

Mr. Cyr: Yes.

Senator Lapointe: During those nine months, he takes part in no activities, and he does not pay attention to anyone; he simply awaits his release.

Mr. Cyr: Exactly, and that is why, in the last analysis, we feel that should there be indeterminate sentencing, then the fellow would not leave until he had at one time or another participated to programmes—that he might otherwise not have felt the compulsion to undergo such treatment.

Senator Lapointe: Yes, but, upon his examination prior to release—do you not have the right to say “no”?

Mr. Thomas: Yes, surely.

Senator Lapointe: He has a bad character, and does not deserve to be released.

Mr. Thomas: Surely.

Senator Lapointe: You have the right to do that, you have the right to keep him?

Mr. Thomas: Yes, surely.

Senator Flynn: To refuse recommendation?

Mr. Thomas: To refuse our recommendation, or to recommend him by saying that we do not consent to his release. I agree.

Mr. Cyr: Certainly.

Mr. Albert: I feel that here we have to make a slight correction—after nine months of a 2 year term, a fellow does not leave automatically; he only becomes eligible for parole.

Mr. Thomas: Only.

Mr. Albert: At that moment, we may say “yes” to parole; we may say “no”.

The Acting Chairman: How can he leave automatically?

Mr. Albert: What I was saying, simply, was . . .

Senator Lapointe: No, no, he says no.

The Acting Chairman: I am sorry.

Mr. Albert: This is merely a correction regarding what madam said a moment ago, to the effect that, on a 2 year sentence, a fellow who has served 9 months, does not leave automatically, he merely becomes eligible for parole, then, at that time, his case undergoes study in order to know whether or not he should be released.

Senator Lapointe: A while ago, you were speaking of sexual offenses, and you seemed to wish the majority of them to be excused, no, part of those who commit sexual offenses, and you criticized newspapers because, should someone be released, having committed another sexual offense, they sensationalize the issue, and you were criticizing the newspapers, claiming that they are criticizing the individual rather than the deed—but it's difficult to dissociate the individual from his act; should he have performed a revolting deed, well, he himself is a little revolting. It's difficult to dissociate one from the other.

Mr. Thomas: Yes, I understand very well what you're saying, however, our difference lies upon what we discover during the course of our work—perhaps of deeper significance—it's that they are stuck with the notorious image that society wishes to have nothing to do with them. That's the problem. This tends to considerably reinforce the offending propensities of the fellow. Delinquency means to experience problems of socializing, of social relations, and should society make them feel that they are always, ever monstrous, they can never escape from this vicious circle that turns endlessly.

Senator Lapointe: Yes, but how can you want society to not consider them as a source of danger, as repugnant beings, if they violate young girls, or things of that nature; they certainly cannot say they are right.

Mr. Thomas: I say that there is certainly an element of truth in what the newspapers print, I think that they are right in wanting to rise up against their detractors.

Mr. Cartier: The important fact regarding the distinction between the deed and the man doing the act—is that an outrageous act is so 100 percent, whereas the man perpetrating the revolting act is not, himself, 100 percent outrageous.

Senator Flynn: Agreed. But I am not . . .

Mr. Cartier: That's the part that we should perhaps not lose in that man. The tenuous remaining ten percent, that may influence the inimical 90 percent; that we must not lose. That is all we have left.

Senator Flynn: Even should newspapers follow your suggestion, and mentioned only revolting or outrageous crimes, and never described the author, or monster—I fail to see how the population at large could differentiate between the outrageous crime and its author.

Mr. Cyr: I believe that the population is capable of such discrimination, should it be educated along that line. For example, should newspapers judiciously make such difference, the population will also make out this difference, since the communications media wield enormous influence, in any case, I feel this is so in relation to the public's emotional reaction.

Senator Flynn: Should all crimes be considered as a form of illness, things are all right. There are certain illnesses whose mere mention was formerly tabooed, as you know. Today, however, one tends to differentiate between the individual and his illness—however, we would probably have to begin by considering all crimes as illnesses—and I am not prepared to go to that extent.

Mr. Belanger: But, rather than using the term “illness”, I feel that this is why in our report, we often prefer to employ the expression: resocialization or re-education. Very frequently, these things simply involve educational deficiencies involving adolescents or children that at times lead to . . .

Senator Flynn: You are referring to juvenile delinquency—there, you have an altogether different problem.

Mr. Thomas: these are often juvenile delinquents.

Senator Flynn: Yes, agreed. But I think that legal authorities deal with them on a special basis.