

think that come the month of May, the individual has changed his views, and that he will so inform us. He may also tell us that he has changed his views due to his desire to leave, or things of that nature. From my viewpoint, it is, in reality, quite difficult to know whether the fellow has progressed, and then realizes that his ideas had not been acceptable, or that he no longer accepts them—thus adopting a different outlook. This evidently involves logic and the intellectual processes of human reasoning. There will also be inmates who change fields of interest, who are not political, that is—non-political reasoning processes—they have committed reproachable acts, as such, prior to being imprisoned. Will they change their minds? Will their conception, regarding society, change automatically, due to their stay at the institution? I feel that the same question arises concerning that type, also. There are inmates, for example, who are rebellious because society will ever have rejected them, and they have always been under compulsion to perpetrate certain acts, in order to survive within a society that tends to push them aside, etc., etc.; such rationalization is typical of their erratic reasoning patterns. Will they, at some stage, realize or share our political views? That is the big question. I have no way of knowing whether they would supply us with a reason, nor whether we could ever be in a position to feel that they have changed their views. I must also admit that there exists no survey, that we have no closely followed cases on a regular enough basis, to establish such conclusions.

Mr. Belanger: I believe that the same thing might occur either inside or outside the prison—as end result—from the viewpoint of political ideology. I feel that a new outlook on life might evidently result—inside, as well as outside the institution. This is what occurred within the Quebec society, where certain leaders changed their opinions from a basis of personal experiences. In that respect, this may arise outside just as easily as inside the institution.

Senator Lapointe: Yes, but they do not alter their opinion due to the influence of psychologists or social workers, or is it, rather due to personal introspection?

Mr. Belanger: No, not necessarily.

Mr. Albert: Let's say that this is a thorny question—such as in your case, madam—you presently hold definite opinions regarding a host of things, and in order to produce a drastic change toward different outlooks, I personally feel that I might require to do a great deal as a psychologist, in order to change your outlook.

Senator Lapointe: Are there hidden implications to be understood from this?

Mr. Albert: No implications, Madam. This is simply to explain that it is quite difficult to answer that question. What can we do in that case? Simply, I feel that we must carry out an analysis of the fellow with whom we are dealing—should it be possible for us to see him, in the event that he should feel the need for some type of help.

I think that in all individuals are found both weak and strong points—it involves long-range work to develop awareness within him; and, perhaps with much patience, a great amount of patience, we may arrive at interesting results. There are no magic formulae applicable to such cases. It involves some type of acquired clinical flair, along with experience, that permits us, at times, to per-

form simple things—that with time, gives rise to gradual change. But, yours is a very difficult question, and I really cannot answer you.

Mr. Belanger: I think that this involves what is termed in English: "reality therapy"—generally carried out by persons capable of discussing with those people—whether it be a psychologist, a social worker, or someone confined to the discussion of social problems.

Mr. Cyr: I believe also, that there is a difference between the act for which he has been imprisoned, and the political views he may share. The fellow is imprisoned for a given act, and not for his ideas, I do not think so, anyhow. Then, I think that in that case, will the fellow share the same ideas upon his release, and will he once more perpetrate the same acts, leading him back to prison. This may be a likely possibility that requires our attention in this matter.

Senator Lapointe: Well, let's say that he had committed a political assassination—he may, upon his release, have somewhat modified his outlook—thinking that by other means, he may succeed as well as by committing murder? Is this what you mean?

Mr. Cyr: Yes.

Senator Lapointe: But let's return to a previously discussed topic from your report; when, for example, you mentioned that the nine month period for car thieves is not adequate to effect a change in their outlook, or to somewhat alter their behaviour—how long do you think it would require, on the average—granted that individuals vary one from the other.

Mr. Thomas: Let me illustrate from a provincial institution, where the aim is truly, rehabilitation—but with juveniles; this is in Boscoville, in the Montreal area; here, there is great emphasis along those lines; two year terms are compulsory. In certain cases, Boscoville has been awarded indeterminate sentences of up to four years. The car thief is not only a car thief; he is a delinquent, who, in many spheres of activities, will appropriate people for himself—as objects—appropriate them in one way or another; he is that way in regard to money, he is like that with women, he behaves in the same way with his boss—he wants to teach him a good lesson,—Moreover, they are capable of demonstrating a gentleness, thereby swaying us all along the line. But, once our back is turned, pfft . . . , just like that. Hence, we may easily be caught off guard and say: I fail to see what can be so serious about him? However he does, to a large extent, manipulate people. He is not only a thief. He has been arrested for a violation. I agree that he is not to be arrested on account of a lifestyle that, in the end, does not quite infringe upon laws—but consists of borderline situations. It's the same thing with women; they are manipulated; they are blackmailed: if you leave me, I'll kill you, I'll hit you—he has no intentions of doing so—but it so terrorizes the woman that she stays with him. The same thing applies to employers. He will take nothing from him; he will say to his employer: you have no right to force me to do such a thing; he will not submit to anything. Then, all of a sudden, he commits an offense. This is what it's all about—it's his style of life that requires changing. The offense is merely an air bubble that surfaces in an anti-social and forceful manner. But underlying all this is a criminal world, where from he