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Extract from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, November 3, 1977:

“With leave of the Senate,

The Honourable Senator Bonnell moved, seconded by the Honourable Senator McGrand:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Health, Welfare and Science be authorized to inquire into and report upon such experiences in prenatal life and early childhood as may cause personality disorders or criminal behaviour in later life and to consider and recommend such remedial and preventative measures relating thereto as may be reasonably expected to lead to a reduction in the incidence of crime and violence in society;

That the Committee have power to engage the services of such counsel, technical and clerical personnel as may be required for the purpose of the inquiry;

That the papers and evidence received and taken on the subject in the preceding session be referred to the Committee; and

That the Committee have power to sit during adjournments of the Senate.

The question being put on the motion, it was—Resolved in the affirmative.”

Le greffier du Sénat

Robert Fortier

Clerk of the Senate

Extract from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Senate Committee on Health, Welfare and Science, Thursday, November 10, 1977:

1. That a Subcommittee, to be called the Subcommittee on Childhood Experiences as Causes of Criminal Behaviour, be appointed consisting of not more than eleven senators, three of whom shall constitute a quorum.

2. That the Subcommittee on Childhood Experiences as Causes of Criminal Behaviour be authorized to inquire into and report upon such experiences in prenatal life and early childhood as may cause personality disorders or criminal behaviour in later life and to consider and recommend such remedial and preventative measures relating thereto as may be reasonably expected to lead to a reduction in the incidence of crime and violence in society;

That the Subcommittee have power to engage the services of such counsel, technical and clerical personnel as may be required for the purpose of the inquiry; and

That the papers and evidence received and taken on the subject in the preceding session be referred to the Subcommittee; and

Extract from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, November 7, 1978:

“Ordre de renvoi

Avec la permission du Sénat,

L'honorable sénateur Bonnell propose, appuyé par l'honorable sénateur McGrand,

Que le Comité permanent de la santé, du bien-être et des sciences soit autorisé à faire enquête et rapport sur les expériences d'avant la naissance et du début de l'enfance qui peuvent provoquer par la suite des troubles de la personnalité ou la délinquance et à étudier et recommander les mesures correctives et préventives y afférentes dont on peut raisonnablement espérer obtenir une réduction de la fréquence des crimes et de la violence dans la société;

Que le comité ait le pouvoir de retenir les services d'avocats, de personnel et de conseillers techniques qu'il jugera nécessaire aux fins de ladite enquête;

Que les documents et les témoignages recueillis sur ce sujet au cours des deux dernières sessions soient défrîchés au Comité; et

Que le Comité soit autorisé à siéger pendant les adjournements du Sénat.

La motion, mise aux voix, est adoptée.”

Avec la permission du Sénat,

L'honorable sénateur Bonnell propose, appuyé par l'honorable sénateur McGrand,

Que le Comité permanent de la santé, du bien-être et des sciences soit autorisé à faire enquête et rapport sur les expériences d'avant la naissance et du début de l'enfance qui peuvent provoquer par la suite des troubles de la personnalité ou la délinquance et à étudier et recommander les mesures correctives et préventives y afférentes dont on peut raisonnablement espérer obtenir une réduction de la fréquence des crimes et de la violence dans la société;

Que le comité ait le pouvoir de retenir les services d'avocats, de personnel et de conseillers techniques qu'il jugera nécessaire aux fins de ladite enquête;

Que les documents et les témoignages recueillis sur ce sujet au cours des deux dernières sessions soient défrîchés au Comité; et
That the Subcommittee have power to sit during adjournments of the Senate."

Que le sous-comité soit autorisé à siéger pendant les ajournements du Sénat."

Le greffier du Comité
Patrick Savoie
Clerk of the Committee
MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, JULY 4, 1978
(22)

[Text]

The Subcommittee on Childhood Experiences as Causes of Criminal Behaviour met this day at 3:00 p.m., the Chairman, the Honourable Senator McGrand, presiding.

Present: The Honourable Senators Bird, Cottreau, Inman and McGrand. (4)


Witness: Dr. Robert W. ten Bensel, M.D., Director, Program in Maternal and Child Health, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

The Chairman introduced Dr. ten Bensel. The witness projected slides and made relevant comments. Dr. ten Bensel then answered questions.

At 5:00 p.m., the Subcommittee adjourned to the call of Chair.

ATTEST:

PROCÈS-VERBAL

LE MAR DI 4 JUILLET 1978
(22)

[Traduction]

Le sous-comité sur la délinquance imputable aux expériences de l’enfance se réunit aujourd’hui à 15 heures sous la présidence de l'honorable sénateur McGrand (président).

Présents: Les honorables sénateurs Bird, Cottreau, Inman et McGrand. (4)

Le sous-comité poursuit l'étude à son ordre de renvoi du 10 novembre 1977.

Témoin: M. Robert W. ten Bensel, médecin, directeur, Program in Maternal and Child Health, Université du Minnesota, Minneapolis (Minnesota).

Le président présente M. ten Bensel. Le témoin projette des diapositives et fait des commentaires pertinents. M. ten Bensel répond ensuite aux questions.

À 17 heures, le sous-comité suspend ses travaux jusqu'à nouvelle convocation du président.

ATTESTÉ:

Le greffier du sous-comité
Patrick Savoie
Clerk of the Subcommittee
EVIDENCE

Ottawa, Tuesday, July 4, 1978

[Text]

The Standing Senate Committee on Health, Welfare and Science, Subcommittee on Childhood Experiences as Causes of Criminal Behaviour, met this day at 3 p.m. to inquire into such experiences in prenatal life and early childhood as may cause personality disorders or criminal behaviour in later life.

Senator Fred A. McGrand (Chairman) in the Chair.

The Chairman: We have with us today Dr. ten Bensel. He received his medical training at Dartmouth and Harvard Medical Schools. He completed his specialist training in Pediatrics at the University of Minnesota Medical School. He later served as associate professor at that school, during which time, in 1971, he was presented with the Distinguished Teaching Award. In 1974 he received his M.P.H. degree from the University of Minnesota School of Public Health. Since then he has been Director and Professor of the Program in Maternal and Child Health, as well as Professor of Pediatrics at the University of Minnesota. In addition, he is Adjunct Professor of the Center for Youth Development and Research there. Dr. ten Bensel has written extensively on the subject of child abuse and neglect and will discuss with us possible early evidence of criminal behaviour.

When we were corresponding, he wrote me a letter on June 12 saying he would speak to our committee with respect to the relationship between cruelty to life as a child and the later development of delinquency and adult criminal behaviour.

Now, I know you are anxious to hear him and, after talking to him for an hour, I am anxious to see him start his discussion. Go ahead, please, doctor.

Dr. Robert ten Bensel, M.D., Director and Professor, Program in Maternal and Child Health, University of Minnesota: Thank you, Senator McGrand and members of the committee.

I have been involved in child abuse and neglect for approximately 17 years. From my experience I will talk about some of the historical relationships between cruelty to animals and to children and later adult behaviour and some of the things I have learned in my research in that area. Secondly, I wish to review with you some of the current concerns with child abuse; not what you have had in your testimony to date, but some new and clarifying kinds of points so that you can understand the dynamics of what is neglect and what is abuse. Then, finally, I will focus on the relationship between these early childhood experiences and development of later behaviour.

The format I would like to use this afternoon is a slide presentation and I will read the text of the slides as I go.
I would like to start with a couple of historical points about what I consider to be the great geniuses who understood society and morality.

One of the first individuals was Moses. In this slide we see Moses being rescued from the bulrushes. I am sure you remember the story of Moses. He went out into the wilderness to get the Ten Commandments; but he did not get the Ten Commandments, he got 613 commandments. Two of those commandments said that "whoever strikes his father or mother" or "whoever curses his father or mother shall be put to death." (Exodus 21:15 and 17) It is interesting to note that, in the understanding of that, there was due process. The child had to be told in front of two witnesses that if the child hit or cursed his parents, then that would be a justification to eliminate him from society. Those laws became the early laws of the United States.

The Bible goes on to say in Deuteronomy 21:18 and 21:20-21 that "If a man has a stubborn and rebellious son, who will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and though they chasten him he will not give heed to them: Then his father and mother will take hold of him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city," and "the judges will then hear the case. If the son does it again, they will bring him back to the elders and say: This is our son; he is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton, and drunkard. And all the men of his city shall stone him with stones; that he die; so shall you purge the evil from your midst."

I have talked with several Talmudic scholars on this subject. They told me that the Jewish community could not tolerate a juvenile delinquent or violent adult. They knew there was a relationship between the two. If a child disobeyed his parents, they would not tolerate this child in their society. They had a law set down to deal with this, so they did not have a problem with juvenile delinquency in those ancient societies. In just the same way, ancient societies could not tolerate cripples. What would you do with a cripple? They wanted stronger people in society.

Perhaps the first genius to put the connection together was William Hogarth, the great English printer and painter. He drew a series of four engravings which are very famous. In these he writes about Tom Nero, a juvenile delinquent. In "The First Stage of Cruelty" Hogarth points out that Tom Nero is cruel to animals. If one is cruel to animals, then one progresses to "The Second Stage of Cruelty", that you are cruel not only to animals but also to children.

Where I would like to start is that, in order to understand the relationships in adolescent and adult anti-social behaviour, I firmly believe that one has to understand these earlier childhood experiences. In order to understand anti-social behaviour seen in adolescence and adults one has to understand early childhood experiences, the family system, what kinds of families these kids are involved in, as well as the community factors that may contribute to the delinquent and anti-social behaviour. I believe failure to make these connections can neither produce effective treatment programs or preventive programs for individuals, the family or the community involved.

I would like to start with a couple of historical points about what I consider to be the great geniuses who understood society and morality.

One of the first individuals was Moses. In this slide we see Moses being rescued from the bulrushes. I am sure you remember the story of Moses. He went out into the wilderness to get the Ten Commandments; but he did not get the Ten Commandments, he got 613 commandments. Two of those commandments said that "whoever strikes his father or mother" or "whoever curses his father or mother shall be put to death." (Exodus 21:15 and 17) It is interesting to note that, in the understanding of that, there was due process. The child had to be told in front of two witnesses that if the child hit or cursed his parents, then that would be a justification to eliminate him from society. Those laws became the early laws of the United States.

