters that an offender's sentence be as individualized as possible, and it matters that clinical intervention with offenders be as personalized as possible.

But what does Bill C-10 do? First of all, it limits the latitude of persons working in the criminal justice system, such as lawyers and judges, to develop sentences adapted to different situations. A significant point is the increased number of mandatory minimum sentences of incarceration. According to the attached legal study entitled "Un virage punitif et coûteux" [a punitive and expensive about-face] (pages 3 to 9), Bill C-10 contains 29 new mandatory minimum sentences of incarceration, ranging from 30 days to five years. For example, there is a minimum sentence of six months' incarceration for growing between five and 200 cannabis plants for the purposes of trafficking, and twice as long a sentence (one year) for growing between 201 and 500 cannabis plants for the same purposes. This study also points out that 15 existing mandatory minimum sentences of incarceration are increased, by factors of between two and eight. Thus Bill C-10 affects no fewer than 44 sentences.

This limitation on the latitude of persons working in the criminal justice system is also reflected in the significant curtailment of the possibility of ordering conditional sentences of incarceration. Not only are there 29 new mandatory minimum sentences of incarceration; as well, conditional sentences of incarceration are no longer an option for any offence with a maximum sentence of 14 years' incarceration, including passport forgery, perjury, drawing a passport without authority, fraud over $5,000, and possession of counterfeit money. The same is true for offences with a maximum sentence of life imprisonment, including breaking and entering a dwelling-house; for offences punishable by indictment with a maximum sentence of 10 years' incarceration that involve bodily harm, use of a weapon, or importing, exporting, trafficking or producing drugs; and for 11 other offences punishable by indictment with a maximum sentence of 10 years' incarceration, including theft of a motor vehicle, theft over $5,000, breaking and entering with criminal intent, and being unlawfully in a dwelling-house (see the study entitled "Un virage punitif et coûteux", pages 10 to 12).

Bill C-10 exhibits a similar intention to limit the latitude of decision-makers and other persons working in the correctional subsystem, a latitude that allows these persons to take action that is best suited to offender development. For example, the study entitled "Un virage punitif et coûteux" notes that, with Bill C-10, a sentence of incarceration of two years or more is now to be carried out taking into account "the nature and gravity of the offence" and "the degree of responsibility of the offender", thus attempting to downplay the objectives of offender rehabilitation and reintegration into society in carrying out the sentence (see the study entitled "Un virage punitif et coûteux", page 15).
As well, other amendments proposed in Bill C-10 have the effect of considerably limiting the latitude of decision-makers and other persons working in the federal correctional subsystem with regard to the conditional release process. For example, the time to be served, following a refusal by the National Parole Board, before applying again for conditional release has been increased from six months to one year (see the study entitled "Un virage punitif et coûteux", page 18). In addition, statutory release is to be automatically suspended for any offender who commits a further offence under a federal statute (see the study entitled "Un virage punitif et coûteux", page 19).

This limitation on the decision-making latitude of National Parole Board members also has repercussions on pardon: the considerably greater number of cases in which offenders may simply no longer apply for a pardon; the significantly longer times required before offenders may apply for a pardon (from five to 10 years after warrant expiry, instead of from three to five years); and the proliferation of ever-more restrictive decision-making criteria (see the study entitled "Un virage punitif et coûteux", pages 22 to 25).

In the ASRSQ's view, less appropriate operation of the criminal justice system automatically means more "rough justice". The issue is clear-cut: Do we want a criminal justice system that systematically creates injustices?

4. More effective?

As well, if the operation of the criminal justice system is to make the best possible contribution to offender rehabilitation, it must be **effective**. In the ASRSQ's view, this means facilitating the achievement of the objectives sought. Here, it means assisting offenders to choose to take charge of their lives and their criminal behaviour in a responsible manner, to realize their pro-social potential and to develop as persons, by facilitating their integration or reintegration into the community and society as well as their reconciliation with themselves and their societal environment.