The Bible goes on to say in Deuteronomy 21:18 and 21:20-21 that "If a man has a stubborn and rebellious son, who will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and though they chasten him he will not give heed to them: Then his father and mother will take hold of him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city," and "the judges will then hear the case. If the son does it again, they will bring him back to the elders and say: This is our son; he is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton, and drunkard. And all the men of his city shall stone him with stones; that he die; so shall you purge the evil from your midst."

I have talked with several Talmudic scholars on this subject. They told me that the Jewish community could not tolerate a juvenile delinquent or violent adult. They knew there was a relationship between the two. If a child disobeyed his parents, they would not tolerate this child in their society. They had a law set down to deal with this, so they did not have a problem with juvenile delinquency in those ancient societies. In just the same way, ancient societies could not tolerate cripples. What would you do with a cripple? They wanted stronger people in society.

Perhaps the first genius to put the connection together was William Hogarth, the great English printer and painter. He drew a series of four engravings which are very famous. In these he writes about Tom Nero, a juvenile delinquent. In "The First Stage of Cruelty" Hogarth points out that Tom Nero is cruel to animals. If one is cruel to animals, then one progresses to "The Second Stage of Cruelty", that you are cruel not only to animals but also to children.

Where I would like to start is that, in order to understand the relationships in adolescent and adult anti-social behaviour, I firmly believe that one has to understand these earlier childhood experiences. In order to understand anti-social behaviour seen in adolescence and adults one has to understand early childhood experiences, the family system, what kinds of families these kids are involved in, as well as the community factors that may contribute to the delinquent and anti-social behaviour. I believe failure to make these connections can neither produce effective treatment programs or preventive programs for individuals, the family or the community involved.

I would like to start with a couple of historical points about what I consider to be the great geniuses who understood society and morality.

One of the first individuals was Moses. In this slide we see Moses being rescued from the bulrushes. I am sure you remember the story of Moses. He went out into the wilderness to get the Ten Commandments; but he did not get the Ten Commandments, he got 613 commandments. Two of those commandments said that "whoever strikes his father or mother" or "whoever curses his father or mother shall be put to death." (Exodus 21:15 and 17) It is interesting to note that, in the understanding of that, there was due process. The child had to be told in front of two witnesses that if the child hit or cursed his parents, then that would be a justification to eliminate him from society. Those laws became the early laws of the United States.

The Bible goes on to say in Deuteronomy 21:18 and 21:20-21 that "If a man has a stubborn and rebellious son, who will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and though they chasten him he will not give heed to them: Then his father and mother will take hold of him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city," and "the judges will then hear the case. If the son does it again, they will bring him back to the elders and say: This is our son; he is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton, and drunkard. And all the men of his city shall stone him with stones; that he die; so shall you purge the evil from your midst."

I have talked with several Talmudic scholars on this subject. They told me that the Jewish community could not tolerate a juvenile delinquent or violent adult. They knew there was a relationship between the two. If a child disobeyed his parents, they would not tolerate this child in their society. They had a law set down to deal with this, so they did not have a problem with juvenile delinquency in those ancient societies. In just the same way, ancient societies could not tolerate cripples. What would you do with a cripple? They wanted stronger people in society.

Perhaps the first genius to put the connection together was William Hogarth, the great English printer and painter. He drew a series of four engravings which are very famous. In these he writes about Tom Nero, a juvenile delinquent. In "The First Stage of Cruelty" Hogarth points out that Tom Nero is cruel to animals. If one is cruel to animals, then one progresses to "The Second Stage of Cruelty", that you are cruel not only to animals but also to children.

Where I would like to start is that, in order to understand the relationships in adolescent and adult anti-social behaviour, I firmly believe that one has to understand these earlier childhood experiences. In order to understand anti-social behaviour seen in adolescence and adults one has to understand early childhood experiences, the family system, what kinds of families these kids are involved in, as well as the community factors that may contribute to the delinquent and anti-social behaviour. I believe failure to make these connections can neither produce effective treatment programs or preventive programs for individuals, the family or the community involved.
This slide shows the streets of London circa 1750, in which Tom is shown beating a horse and children are being run over in the streets. If one is cruel to animals and to children, the next stage of cruelty ("Cruelty in Perfection") is murder. Tom has murdered his wife in the next slide.

It is interesting to note that in western society child abuse, as an issue, was not realized until 1961. The first article ever written in English in the western world was in 1969 when people realized that women were the victims of assaults from their husbands.

Up until 1820 criminals were publicly dissected; Tom ended up being publicly dissected. This "Fourth Stage" is called "The Reward of Cruelty", the reward of violent behaviour. Murderers were publicly hanged and their bones were placed on display in a medical school. The irony of the story is that the dog is eating out Tom's heart with a smile on his face. Hogarth said that, "The Four Stages of Cruelty" were done in the hope of preventing, to some degree, the cruel treatment of animals which makes the streets of London more disagreeable to the human mind than anything whatever, the very describing of which is pain."

He was very sensitive to the whole business of cruelty. What he pointed out was the progression from cruelty to animals, to cruelty to children, to cruelty to wives. He said, "It could not be done in too strong a manner, as the most stony-hearts were meant to be affected by them..." (1750). He was attempting to change society, which he did. He was the world's first great genius who saw a relationship to violence.

A second great genius was Charles Dickens. Dickens came along and realized the greatness of Hogarth. In writing about Oliver Twist and the reason he wrote it, he said:

It appeared to me that to draw a knot of such associates in crime as really do exist, to paint them in all their deformity, in all of their wretchedness, in all the squalid poverty of their lives; to show them as they really are, forever skulking uneasily through the dirtiest paths of life, with the great black, ghastly gallows closing up their prospects; it appeared to me that to do this would be an attempt to do something which was greatly needed and which would be a service to society. (1841)

In other words, he wrote down the association between poverty and the upbringing of the orphans and its association with crime.

One hundred years ago this was a big problem in western society. What about those children who were homeless? These children were called "street arabs." A "street arab" is an abandoned child who makes the streets his home. "Guttersnipes," on the other hand, are children on the streets begging, borrowing and stealing money for their alcoholic parents. This was an enormous problem, and this problem was defined in Oliver Twist. These children were known as "street waifs" or "street urchins" who roamed the streets of many large cities of the world. It has been known for 200 years that there has been an association between alcohol, poverty and criminal types of behaviour.

---

[Traduction]

Cette diapositive illustre les rues de Londres vers 1750 où l'on voit Tom en train de battrer un cheval et les enfants se faire écrasés. Si quelqu'un est cruel envers les animaux et les enfants, le prochain stade de la cruauté («cruauté dans sa perfection») est le meurtre. Dans la prochaine diapositive, Tom a tué son épouse.

Il est intéressant de constater que la société occidentale n'a reconnu le problème de l'enfance maltraitée qu'en 1961. C'est en 1969 qu'a paru pour la première fois dans le monde occidental, un article écrit en anglais au sujet de femmes victimes des mauvais traitements de leur époux.

Jusqu'en 1820, les criminels étaient dissecés publiquement. Tom a été dissecé en public. Ce quatrième stade, punition de la cruauté, illustre comment s'expiait un comportement violent. Une pendaison publique était le sort des meurtriers; leur squelette était utilisé dans les écoles de médecine. L'ironie de l'histoire vient du fait que finalement c'est le chien qui dévore le cœur de Tom en affichant pittigiquement un sourire. Hogarth a avoué avoir créé ⁷ les quatre stades de la cruauté dans l'espoir de réduire, dans une certaine mesure, les traitements cruels infligés aux animaux qui plus que n'impose qu'aidaient réduire les rues de Londres atrocement désagréables; c'est la souffrance que l'on voulait faire disparaitre.

Il était très sensible à cette question de cruauté. Il a monté au progression depuis la cruauté envers les animaux, la cruauté envers les enfants, la cruauté envers les épouses. Il a dit que ses illustrations ne pouvaient pas être trop choquant puisqu'elles devaient atteindre les cœurs les plus endurcis... (1750). Il tentait de changer la société, et il a réussi. Il fut le premier grand génie à établir un rapport en matière de violence.

Charles Dickens est un autre grand génie. Il a reconnu le talent de Hogarth. En expliquant Oliver Twist et les raisons qui l'avaient poussé à écrire ce roman, il dit:

Il m'a semblé qu'en illustrant un groupe de criminels tels qu'ils existent vraiment, en exposant toute leur laideur, tout leur caractère misérable, toute la pauvreté crosseuse de leur vie et en les montrant tels qu'ils sont, empêtrés dans les trains de vie les plus lamentables, avec, au bout du compte, la perspective peu engageante de la potence, je faisais quelque chose de très utile pour la société (1841).

En d'autres mots, il a établi un rapport entre la pauvreté, la façon d'éduquer un orphelin et le crime.

Il y a 100 ans, la situation constituait un sérieux problème pour la société occidentale. Mais qu'arriva-t-il à ces enfants qui n'avaient pas de foyer? On les appelait des vagabonds. Un vagabond désigné en anglais comme street arale était un enfant abandonné qui avait choisi de vivre dans la rue. Par contre, les (guttersnipes) gamins des rues qui vivaient entre les deux, empruntés ou volant de l'argent pour leurs parents alcooliques. Il s'agissait d'un problème important que Dickens a décrit dans Oliver Twist. Les gamins des rues, les galopins se précipitaient dans les rues de plusieurs grandes villes du monde. On sait depuis 200 ans qu'il existe un rapport entre l'alcoolisme, la pauvreté et les comportements criminels.
[Text]
One of the other great social reformers of the last century was Jacob Riis, a Dane. He went around the United States photographing children sleeping in alleyways. This slide shows a picture with the caption, “No place to go, nothing to do.” This was the beginning of the awareness of these children. They were the “neglected” children, by today’s terminology, and this was associated with juvenile delinquency, and school failure. In his writings he wrote:

That bad environment becomes the heredity of the next generation.

The next slide shows crime with a dagger floating across the cities. The caption states:

There floats a phantom in the slums' foul air, into the spectre of that dirty lair, red handed, ruthless, furtive, unerect, murderous crime—the nemesis of neglect.

Crime was thought to be due to bad housing, bad jobs; all of these things, in the environment.

The humane movement started in North America with Henry Bergh. Part of the concern of humanity came about because of the Civil War and the bloody wars that went on in this part of the world. Henry Bergh was concerned about being humane to animals. If you recall, Queen Victoria was really the first person to set up the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in 1824. Henry Bergh’s whole philosophy was that, “Men will be just toward men when they are charitable towards animals.” Society moved first to be kind and humane to animals. Henry Bergh invented the horse ambulance before there were ambulances for people. Society took better care of its animals than its people.

The next slide shows this relationship, and it is in many people's minds today that if you are “kind to pets in childhood, benevolent in middle life, you are honoured and revered in declining age.” Henry Bergh set up the humane society for animals in 1866.

This is a picture of Mary Ellen, taken in 1875 in New York City. Mary Ellen was 8 years of age and was found by a social worker in this condition. She went to everyone in the community but obtained no results. Finally, she went to see Henry Bergh. Her reasoning was that this girl is a human being and a human being is part of the animal kingdom, therefore, society ought to be kind to children as well as animals.

This is the first time in the history of the world that society went into a family to say that that child had a right and that child needed protection.

This is a picture from the Liverpool Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children taken about 1900. Child abuse and

[Translation]
Un des autres grands réformateurs de la société du siècle dernier était un danois nommé Jacob Riis. Il a parcouru les États-Unis en photographiant les enfants qui dormaient dans les ruelles. Cette diapositive représente une photographie avec la légende: «No place to go, nothing to do». (Je n’ai nulle part où aller, je n’ai rien à faire). C’est le début de la prise de conscience vis-à-vis de ces enfants. Ceux-ci étaient les enfants négligés selon la terminologie courante et que l’on associait autrefois à la délinquance juvénile et aux insuccès scolaires.

Dans ses écrits, il a dit qu’un environnement défavorable fait partie de l’héritage de la génération suivante.

La diapositive suivante illustre le crime au moyen d’un poignard suspendu au-dessus des villes. Voici la légende:

«There floats a phantom in the slums foul air into the spectre of that dirty air red-handed ruthless, furtive une­rect murderous crime, the nemesis of neglect.» (Dans l’air vicié des taudis, dans l’horreur de ce repaire malpropre, il erre un fantôme, rouge de sang, impitoyable, sournois, bas, le meurtre, conséquence de la négligence)

Le crime croyait-on, était attribuable au mauvais logement, aux emplois mal rémunérés qui caractérisaient ce milieu.

Le mouvement humanitaire a été lancée en Amérique du Nord par Henry Bergh. Cette préoccupation de choses humain­itaires était attribuable en partie à la guerre civile et aux guerres sanglantes que connaissait cette partie du monde. Henry Bergh se préoccupait des soins humanitaires apportés aux animaux. Vous vous souvenez sans doute que c’est la reine Victoria elle-même qui a institué la Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (une société protectrice des animaux) en 1824. Toute la philosophie d’Henry Bergh se résumait à ceci: les hommes seront justes envers les hommes lorsqu’ils seront bienveillants envers les animaux. La société s’est d’abord montrée bonne et humanitaire envers les animaux. Henry Bergh a créé une ambulance pour les chevaux avant qu’il n’en existe pour les hommes. La société prenait mieux soin des animaux que des citoyens.

La prochaine diapositive démontre le rapport que font actuellement plusieurs personnes: si quelqu’un est gentil avec les animaux durant son enfance, s’il est bienveillant durant sa maturité, il mérite, comme vieillard, le respect et les honneurs. Henry Bergh a créé en 1866 une société de protection des animaux.

Voici une photo de Mary Ellen, prise en 1875 à New York. Mary Ellen avait huit ans lorsqu’elle fut trouvée dans cet état par une travailleuse sociale. La travailleuse sociale s’est adres­sée à tout le monde dans la société sans obtenir de résultat. Enfin, elle a allée voir Henry Bergh. Elle était d’avis que cette petite fille était un être humain et, comme être humain, elle faisait partie du royaume des animaux; la société devait donc se montrer bienveillante envers les enfants aussi bien qu’envers les animaux.

C’était la première fois dans l’histoire qu’on voyait une société dire à la famille que l’enfant avait des droits et qu’il avait besoin de protection.

Voici une photo de la Liverpool Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (une société protectrice des enfants) prise
neglect had been kept in the closet for 200 or 300 years in our society until recognition that there was a problem called "neglect and abuse."

I want to deal now with a couple of the studies which prove what Hogarth said. A study of 84 prisoners in 1966 conducted by Hellman showed that 74 per cent of those people who committed aggressive crimes had a history of enuresis, firesetting and cruelty to animals. Enuresis, otherwise known as bedwetting, is a psychological symptom of stress, a nervousness of the body system reacting to stress. The mere fact that they had a history of this triad did not necessarily mean that they committed violent crimes. Twenty-eight per cent of the prisoners who had a history of enuresis, firesetting and cruelty to animals committed no violent anti-social act. However, 74 per cent of those people who had a history of this triad did not necessarily mean that they committed violent crimes. Twenty-eight per cent of the prisoners who had a history of enuresis, firesetting and cruelty to animals committed no violent anti-social act.

Clark (1967) also studied the early personal history of murderers. He found there were five factors, the first of which was severe emotional deprivation, or overt rejection in childhood. That is today what we call neglect. The parents were not with the children. Second, parental seduction, sexual seduction, and we know there is a very clear relationship between incest, sexual abuse of children, and later anti-social behaviour—in this case, adult murderers. The second, exposure to brutality and extreme violence in the home. Fourth, childhood firesetting. Fifth, cruelty to animals or other children.

We see this pattern very early. I am often asked how early. I have seen it start as early as one year old. As a matter of fact, we had a killing in Minneapolis where a two-year-old child beat a one-year-old child to death in a sandbox with a metal truck in a fight over who was going to have to truck. In that case, the children were physically abused and neglected. When children of two years or 18 months of age fight aggressively—and I have seen this happen in six cases—those children are victims of being physically abused. This pattern starts early, and it can be identified early. One of the problems with which we are faced is how to intervene in that situation. We will come back to that later.

One of the larger studies on child abuse is Dr. Lenoski's of U.C.L.A., from the Los Angeles General Hospital. This was a 1975 study, and what he found was very interesting. The study covered 674 cases of abuse, and one of his major findings was that only 3.7 per cent of the families had a pet, whereas in the general population about 36 per cent of the families have a pet. That was the first observation relating pets to child abuse.

One of the other studies is Dr. Disbrow's study from Seattle in 1977. Again, Disbrow found that there were fewer pets in...
sex. There have been a number of studies which show that girls

the homes of neglecting and abusing people, and where there were pets in the home the kids were closer to the pet. The theory is that pets are not part of the family. As a matter of fact, I have some data that suggests that you can have incidents of a husband and father being cruel to the family pet, the kids and his wife. The classic domestic quarrel would see the father kick the dog, the kids, his wife, and even the plants. Every living thing in the family is destroyed. In that type of family, the child may often attach to the pet. Because the parents are not there or are being abusive, the kids attach to the pet. Pets have a positive relationship in the development of these children. That is an area that we are just starting to look at now; that is, the importance of pets in early childhood development. The studies seem to indicate that pets may be a positive factor in the life of a child.

Next, several thoughts about the current terminology of child abuse and neglect. It is unfortunate that these two terms are often lumped together; that is to say, if you have neglect you have abuse. When we are talking about neglect, it is an omission of care, and it may be emotional, it may be physical, it may be medical, it may be nutritional. There are all these kinds of failures to provide the child with basic needs. Abuse, on the other hand, is an intent to hurt the child. That is what distinguishes it from discipline. When you are disciplining a child, you are not intending to hurt that child, you are not intending to break his arm or to cause a brain hemorrhage, and et cetera—that constitutes excess. Abuse is when there is an intent to do harm. It is an act of commission. It can be verbal assault, physical assault, and when it is repeated you have the Battered Child Syndrome.

What we are finding now is that most of the infants are not hit when they are young; rather, they are shaken. The parents' anger manifests itself in the act of shaking the infant, not hitting the infant. Most cases of sexual abuse against children are intentional. The parent, or somebody, intends to have sex with the child.

My studies point out that the emotional abuse or neglect is the primary cause of all these other forms of abuse and neglect. It is the core of the issue. We are usually dealing with the symptom—the broken arm, or a case of incest, or whatever. The basic core issue is the emotional issue, and that is the one society is hesitant to become involved in.

I also want to point out that the project or study undertaken by this committee is a very important one, and it is part of what is going on in the world today. In 1977, the World Health Organization published a booklet on mental health. Mental health is a rising concern in countries all around the world.

One of the questions with which we are faced is why, in the case of abused or neglected children, does one become a criminal and one not. There are several factors that protect an individual from these things happening, one of which is one's sex. There have been a number of studies which show that girls...
are less susceptible to childhood stresses than are boys. The males take more of the insult from psychological damage.

A second factor is the temperament of the child. Some children are more adaptable. We do not know why they are more adaptable, but some children are, and some children, in the face of deprivation, some children in concentration camps, survive. They were more adaptable, more resilient in the face of this kind of trauma.

A third factor is the isolated nature of stress. Multiple stresses potentiate damage. The more stress one has in one’s life, the greater the insult.

A fourth factor is the coping skills that one has. We know it is important to have happy experiences. Going to summer camp, or going to a relative’s, or some other happy event at a critical time in one’s life, very often determines whether or not one suffers emotional damage. A further factor is whether or not there is a good relationship with one parent. Today the question is not mothering, it is not fathering; it is parenting. One parent can do the job.

A sixth factor is schooling. It is important that successes are experienced outside the home. We know from the HeadStart Program in the United States that a good school program can help make up some of the deficiencies that are happening in the home. This is important.

Finally—and this is the whole basis of treatment and intervention and why I have a bias in my job as Professor of Maternal and Child Health—if we can improve the family circumstances early, the latter years of childhood can be spent in harmony, thereby reducing the risk to the child. So, the longer we wait to provide these services, the more damage will be occasioned to that child and other children in the family.

Several thoughts about the dynamics are required because it is important to understand the current knowledge of what is meant by the terms “neglect” and “abuse.” The current understanding is that there is an abuser, there is a child, and more and more the crisis situations in a family are important. The basic dynamic in physical abuse is role reversal. The question I ask parents is why they want children, and what we find is this concept of role reversal, which is “the interchanging of traditional role behaviours between the parent and the child, so that the child adopts some of the behaviours traditionally associated with the parents” (Flanzraid & Dunsavage, 1977).