But what does Bill C-10 do? It certainly does not help improve society's feelings toward offenders. The government's alarmist discourse underlying this bill fuels unwarranted fear and distrust of offenders, portraying them as monsters and thus closing the public's mind to them, a situation that can only hinder their reintegration into the community and society. This discourse also fuels resentment toward offenders,

thus reducing the chances of reconciliation among the persons involved. In short, this bill does not create a climate that is conducive to lessening the likelihood of offenders' reoffending.

The ASRSQ also points out that Bill C-10 will be counterproductive, in terms of the administration of justice and correctional intervention. In fact, the proposed amendments are likely to create a perception among offenders that "the system" is not fair to them, introducing measures on minimum sentencing, restrictions on conditional sentences, and restrictions on release that will over-penalize many offenders. Equally counterproductive is the meanness toward offenders that appears to characterize many of the amendments proposed in Bill C-10, particularly the provisions affecting pardon. Both these factors are likely to fuel offenders' own resentment toward society. They both pour oil on the flames, instead of endeavouring to assist offenders to develop the motivation to take charge of their lives. We note that individuals' motivation to change depends on the "carrot" as well as the "stick". Essentially, what we see here is reliance on the "stick", in the form of incarceration.

With regard to incarceration, the following comment is called for. Reality has established that the belief that incarceration is the real solution to the problem of crime is a form of wishful thinking. On this point, the study entitled "Un virage punitif et coûteux", page 14, highlights the following relevant facts:

> Numerous studies have shown that imprisonment raises the likelihood of recidivism: a study commissioned by the federal Department of Public Safety in 2002 looked at the results of 111 studies involving 442,000 offenders. The study found that imposing harsher sanctions led to a 3% increase in the recidivism rate. Longer sentences magnified that effect: "Compared to community sanctions, imprisonment was associated with an increase in recidivism. Further analysis of the incarceration studies found that longer sentences were associated with higher recidivism rates. Short sentences (less than six months) had no effect on recidivism but sentences of more than two years had an average increase in recidivism of seven per cent."

These facts certainly provide food for thought about how best to reduce crime and recidivism rates in our society.

Along other lines, one may question the proposed amendments' effectiveness in actually meeting the needs of victims of crime. Victims have needs: (1) to be treated with respect; (2) to be informed about how the system works, how their case is proceeding, and what is being done about the offender, including the offenders' eligibility dates for conditional release; (3) to be protected and reassured; (4) to be assisted in facing the repercussions of being victimized; (5) to be able to take part in settling the dispute in which they are involved; (6) to experience a sense of justice, in that offenders are given appropriate sentences that make them think, and are invited to make amends for the harm caused to the victims. More importantly, however, victims want (7) to find again a serenity that will allow them to move on to something more constructive.

But what does Bill C-10 do? Granted, it opens some doors to more active victim participation in the offender release process. Unfortunately, these additional openings are designed to allow victims to block offenders' rehabilitation further. We are a long way here from the spirit of recognizing offenders' efforts and accompanying them in the process of reintegration into the community and society. As well, the discourse underlying Bill C-10 incites a desire for revenge. It is clear that the government is making a choice here between perpetuating a spirit of vengefulness and promoting potential reconciliation between the parties when possible. In the ASRSQ's view, holding onto vengefulness does nothing positive for the community. Since the desire for revenge is often insatiable, this approach can only escalate meanness toward offenders. If we want victims of crime to move beyond victimization, we must move beyond, and not perpetuate, this model of conflict.

5. More efficient?

Lastly, if the operation of the criminal justice system is to do its job at less cost, it must be **efficient**. In the ASRSQ's view, this means using the fewest resources, or the least costly solutions, required to achieve the objectives sought. Thus we should make use of incarceration – the most expensive solution – only as a last resort.