Basically what we are finding is that the abused child is a highly valued and wanted child; the parents are having children to take care of themselves. They want their children to love them and care for them, but they cannot love them at that early age. That is called role reversal. In Dr. Lenoski’s data 25 per cent of children are named after their parents. One of the
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ses études ont démontré que les filles sont moins vulnérables au stress de l’enfance que les garçons. Psychologiquement parlant, ces derniers en sont plus affectés.

Comme deuxième facteur, on peut mentionner le tempérament de l’enfant. Certains enfants s’adaptent plus facilement; nous ne savons pas pourquoi, mais il en est ainsi. Par contre, dans une situation de privation, certains enfants vont survivre, dans des camps de concentration par exemple. C’est tout simplement qu’ils s’adaptent plus facilement, qu’ils se relèvent plus facilement de ce genre d’épreuve.


Quatrième élément, les aptitudes de l’enfant à résister à ce phénomène qu’est le stress. Tous savent qu’il est important de connaître des expériences positives comme le fait d’aller dans un camp d’été, de rendre visite à un parent, ou d’autres événements heureux à un point critique de la vie, qui font très souvent que l’enfant souffrira ou non de problèmes émotifs. Un autre facteur consiste à savoir s’il existe de bonnes relations avec les parents. Aujourd’hui, la question n’est pas de savoir si l’enfant a besoin d’une mère, ou d’un père; il a besoin d’un parent capable de l’aider.

Mentionnons comme sixième facteur, l’éducation. Il est important que l’enfant connaisse des succès à l’extérieur du foyer. D’après le Headstart Program aux États-Unis, un bon programme scolaire peut permettre de remédier aux déficiences que l’enfant connaît au foyer. Cela est très important.

Enfin—et c’est là le fondement intégral du traitement et de mon intervention, et la raison pour laquelle je devi en un peu de mon rôle à l’école maternelle et en matière d’hygiène à l’enfance—s’il est possible d’améliorer la vie familiale au tout début de l’enfance. Les dernières années de cette période pourront se dérouler dans une atmosphère d’harmonie, réduisant ainsi le risque de criminalité. Ainsi donc, plus on attendra pour offrir ces services, plus on occasionnera de problèmes à cet enfant et à ses frères et sœurs.

Il faut souvent faire appel à la dynamique parce qu’il est important de comprendre ce que l’on entend aujourd’hui par «négligence» et «mauvais traitements». Le problème est aujourd’hui perçu de la façon suivante: il y a une personne qui maltraite l’enfant, mais il y aussi l’enfant et l’on tient de plus en plus compte du fait qu’il existe une situation de crise dans la famille. Le point fondamental dans les sévices infligés aux enfants vient du renversement des rôles. Je demande aux parents pourquoi ils veulent des enfants; et la réponse que l’on me donne tourne autour de cette notion de renversement des rôles, à savoir «le renversement des comportements traditionnels entre les parents et les enfants, de sorte que l’enfant adopte certains des comportements qui ont toujours été suivis par les parents.» (Flanzraich Roman & Dunsavage, 1977).

Fondamentalement, nous découvrons que l’enfant maltraité est un enfant très désiré et sur lequel on mise beaucoup; les parents ont des enfants pour que ces derniers prennent soin d’eux. Ils veulent que leurs enfants les aiment et s’occupent d’eux, mais ils ne peuvent leur rendre cet amour réciproque au début de leur enfance. C’est ce que l’on appelle le reverse-
classical cases I had was where a family named the child Harley Davidson. Dad was a motorcyclist, so they named the child Harley Davidson, and Harley Davidson was dead by three months of age. I think daddy expected him to ride a motorcycle. There are all kinds of bizarre circumstances about how you get names. Do you know where your name came from and why it was given to you?

One of the things with alcohol, according to Estes and Heinemann (1977), is that “children in the family with alcoholism are not only forced prematurely into adult roles but also frequently are innocent victims of inadequate fulfilment of the parental role. Emotional neglect by either one or both parents is the most frequent childhood experience of such children.” One of the things that has been pointed out recently by the National Institute of Alcoholism in the United States is that when you have alcoholism in the family you have, by definition, emotional neglect, because the parent is unavailable to the child. The parent is just not there when the child needs the parent. This is what has been described by Dr. Helfer as the WAR—the World of Abnormal Rearing.

You ask the question, “Why do parents have children?” The child may be wanted or unwanted, but the abused person is highly wanted, not usually unwanted. What happens is that the parents put unrealistic expectations on the child, and that is known as role reversal. They want a child to take care of them. The child complies, but the child learns not to trust adults because the adults may be beating up on them. We know that is a very important factor because the first stage of human development, according to Erickson, is trust. You cannot relate to other people unless you trust them. So here start with trust not learned. They become very isolated; they cannot relate to other people. So what happens then is that they have a low self-esteem, they feel they are “no damn good.” They pick their friends the same way and usually end up picking their spouse the same way, and so it goes round and round, generation after generation. I think there is some good data to accept this concept.

The best study I can give you—in fact, the best scientific study—is the Disbrow study (1977) where they have 169 mass-controlled studies of those who have been abused and we have found that indeed abusing parent were abused more frequently as children.

Second, they are low in empathy. Third, they have very few close friends. Fourth, they are separated from their children. Fifth, there is role reversal. Sixth, they are more sadistic. Seventh, they have a low boiling point, a shorter fuse and they get angry very quickly. Eighth, they are strict disciplinarians; they are the boss in charge of the family. Ninth, there is low communication; they do not talk much; they act out their feelings. And this is what the violent person is doing—he is acting out his feelings rather than talking them out.

[Traduction]

ment des rôles. D'après les données de M. Lenoski, 25 p. cent des enfants reçoivent le nom de leurs parents. L'un des cas classiques que j'ai connu est celui d'un couple qui a nommé l'enfant Harley Davidson. Le père était motocycliste, il l'a donc nommé Harley Davidson, et l'enfant est mort à trois mois. Je crois que le père s'attendait à ce que l'enfant conduise une motocyclette. Il y a toutes sortes de circonstances bizarres au sujet des noms. Est-ce que vous savez d'où vient votre nom et pourquoi on vous l'a donné?

Selon Estes et Heinemann (1977), les enfants qui vivent dans une famille d'alcooliques doivent non seulement jouer prématurément des rôles d'adultes, mais ils sont aussi fréquemment les victimes innocentes de leurs parents qui ne prennent pas leurs responsabilités. La négligence émotion de l'un ou l'autre parent constitue l'expérience la plus fréquente de ces enfants. L'un des problèmes qu'a soulevé dernièrement le National Institute of Alcoholism aux États-Unis, c'est que l'alcoolisme dans la famille, entraîne, par définition, la négligence émotion parce que les parents ne sont pas disponibles. Ils sont tout simplement absents lorsque l'enfant a besoin d'eux. C'est un monde des relations perturbées selon la description de M. Helfer.

Si vous demandez aux parents pourquoi ils ont des enfants, ils vous répondront que l'enfant est peut-être désiré ou non, mais l'enfant maltraité est très désiré. Ce qui se produit, c'est que les parents s'attendent à des choses irréalisables de la part de l'enfant, et c'est ce qui l'on convient d'appeler le renversement des rôles. Les parents veulent un enfant qui prend soin d'eux. L'enfant se soumet à ce rôle, mais il apprend à ne pas faire confiance aux adultes parce que les adultes essayent peut-être de profiter de lui. Nous savons que c'est là un facteur très important parce que selon Erickson, le stade préliminaire du développement humain est la confiance. Il est impossible de s'identifier à d'autres personnes si on ne leur fait pas confiance. Ainsi donc, nous avons ici un problème de méfiance. Les enfants s'isolent énormément, ils ne peuvent s'identifier à d'autres personnes. Ce qui se passe alors, c'est que les enfants ont très peu de respect de soi, ils ont l'impression qu'ils sont inutiles. Ils choisissent ainsi leurs amis de la même façon, finalement leur conjoint et il en va ainsi de génération en génération. Je crois que les preuves sont suffisamment bonnes pour que l'on puisse accepter cette idée.

La meilleure étude que je puis vous citer—et même, la meilleure étude scientifique—est celle de Disbrow (1977), qui comporte 169 études de cas répartis dans la masse de personnes qui avaient subi de mauvais traitements et nous avons découvert qu'effectivement les parents brutaux avaient très souvent été maltraités lorsqu'ils étaient enfants.

Deuxièmement, ils ont une faible empathie. Troisièmement, ils ont très peu d'amis proches. Quatrièmement, ils sont séparés de leurs enfants. Cinquièmement, il y a eu un renversement des rôles. Sixièmement, ils sont plus sadiques. Septièmement, ils sont prompts à se fâcher, il leur manque de la patience. Huitièmement, ils sont très stricts en matière de discipline; ils sont les patrons de la famille. Neuvièmement, il y a peu de communication; ils ne parlent pas beaucoup; ils expriment leurs sentiments par des actions. Et c'est ce que fait la
The last point is very interesting. It is the first physiological data that such people have high blood pressure and a high pulse rate. This manifests the high anxiety that they have. You find them sitting on the edge of their chair. Neglecting energy to take care of themselves, so how can they take care of their children? Secondly, they got along poorly with their own parents when they themselves were children. There was poor modelling. The third point is that they have more problems with attachment. The whole question of bonding which the committee has been discussing is more related to problems of neglect than it is to problems of abuse. Neglect is a problem of attachment. The fourth point is they have poor satisfaction with the way disagreements are handled in their own families.

On the point of unwanted children—and I have studies only from the United States—we find that 22 per cent of all the children born in the United States are unwanted at the time of their birth by one or more of the parents. The more kids you have, the more there are unwanted. I have five children, and I think if I had another there would be more of a chance that I might not want that child because of various pressures, particularly when it costs $50,000 to raise a child from zero to 18. And that is just the economic cost of raising children today.

So what they are finding is a rise in the rate of illegitimacy, and what they are finding too is that the high illegitimate birth rate correlates with a high homicidal rate (Bumpass & Westoff, Science, 169, 1970).

One question that somebody asked to discuss was the impact of abortion and there is one study I want to show you from Sweden which was made in 1966 (Fossman & Goteburg, Acta Psych Scand, 42, 1966). This deals with the cases of 120 children who were born after the state refused to give an abortion. They followed the children up for ten years. This study again speaks more to neglect. What they found is that if the child was born after the mother had requested an abortion and was denied, then they also found more delinquency—18 per cent as against 8 per cent. You find more problems in a school failure; only 14 per cent of them stayed around for further education as opposed to 33 per cent. But it is not an all-or-nothing phenomenon. Forty-eight per cent of the children in the denied group did not have any problems versus 68 per cent free of problems in the control group. Again, in this whole business one has to be very careful because there are very few hundred per cent relationships. The data certainly suggests that if society moves to restricting abortions then we are going to have more neglect on our hands. In other words, we are going to have more social problems, more delinquency, more school failures, according to the data we have.

[Traduction]

La dernière chose est très intéressant. C'est la première donnée psychologique: ces personnes ont le pouls rapide et souffrent d'hypertension, phénomènes qui trahissent l'angoisse qu'elles éprouvent. Elles s'assoient sur le bord de leur chaise. Les parents négligents d'autre part, ont le pouls faible. Si vous avez déjà rencontré des personnes du genre, vous avez sans doute remarqué qu'elles avaient à peine suffisamment d'énergie pour prendre soin d'elles-mêmes, alors comment pourraient-elles s'occuper de leurs enfants? Deuxièmement, elles ne s'entendaient pas très bien avec leurs propres parents lorsqu'elles étaient elles-mêmes enfants. Elles n'ont pas eu de modèle fort à imiter. Troisièmement, elles éprouvent plus de difficulté à s'attacher. Toute la question des liens que le Comité a traitée est beaucoup plus reliée aux problèmes de la négligence que de ceux causés par les mauvais traitements. La négligence est un problème d'attachement. Quatrièmement, elles retirent peu de satisfaction de la façon dont les mésententes sont réglées dans leurs propres familles.

Au sujet des enfants non désirés—et je me base uniquement sur des études provenant des États-Unis—nous découvrons que 22 p. cent de tous les enfants nés aux États-Unis ne sont pas désirés au moment de leur naissance par un des parents ou les deux. Plus il y a d'enfants dans une famille, moins ils sont désirés. J'ai cinq enfants, et je crois que si j'en avais un autre, il y aurait plus de chance que je ne veuille pas cet enfant en raison de diverses pressions, plus particulièrement, si l'on sait qu'il en coûte $50,000 pour élever un enfant de sa naissance à l'âge de 18 ans. Et cela représente uniquement le coût, sur le plan économique de l'éducation d'un enfant aujourd'hui.

On découvre donc une hausse du taux des naissances illégitimes qui correspond à un taux élevé d'homicides (Bumpass et Westoff, Science, 169, 1970).

Quelqu'un a proposé comme sujet de discussion l'incidence de l'avortement. Il y a une étude que je désire vous montrer à ce sujet. Elle a été effectuée en Suède en 1966 par Fossman et Goteburg, et s'intitule ACTA Psych SCAND, 42. Elle traite des cas de 120 enfants qui sont nés parce que l'État avait refusé d'accorder un avortement. On a suivi ces enfants jusqu'à l'âge de dix ans. Cette étude, elle aussi, traite davantage de la négligence. On a découvert que si les enfants naisaient parce que la mère n'avait pu obtenir l'avortement demandé, il y avait alors un taux plus élevé de délinquance—18 p. cent par rapport à 8 p. cent. On note également plus de problèmes d'échecs scolaires; seulement 14 p. cent d'entre eux ont poursuivi leurs études par opposition à 33 p. cent. Mais il ne s'agit pas d'un phénomène absolu. Quarante-huit pour cent des enfants du groupe dont l'avortement avait été refusé n'avaient aucun problème par rapport à 62 p. cent des enfants sans problème du groupe-témoin. Répétons-le, dans toute cette affaire, il faut être très prudent car il y a très peu de rapports où l'on ne trouve pas un certain chevauchement. D'après les données, on peut certainement déduire que si la société limite de plus en plus l'avortement, nous allons avoir plus de problèmes de négligence sur les bras. En d'autres termes, nous
A summary of the dynamics is very important for the committee. When somebody uses the word "neglect" it means generally that the children are unwanted and you have all the problems that follow from that. The parents never got close to their kids, never attached. Secondly, the abused child is a highly valued child because of role reversal. So that abortion or family planning will have no impact on abuse. It is important to keep this in mind, because certain people have used this kind of information to make the case for or against family planning.

The world in which these kids grow up has been best described in Harold Martin's book, The Abused Child. This points out first of all that it is a non-nurturing world. The children are not having their needs met, and, in fact, they are taking care of their parents most of the time.

Second, there are restrictions and opportunities to learn; they are just not taken places or talked to. Third, there is inadequate stimulation or support. Fourth, they are in danger whether they perform or not. They may be verbally chastised. Fifth, their energies are pre-empted by survival and they have a lot of anxiety.

It has been said over and over again by many authors, and in my own study of about 500 families, that children who grow up in an abusing home have a "desert" of unmet needs, and a "jungle" of confusion caused by the attack of those persons (parents) that they are dependent upon. The unpredictability and the unsafe environment forces the children into an uneven sequence of development that, at that time, serves as a survival environment. In other words, the children do not grow and develop properly, being in an abused and neglected environment.

One of the things that as therapists we have to deal with is that the most difficult people in the world to deal with are persons who have been abused and neglected. First of all, they do not trust anybody; they are mistrustful. Second, they have been shamed so they have low self-esteem. Thirds, they have a role reversal. They are mad and angry at their parents for having to take care of them through their own childhood. Fourth, they have many dependency needs and so they manipulate the adults around them. Fifth, they have a lack of knowledge.

One of the things characteristic of juvenile delinquents, or murderers, is that they do not have common sense. The same is true of abused children. They do not have common sense. They do not know what the rules are. They have a lot of denial. They deny that they have done wrong. They do not know what the values are. They do not have an understanding of the world.
around them. They do not have much of a sense of humour either. Indeed, one of the things that characterizes delinquents is a lack of sense of humour. And they do not know what the boundaries are, or what the rules are. They cannot say no. They often go off with gangs and get into trouble because of these kinds of dynamics. There is a lack of permission to talk about it in their family and they have a lot of fantasies. They make up a lot of stories. As a matter of fact, there may be doubling of the personalities. They develop other personalities around them. They do not have much of a sense of humour in their family and they have a lot of fantasies. They blame other people for the things that are happening in their own lives.

One of the reasons for their violence is the frustration and the rage that they are carrying around inside them. They are angry at their parents and at the world: "How come nobody came in to help when I was a young kid?"

Another factor is life crises. The best book on that is the Justice and Justice book, The Abusing Family. They show that these families that physically abuse have relentless life crises. There is one crisis right after another. They find that they cannot readjust, that there is what is called a type of "future shock". They are kind of numbed and overwhelmed by all these things coming at the family. In their study they found that the distinguishing factor was change, not economic or environmental stress.

There is no data to substantiate that neglect and abuse occur more in poverty. As a matter of fact, it is just reported more in poverty because they are more vulnerable. It occurs in the whole socio-economic spectrum. It is just hidden better. That's all. It is what I call families that look good but are feeling terrible. There are many families that look very good but which are carrying around a lot of these kinds of problems.

One other study that was done in Boston on the basis of treating these families, and published last year by Dr. Newberger (Pediatrics, 1977) shows that abusing families have much more stress operating. Whereas they could not separate out those children having accidents and poisonings from just normal kids coming into the emergency, nevertheless they were from situations where the father had left home, the house had burned down, the toilet wasn't working, they were out of a job, and so on. There are more and more of these stresses until you reach the point of frustration.

One theory is that anyone can become an abusing person, if he gets stressed enough to get out of control with his children. As I said, I, having five children, have gotten out of control with my kids. I have crossed that line sometimes, but I know when to call for help. I know what the boundaries are. That is

entoure. Ils n'ont pas non plus le sens de l'humour. En effet, une des choses qui caracterise les delinquent, c'est le manque du sens de l'humour. Et ils ne connaissent pas les limites, c'est-à-dire les regles. Ils ne peuvent dire non. Souvent, ils se joignent à des bandes et ont des problemes à cause de cela. Ils n'ont pas la permission d'en parler au sein de leur famille et ils vivent dans un monde d'idées fantasques. Ils inventent toutes sortes d'histoires. En fait, il peut y avoir dédoublement de la personnalité. Il y a une dissociation de la personnalité qui leur permet de répondre à leurs besoins qui ne sont pas satisfait dans leurs familles. Ils font beaucoup de projection. Ils blâment les autres pour des choses qui se produisent dans leur propre vie.

Une des raisons expliquant leur violence provient de la frustration et de la colère qu'ils ont au cœur. Ils sont fâchés contre leurs parents et contre le monde. Ils se demandent pourquoi personne n'est venu à leur aide lorsqu'ils étaient jeune enfant.

Les périodes de crise constituent un autre facteur. Le meilleur livre écrit à ce sujet s'intitule The Abusing Family, par Justice et Justice. Ils démontrent que les familles qui infligent de mauvais traitements physiques aux enfants traversent une série d'implacables crises durant leur vie. Ces crises se succèdent l'une après l'autre, ils ne peuvent s'en remettre et ils sont sous l'effet d'un genre de choc permanent. Ils sont dans un état d'engourdissement et comme écrasés sous le poids des crises familiales. Au cours de leur étude, ils ont prouvé que le facteur qui pouvait les distinguer était le changement, et non le facteur économique ou la tension due au milieu.

Il n'existe aucune donnée prouvant que la négligence et les mauvais traitements se produisent plus souvent dans les familles pauvres. En fait, ces faits sont rapportés plus souvent dans les familles pauvres parce que celles-ci sont plus vulnérables. Mais ils sont susceptibles de se produire dans toute l'échelle socio-économique. C'est qu'ils sont plus cachés dans les autres milieux. C'est tout. C'est ce que j'appelle les familles bien, selon les apparences, mais qui ont de graves problèmes. Il existe de nombreuses familles qui semblent être de très bonnes familles mais qui éprouvent un grand nombre de ces problèmes.

Une autre étude qui a été effectuée à Boston pour le traitement de ces familles et qui a été publiee l'année derniere par le Dr Newberger (Pediatrics, 1977) démontre que les familles qui infligent des sévices aux enfants sont celles où il existe le plus de tension. Tandis qu'on ne pouvait faire une distinction entre les enfants ayant subi un accident ou un empoisonnement des enfants normaux se présentant à la clinique d'urgence, il existait cependant des situations où le père avait abandonné la famille, la maison avait été brûlée complètement, les toilettes ne fonctionnaient pas, ils étaient sans emploi, etc. Ces tensions s'accumulent jusqu'à ce qu'elles atteignent le point de frustration.