But what does Bill C-10 do? Generally speaking, persons working in the criminal justice system are often asked, or obliged, to use correctional measures involving more intense oversight than is necessary. For persons working in the criminal justice system, this can be seen, first of all, in the greater number and length of minimum sentences of incarceration (see the study entitled "Un virage punitif et coûteux", pages 3 to 9). It can also be seen in the significant curtailment of access to conditional sentences of incarceration (see the study entitled "Un virage punitif et coûteux", pages 10 to 12). As well, it can be seen in the nine instances of lengthier maximum sentences (see the study entitled "Un virage punitif et coûteux", pages 9 to 10), for example, the maximum sentence for producing cannabis is increased from seven to 14 years, and the maximum sentence for producing amphetamine is increased from 10 years to life imprisonment. Furthermore, this requirement can be seen in the 29 additional offences for which offenders eligible for statutory release may continue to be detained in custody (see the study entitled "Un virage punitif et coûteux", pages 20 to 22), for example, high treason and extortion.

For persons working in the correctional subsystem, this requirement can be seen first of all in the reversal of a principle of federal sentence administration: Bill C-10 replaces "the least restrictive measures consistent with the protection of the public, staff members and offenders" with "measures that are consistent with the protection of society, staff members and offenders and that are limited to only what is necessary and proportionate to attain the purposes of this Act" (see the study entitled "Un virage punitif et coûteux", pages 15 to 16). Since the main purpose of the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* (CCRA) is the protection of the public, security is given a higher value than freedom. However, section 7 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* provides, "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice." In this context, this particular amendment proposed by Bill C-10 could be unconstitutional.

For persons working in the correctional subsystem, this requirement can also be seen in the additional hindrances devised in Bill C-10 for sentence administration and offender release. Examples include the 29 additional offences for which offenders eligible for statutory release may continue to be detained in custody, and the provisions on pardon (see the study entitled "Un virage punitif et coûteux", pages 15 to 25). With regard to pardon, in the ASRSQ's view, certain amendments proposed in Bill C-10 could even be unconstitutional under section 15 of the *Charter* since they could be considered to discriminate against a considerable group of Canadian citizens.

In relying mainly on control and incarceration, Bill C-10 would significantly increase the operating costs of the criminal justice system, thus making it less efficient. The ASRSQ points out that in 2008-2009 the average annual cost of incarceration of one federal inmate was $109,699, as compared to $29,976 to supervise that inmate in the community. Essentially, the issue is this: Can our society afford to throw money out the window for such an inefficient approach?

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The ASRSQ cannot remain indifferent to a bill that essentially makes the criminal justice system less humanist, less professional, less appropriate, less effective and less efficient. We cannot support a bill that orients an entire system toward greater social dysfunction. We can only oppose a bill that runs counter to the clearly understood interests of our communities and of society in general. For these reasons, the ASRSQ **expressly urges parliamentarians to reject Bill C-10**.

As well, the ASRSQ invites parliamentarians to consider seriously the advisability of **establishing a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the criminal justice system** in Canada. This Commission could consider in greater depth the various issues behind Bill C-10. In a non-partisan manner, the Commission could propose solutions offering nuanced responses to these situations, while maintaining the overall consistency if a criminal justice system that continues to seek justice, peace and security.

CONCLUSION

Since the beginning of time, crime and society's response to it have been the subject of impassioned debate. Aside from major debates on principle, there are times when it is important to recall certain undeniable facts. This more pragmatic approach makes it possible to situate better the clearly understood interests of our society in ascertaining how to deal with such a complex phenomenon that generates so much emotion. The ASRSQ therefore urges Canadians to reflect carefully on the actual extent of Bill C-10. In this regard, it is not without interest that states as conservative about criminal justice as California and Texas have now opted for this pragmatic approach. Publicly acknowledging the **failure** of their longstanding "tough justice" model, the authorities in these United States jurisdictions are now publicly wondering why Canadians should repeat the mistakes they made. In answering this question, clearly the burden of proof rests on the government of Canada, not on the numerous opponents of Bill C-10!