Une théorie veut que toute personne soit sujette à infliger de mauvais traitements aux enfants si elle a suffisamment de problèmes pour perdre le contrôle de soi avec ses enfants. Comme je l'ai dit, moi-même, qui ai cinq enfants, j'ai quelquefois perdu le contrôle avec mes enfants. J'ai parfois dépassé les
On the question of attachment, let me relate to you recent data on this subject. If you do not attach the mother, father or some other caretaker to that child, which is a process which normally occurs at birth but may go as late as nine weeks, the chance of physical abuse is 23 to 31 per cent of that group. Second, there are more behaviour problems. Third, there are more divorces in those families. Fourth, more babies are voluntarily relinquished for adoption. Fifth, it is the leading cause of failure to thrive—25 to 41 per cent—which is more of a neglect situation.

Another study was published in March, 1978 by Kempe. It concerned 100 children. After looking at their families, at the fathers and mothers of the children, after looking at them in birth and after interviewing the families, they judged the parents might be at “high risk” for abusing their kids. They put 50 in one group with regular care—that is, going to the doctor every two weeks, six weeks, and so on—and 50 in another group in which they put a health visitor. They found that in the group that had the health visitor there was no physical abuse, whereas in the other group five of the 50 kids were seriously injured.

The predictability of this is what is so exciting for society, because it is the first time we have had a handle on this. They could predict with 80 per cent accuracy who were going to abuse or neglect their kids. Eighty per cent! I have given Senator McGrand a copy of the questionnaire they used, for purposes of your records. Using that questionnaire and by watching the children they were able to predict within 80 per cent accuracy.

They found, apart from the five cases of child abuse, five cases of failure to thrive in the same group, and the accident rate was quite high. Twenty-two out of the 50 children had repeated accidents, usually around the head and face, as opposed to 4 per cent in the group with the health visitor. In other words, they were able to cut down on accidents, on failure to thrive and on abuse. There was no correlation with immunization, because they were getting physician care in both groups. In the conclusion of the paper Dr. Kempe said that the cost for the support group was $12,000 for society to prevent five cases of severe abuse, five cases of failure to thrive and 18 accidents. When you compare that to the cost of hospitalizing and treating one abused child, that is pretty cheap, because just one case of child abuse could cost $10,000 or more.
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[Traduction]

En ce qui concerne la question des liens affectifs, permettez-moi de vous faire part des données récentes à ce sujet. Si ni la mère, ni le père, ou une autre personne ne forme de liens affectifs avec l'enfant, ce qui doit normalement se faire au moment de la naissance mais qui peut se produire aussi tard que neuf semaines après, le risque que les enfants appartenant à ce groupe soient soumis à de mauvais traitements est de 23 à 31 p. 100. En second lieu, il existe dans ce groupe un plus grand nombre de problèmes de comportement. Troisièmement, il y a un plus grand nombre de divorces dans ces familles. Quatrièmement, un plus grand nombre de bébés sont volontairement laissés à l'adoption. Cinquièmement, c'est une des causes principales qui empêche l'enfant de bien se développer—de 25 à 41 p. 100, c'est-à-dire qu'il s'agit d'une situation qui équivaut à la négligence.

Une autre étude a été publiée en mars 1978 par Kempe. Elle a été effectuée en observant 100 enfants. Après avoir étudié la famille, le père et la mère de ces enfants, à partir du moment de la naissance, et après avoir interviewé ces familles, ils ont jugé quels étaient les parents représentant un risque élevé en ce qui concerne les sévices infligés aux enfants. Ils ont placé cinquante d'entre eux dans un groupe recevant des soins réguliers, c'est-à-dire une visite chez le médecin toutes les deux ou six semaines, etc, et cinquante dans un autre groupe recevant la visite d'un représentant du ministère de la Santé. Ils ont découvert que dans ce dernier groupe aucun sévices n'avait été infligé aux enfants, tandis que dans l'autre groupe cinq des cinquante enfants avaient été blessés gravement.

Le fait de pouvoir prédire ces cas représente un grand pas en avant pour la société, parce que c'est la première fois que ceci a été fait. Ils ont pu prédire avec une exactitude allant jusqu'à 80 p. 100, quels étaient les enfants qui seraient victimes de négligence ou de mauvais traitements. J'ai donné au Sénateur McGrand un exemplaire du questionnaire qu'ils ont utilisé, pour vos dossiers. En se servant de ce questionnaire et en observant les enfants, ils ont pu faire des prédictions avec une exactitude de 80 p. 100.

Ils ont découvert, outre les cinq enfants victimes de mauvais traitements, cinq cas dans le même groupe qui accusaient un manque de développement, ainsi qu'un taux d'accident très élevé. Vingt-deux des cinquante enfants ont eu plus d'un accident, ordinairement à la tête ou au visage, par rapport à 4 p. 100 dans le groupe recevant la visite du représentant du ministère de la Santé. En d'autres mots, ils étaient en mesure de réduire le nombre d'accidents ainsi que de cas de régression et de sévices. Il n'y avait aucun lien entre ces cas et la prévention, puisque les deux groupes étaient suivis par un médecin. En guise de conclusion, M. Kempe disait que le maintien de ce groupe de soutien coûtait $12,000 à la société, dans le but d'empêcher cinq cas de sévices graves, cinq cas de régressions et 18 accidents. Si vous comparez ce montant avec les coûts d'hospitalisation et de traitement d'un seul enfant maltraité, vous constaterez qu'il n'est pas très élevé, car il en
The more important thing is the long-term outcome. It is not just the immediate, isolated, physical trauma that I am concerned about; it is the whole disruption of the parent-child interaction that causes devastating damage to the victim, the abused child. That is my major concern.

It has been pointed out by Schmitt and Kempe in Nelson's *Textbook of Pediatrics*, 1975, that "of the children who have been physically abused without intervention, 5 per cent are killed, 35 per cent are seriously re-injured and, moreover, the untreated families tend to produce children who will grow up to be juvenile delinquents and murderers as well as child batterers of the next generation." In other words, not only is there this initial mortality, which is high, but it is the harm it does to the kids who survive.

Ruth Kempe, in 1977, said, "By far the most disturbing and consistent finding and observation of young children who have been abused and neglected is the delay, or arrest, of their development." It is the uneven development that happens. We can start to see this very early. This was pointed out again by Ruth Kempe. In the first six months of life we can start to see the child with feeding problems. We start to see the child with colic, with the irritating cry, and they may start to show a delay in the motor development.

I have to deal with facts, and I can start as a pediatrician where I teach nurse practitioners and young physicians to be concerned about the early feeding patterns, the early problems we start to see. From six to twelve months these kids cannot discriminate their environment. They are very apathetic. They may have a "frozen watchfulness." They will sit and look at the corner of the room for long periods of time. One of the things that is very striking is that these kids cannot play, because they do not trust anyone; they cannot become quiet. Then, pre-school children, when you are with them, are preoccupied, watching and expecting you to punish them. They are anxious and fearful. They have speech delay, they avoid feelings, and they start to act out an aggressive mode of coping very early. In the early school-age child, IQs are depressed.

They range from 76 to 117. Again, we find difficulties in trusting others, a lack of capacity to enjoy play, an inability to show pleasure, a poor self-image, preoccupation with fears, and delays in maturation of speech and verbal expression of feelings.

One recent quote from Dr. Kempe (March 1978) is:

At the Kennedy Mental Retardation Center, 20 per cent of all retarded and cerebral palsied children examined were found to be victims of abuse. At a child guidance clinic the number is even larger.

[Traduction]

Le facteur le plus important est le résultat à long terme. Ce qui m’inquiète, ce n’est pas uniquement le traumatisme physique immédiat et isolé, mais surtout la rupture des rapports entre les parents et l’enfant, laquelle peut entraîner des conséquences néfastes pour l’enfant maltraité.

Smith et Kempe mentionnent dans le *Textbook of Pediatrics*, 1975, de Nelson, que «des tous les enfants qui ont été victimes de sévices sans qu’il y ait eu aucune intervention, 5% ont été tués et 35% ont été sérieusement blessés; en outre, les enfants issus de familles qui n’ont pas reçu l’aide de spécialistes ont une tendance marquée à sombrer dans la délinquance ou la criminalité et ils constitueront vraisemblablement la prochaine génération de parents brutaux.» Autrement dit, il n’y a pas seulement le taux de mortalité élevé dont il faille tenir compte, mais également les inconvénients subis par l’enfant maltraité qui ne succombe pas.

En 1977, Ruth Kempe mentionnait que «dans le cas des jeunes enfants maltraités et négligés, la constante d’ailleurs alarmante qui causait le plus de problèmes se traduisait sans contredit par le ralentissement ou l’interruption du développement de l’enfant.» Il s’agit d’un développement irrégulier. Nous pouvons déceler ce problème très tôt et ce fait a été encore une fois souligné par Ruth Kempe. Au cours des six premiers mois de la vie, il est possible de déterminer si l’enfant a des problèmes d’alimentation. Le cas échéant, il souffre de coliques accompagnées de pleurs agaçants et son développement moteur peut être retardé.

Je dois toutefois m’en tenir aux faits. Étant pédiatre, j’enseigne aux infirmières et aux jeunes médecins à se préoccuper des méthodes initiales d’alimentation, des premiers problèmes qui nous déclenchons. Entre six et douze mois, ces jeunes enfants ne peuvent pas distinguer les divers éléments de leur environnement. Ils sont fort apathiques. Ils peuvent «avoir un regard fixe». Assis, ils regarderont un coin de la chambre pendant longtemps. Fait étonnant entre tous, ces jeunes enfants ne peuvent pas jouer puisqu’ils ne font confiance à personne; ils sont également toujours agités. Quant aux enfants d’âge préscolaire, ils sont préoccupés et s’attendent toujours à être punis. Ils sont anxieux et craintifs. Leur faculté de parole se développe plus lentement, ils ne manifestent aucun sentiment et commencent déjà très tôt à faire preuve d’agressivité. Dans le cas des jeunes enfants d’âge scolaire, les quotients intellectuels sont bas, variant entre 76 et 117. Encore une fois, ils font difficilement confiance à autrui, ne peuvent pas prendre plaisir au jeu ni manifester de satisfaction, ont d’eux-mêmes une image peu reluisante, sont angoissés et accusent enfin un retard en matière d’Élocution et d’expression verbale des sentiments.

En mars 1978, M. Kempe mentionnait ce qui suit:

Au Kennedy Mental Retardation Center, l’examen de tous les enfants arrêtés et souffrant de paralysie cérébrale a révélé que 20% d’entre eux avaient été victimes de sévices. Dans une clinique d’aide à l’enfance, ce pourcentage était même plus élevé.
When someone tells you that in a school system they do not have any abused or neglected kids, or there are no kids who are retarded from abuse or neglect, they have not asked the right questions, because it is there. It’s across the board.

In Martin’s book, The Abused Child, he states:

Abused children are at a considerable risk for having learning disorders in schools than their non-abused peers. School personnel have reported that children assigned to education in handicapped classes are over-represented by abused and neglected children.

From studies I have done in our community, from 80 per cent to 100 per cent of all kids receiving special education have associated histories of abuse and neglect.

I teach teachers about abuse and neglect, and in the classrooms where the kids are having trouble they all come from alcoholic families, broken homes, or suffer from overt abuse and neglect. It is striking. I ask them—and I will come back to this point—How can you learn when your energies are all going to survival? How is the school going to teach reading, writing and arithmetic when they are carrying the pain of being a parent in their own home, when they have to deal with the family? That is a real problem and a very clear message.

One of the research projects that is most exciting is by Torey Hayden who has studied kids who do not talk in school.

From studies I have done in our community, from 80 per cent to 100 per cent of all kids receiving special education have associated histories of abuse and neglect.

I teach teachers about abuse and neglect, and in the classrooms where the kids are having trouble they all come from alcoholic families, broken homes, or suffer from overt abuse and neglect. It is striking. I ask them—and I will come back to this point—How can you learn when your energies are all going to survival? How is the school going to teach reading, writing and arithmetic when they are carrying the pain of being a parent in their own home, when they have to deal with the family? That is a real problem and a very clear message.

What Torey found—she did not know much about child abuse. She called me up and said, “Dr. ten Bensel, what I found, after studying these kids, is that 83 per cent were unplanned pregnancies, and the biggest correlation is that 75 per cent of all the kids who would not talk in school were abused or neglected; and they were usually hit in the mouth, and often were sexually abused.

That is an incredible statistic. They all come from broken homes. There were only two children who were with their natural parents, and most were from families with one natural parent. Ten children were in the care of guardian homes.

She has extended her study to show there is 100 per cent correlation between kids who do not talk and act out aggressively—100 per cent of them were severely abused. They all come from alcoholic families. It is a very high association.

These kids do not talk, and they do not get any help in the classroom because they are not talking. The kids who get...
attention in the classroom are those who are acting out, who are hitting other kids. The kid who is not talking really is more vulnerable.

So my conclusion is: How can children learn if their primary energy goes toward survival? The children's energy is pre-empted by other priorities such as survival, taking care of the parent's pain, and they have been placed in a position of role reversal where they are the parent of their own parents.

These kids are angry. When I asked them, "Did you take care of your parents when you were a child?" they said, "Yes, I took care of them. They were drunk, and I was taking care of them." That is role reversal, and it is very important to understand.

Murray Straus has said (Sexual Inequality, Cultural Norms 1976):
If one is truly concerned with the level of violence in America, the place to look is in the home rather than in the street.

I am sure that is the same in Canada or any country you want to look at. As Richard Gelless said:
The family is the training ground for violence.
The data to substantiate this is rather striking. He went on to say:

How much violence you experience as a child is how violent you will be as an adult. There is a direct relationship. The more you beat up kids, the more violent they are going to be.

Buttons, in a study in 1974, said that there is a near perfect correlation between the amount and severity of physical punishment suffered by a child during the ages of 2 and 12, and the amount and severity of adolescent antisocial aggressiveness displayed by the same child.

With regard to child murderers, if you look at children who kill, you find that a child as young as five can experience homicidal rage and plan to carry out a first degree murder. The key thing that I want to point out is that, in children who murder, they find that they often take care of themselves and their siblings at a very young age, and often their parents as well.

These are authors writing about the stuff who do not know anything about child abuse; and they are describing classic cases. If you read the psychiatric literature, you find they are describing classic cases of child abuse in trying to explain these murder situations. Children who murder often act out aggression that their parents subconsciously wished to do themselves. In other words, they are picking up the messages from their parents and acting them out.

The studies that support the 100 per cent relationship between child abuse and adult behaviour reveal that all violent juvenile delinquents have been abused children. In the studies I have done in Minneapolis, I have never met a violent juvenile delinquent who was not abused as a child. I am not talking about status offences; I am talking about arson, murder, carrying a dangerous weapon, and so on. Secondly, all of the punishment suffered by a child during the ages of 2 and 12, and the correlation between the amount and severity of physical punishment suffered by a child during the ages of 2 and 12, and the amount and severity of adolescent antisocial aggressiveness displayed by the same child.

With regard to child murderers, if you look at children who kill, you find that a child as young as five can experience homicidal rage and plan to carry out a first degree murder. The key thing that I want to point out is that, in children who murder, they find that they often take care of themselves and their siblings at a very young age, and often their parents as well.

These are authors writing about the stuff who do not know anything about child abuse; and they are describing classic cases. If you read the psychiatric literature, you find they are describing classic cases of child abuse in trying to explain these murder situations. Children who murder often act out aggression that their parents subconsciously wished to do themselves. In other words, they are picking up the messages from their parents and acting them out.

The studies that support the 100 per cent relationship between child abuse and adult behaviour reveal that all violent juvenile delinquents have been abused children. In the studies I have done in Minneapolis, I have never met a violent juvenile delinquent who was not abused as a child. I am not talking about status offences; I am talking about arson, murder, carrying a dangerous weapon, and so on. Secondly, all of the

Voici ce que j'en conclus: comment les enfants peuvent-ils apprendre lorsque toutes leurs énergies sont axées sur leur survie? Leurs énergies sont aussi affaiblies par d'autres problèmes comme le fait de subir les conséquences des malheurs des parents. Ils sont dans une situation où les rôles sont inversés: ils sont les parents de leurs propres parents.

Ces enfants sont coléreux. Lorsque je leur demandais si, étant jeunes, ils avaient pris soin de leurs parents, ils répondaient: «Oui, j'ai pris soin d'eux. Ils buvaient». Les rôles étaient inversés et c'est ce qu'il importe de comprendre.

Selon Murray Straus (Sexual Inequality, Cultural Norms, 1976):
Pour vraiment situer l'ampleur de la violence en Amérique, il faut examiner la cellule familiale plutôt que le milieu urbain.

Je suis convaincu que la même chose est vraie au Canada et partout ailleurs. Comme le dit Richard Gelles:
La violence se développe dans le milieu familial.

Il existe énormément de données pour illustrer cette idée:

La violence vécue dans l'enfance se reflètera dans la vie adulte. Il y a un rapport quantitatif direct entre les services subis par l'enfant et l'agressivité qu'il manifesterà par la suite.

Dans une étude faite en 1974, A. Buttons montrait qu'il existe un rapport presque parfait entre la quantité et la sévérité des punitions corporelles subies par un enfant entre deux et douze ans et l'ampleur et la sévérité de l'agressivité antisociale qu'il présentera à l'adolescence.

Quant à la criminalité infantile dès l'âge de 5 ans, les enfants peuvent manifester des rages homicides, et se proposer même de perpétrer un crime. Un élément essentiel que je tiens à signaler, c'est que l'on constate que très souvent, à un très jeune âge les enfants homicides se sont occupés d'eux-mêmes et de leurs frères et sœurs parfois même de leurs parents.

Ces auteurs parlent de la question alors qu'ils ne sont pas spécialistes de l'enfance maltraitée, et ils décrivent des exemples classiques. Des écrits de psychiatres décrivent des cas classiques d'enfance maltraités pour essayer d'expliquer cette catégorie de criminalité. Souvent les enfants homicides manifestent une agressivité que leurs parents voulaient inconsciemment extérioriser. En d'autres termes, ils reprennent les messages de leurs parents pour les vivre.

Les études qui établissent le rapport absolu entre la violence vécue par l'enfant et le comportement adulte montrent que tous les délinquants juvéniles violents ont été des enfants maltraités. Dans les études que j'ai faites à Minneapolis, je n'ai jamais eu de cas de délinquant juvénile violent qui n'avait pas été maltraité dans son enfance. Je ne parle pas d'infractions au civil, mais de pyromanie, de meurtre, de port d'armes.
Thirdly, all assassins, or individuals who have attempted assassinations in the United States during the past 20 years had been victims of child abuse (Gelles). There is 100 per cent correlation. That is quite a toll for society to pay for not intervening. It is just incredible, but the data that there is striking.

The first study ever done on murders and childhood experiences was in 1958, in Minnesota. Duncan studied six adult murders. They found that all six male prisoners convicted of first degree murder came from middle-class homes, which were respected by the community. But all suffered brutality during childhood by one parent with the compliant acquiescence of the other. They were all families that looked good — middle-class families. Where did these murders come from? They were all beaten as kids. That was before child abuse was even described as an entity; that was 1958.

Sedin and Blomgren in 1975 studied 10 adolescents who murdered, versus 10 who threatened, versus 10 adolescents used as controls. They pointed out significant findings related to homicide included unfavourable home in eight out of 10 cases; parental brutality in six out of 10 cases; exposure to violence or murder within their own family in five out of 10 cases; sexual seduction by parent in four cases; and, on the other hand, strict religious values, sexual inhibition in the family, in five cases.

What stands out in these studies again is the high correlation — these are adolescents who murder — with parental brutality or sexual seduction. Other studies in this area by Smith, 1975, quoted:

Characteristically these parents suffer early experience of deprivation which results in underdeveloped ego and a vulnerability to outbursts of violent aggression.

Again, Bender, Easson and Stenhilder, went on to described the stereotype of the homicidal adolescent as an unwanted child with an underdeveloped ego which resulted from oral and material deprivation. I could sit here and quote you study after study by clinical research psychiatrists and psychologists which, in their own words, restabiliated these relationships.

In their study, Easson and Stenhilder, 1969, studied eight boys who were guilty of murderous assault. They all came from normal families in all other aspects except they had been habitually beaten by a parent. That is the only thing that separated those two families. Dr. Frazier, Director of Columbia University Psychiatric Institute, spoke in his study of murderers who had been victims of remorseless physical brutality when they were children. On and on the record goes.

[Text]
criminals at San Quentin prison who have been studied had violent upbringing as children (Gelles).

[Traduction]dangereuses, et ainsi de suite. En outre, tous les criminels étudiés à la prison de San Quentin ont eu une enfance très marquée par la violence (Gellers).

En troisième lieu, tous les meurtriers ou toutes les personnes qui ont essayé de commettre des meurtres aux États-Unis au cours des vingt dernières années ont subi des sévices dans leur enfance (Gellers). Le rapport est absolu. La société paye extrêmement cher son attitude de laisser-faire. La chose paraît incroyable, mais tous ces exemples sont probants.


En 1975, Sedin et Blomgren ont étudié le cas de dix adolescents homicides, par rapport à dix autres qui ont proféré des menaces de mort, et à dix autres encore utilisés comme normes. Ils ont signalé des conclusions intéressantes au sujet des homicides: dans 8 cas sur 10, un milieu familial défavorable; des parents brutaux dans 6 cas sur 10; dans la moitié des cas il y avait une exposition à la violence au crime dans le milieu familial; dans 4 cas, il y avait séduction sexuelle par un des parents; et par ailleurs, dans 5 cas, les familles avaient des valeurs religieuses strictes et étaient empreintes d'inhibitions sexuelles.

Là encore, dans le cas d'adolescents homicides, ces études établissent le rapport étroit entre leur crime et la brutalité ou la séduction sexuelle exercée par leurs parents. Dans une étude entreprise en 1975, Smith déclarait:

Chose caracteristique, ces parents ont souffert de privations à un très jeune âge, ont une personnalité sous-développée et sont portés à des excès de violence.

Autre exemple, Bender, Easson et Stenhilder ont décrit le stéréotype de l'adolescent homicide comme étant un enfant non souhaité, avec une personnalité sous-développée, qui est le résultat de privations orales et maternelles. Je pourrais vous citer ici énormément d'études sur la recherche clinique faite par des psychiatres et des psychologues, qui expliquent ces rapports dans leurs propres termes.

En 1969, Easson et Stenhilder ont étudié le cas de 8 garçons coupables de voies de fait suivies de meurtre. Ils étaient tous issus de familles normales à tous égards, si ce n'est que l'un des parents leur infligait à l'occasion des corrections physiques sévères. C'est la seule chose qui en faisait des familles différentes de la normale. M. Frazier, directeur de l'Institut psychia- trique de l'Université de Columbia, a parlé dans son étude de criminels qui avaient été victimes de brutalités physiques impitoyables lorsqu'ils étaient enfants. Les exemples à cet égard abondent.
Silver, Dublin and Lourie, in their article in 1969, “Does violence breed violence?”, after studying three generations of families of abused children, concluded, “Children battered become tomorrow’s murderers”. They claimed that the child has an unusual degree of hostility towards parents and towards the world in general. How are you going to be kept in control by society when you have never learned trust from your parents? That is the key thing in the value system.

Before this meeting, I was talking to Senator McGrand about the issue of morality. All countries who have survived have had two critical issues in regards to their own morals. Firstly, you have to be humane to other individuals and living things. You do not survive unless you are. Secondly, people are responsible for people. The studies show we have children who are growing up in an environment where they are brutally assaulted. They cannot have learned humaneness because nobody ever helped them, nobody ever intervened. There are signs of an amoral society when abuse becomes that severe. In violence breed.

If you look at the problem of sex murders, in Timinick’s article of 1977, you find that they all came from broken families and suffered cruelty and brutality, usually at the hands of a woman, plus acting out, as a child, vandalism, arson, and cruelty to animals. You see the pattern over and over again. There is cruelty to animals, cruelty to kids, and if a woman has beat up on you, then you are more likely to become a sex murderer.

Senator Bird: Or rape?
Dr. ten Bensel: Or rape. When rape goes to murder, it is clearly aggressive.

Judge Dembitz, who is the chief judge in New York State family court has said, “The root of crime in the streets is the neglect of children.”

Let me show you the relationships to delinquency. In view of the time, I will come immediately to the key study. There are a lot of studies on early perinatal problems; however, I really want to get to the heart of the issue.

There are three major studies the committee has to know about. First of all, Dr. Weston, in Philadelphia, studied 100 juvenile offenders. Eighty-two out of the 100 were abused as children; 43 recall being knocked out by their parents.

The second study was Hopkins and Steele, 1972, from Denver. They had 100 juvenile delinquents, first arrests on whom they had the complete records. They found that 84 were abused before entering school. That is, 84 out of 100. Secondly, 92 of those children were bruised, lacerated or fractured by their parents within a year and a half prior to their arrest.

Le sénateur Bird: Ou de commettre des viols?
M. ten Bensel: Ou le viol. Lorsque le viol aboutit au meurtre, il est nettement agressif.

Le juge Dembitz, qui est juge en chef au tribunal familial de l’État de New York a déclaré «le crime dans les rues a pour origine la négligence à l’égard des enfants».

Permettez-moi de vous montrer les rapports avec la délinquance. Étant donné que le temps qui nous est alloué est limité, je vais en venir immédiatement à l’étude clé. Il existe un grand nombre d’études sur les problèmes périnatals précoces. Toutefois, je veux vraiment en venir au cœur de la question.

Il existe trois études importantes que le comité doit connaître. Tout d’abord, M. Weston, de Philadelphie, a étudié le cas de 100 délinquants juniors: 82 p. 100 d’entre eux avaient été maltraités pendant leur enfance et 43 se souvien d’avoir été violemment frappés par leurs parents.

La seconde étude a été réalisée en 1972 par Hopkins et Steele de Denver. Ils avaient les dossiers complets de 100 délinquants juniors qui étaient arrêtés pour la première fois. Ils ont constaté que 84 d’entre eux avaient été maltraités avant d’entrer à l’école, soit 84 p. 100. Deuxièmement, 92 de ces enfants avaient subis des contusions, des lacérations ou des
The main study is that of Alfaro which was started in 1975. What I want to do is go into this report in some detail and then I will conclude my remarks. This report has just come out of New York City March 1978. What they did was they followed a large number of children to see what happened to them in their subsequent behaviour, and what they found is very dramatic.

I think this may be one of the recommendations you might make in your committee, because New York is the only state in the United States which has a special committee related to the legislature and to the government of the state to study this issue and collect good data on which to make policy. I think also you have to broaden your spectrum and look at the entire issue of family violence. If you consider this issue important, it has to have a fairly top level in the structure of government in order that it may be understood and supported.

The mission of the study was to determine whether the existing child protective system was suffering from administrative problems, inadequate legislation, or both.

José Alfaro said in the report, “It is generally felt that the long-term consequences were ignored (child abuse or neglect) in the formulation of public policy and programs, not deliberately, but out of ignorance.” You have to have good data. You have to have facts upon which to make judgments.

What they did was they took 5,136 children from 1,423 families who were reported to child protective services or the children's court in 1952/53. Of those children 4,456 did have contact with at least one agency or court for child abuse, neglect, juvenile delinquency, or ungovernability. What they found, in following them up 25 years later, was that roughly 60 per cent of those children came back into the system.

They took a second sample of 1,963 children who were reported as delinquent or were on probation in 1971 or 1972 and they traced their histories backwards to see where this group came from. Therefore, they had roughly 7,000 children that they followed. That is the largest study that I know of anywhere in the world.

Why did they become delinquent? What happened? In the results of one of these studies they found that “as many as 50 per cent of the families reported for child abuse and neglect had at least one child who was later taken to court as delinquent or ungovernable. In other words, 50 per cent of those families had a child who was delinquent or ungovernable, and for New York that situation is very severe. Your

[Traduction]
fractures infligées par leurs parents, moins de 1 an et demi avant leur arrestation, soit 92 p. 100. Ce qui est encore plus frappant, c'est que seulement un enfant sur 100 se trouvait à l'aide sociale. Il ne s'agissait pas d'enfants appartenant à des milieux pauvres, mais à la classe moyenne.


Je pense que cela pourrait être une des recommandations que vous pourriez faire à votre comité, parce que New York est le seul État des États-Unis qui possède un comité spécial relevant de la législature et du gouvernement de l'État, et qui a pour objet d'étudier cette question, ainsi que de recueillir des données satisfaisantes pour l'établissement d'une politique. Je pense également que vous devez élargir votre spectre et examiner dans sa totalité la question de la violence familiale. Si vous considérez cette question comme importante, elle doit occuper une place de choix dans la structure du gouvernement afin de pouvoir être comprise et de recevoir un appui.

L'étude avait pour objet de déterminer si le système actuel de protection de l'enfance souffrait de problèmes administratifs, d'une législation inadéquate ou des deux à la fois.

José Alfaro a déclaré dans son rapport: «Dans l'élaboration d'une politique et d'un programme publics, on est généralement d'avis que l'on n'a pas tenu compte des conséquences à long terme des mauvais traitements ou de la négligence à l'égard des enfants et ce, non de façon délibérée, mais par ignorance». Vous devez être en possession de données satisfaisantes et de faits sur lesquels vous pouvez fonder des jugements.

Ils ont pris 5,136 enfants dans 1,423 familles qui avaient été signalées au service de protection de l'enfance ou aux cours juvéniles, pendant la période 1952-1953. De ces enfants, 4,456 avaient été en rapport avec, au moins, un organisme ou tribunal, pour mauvais traitements, négligence, délinquance juvénile ou indiscipline. En procédant à un contrôle 25 ans plus tard, on s'est aperçu qu'environ 60 pour cent de ces enfants se retrouvaient en cause.

Ils ont pris un deuxième échantillon, composé de 1,963 enfants, qui avaient été signalés comme délinquants, ou se trouvaient en liberté surveillée en 1971 ou 1972, et ils ont retracé leurs antécédents pour voir d'où provenait ce groupe. En conséquence, il y a eu environ 7,000 enfants qui ont été soumis à observation et, à ma connaissance il s'agit là de l'étude la plus importante qui ait été réalisée au monde.

Pourquoi ces enfants sont-ils devenus des délinquants? Que s'est-il produit? Il ressort de l'une de ces études que jusqu'à 50 pour cent des familles qui avaient été signalées pour mauvais traitement et négligence à l'égard des enfants avaient au moins un enfant qui avait, ultérieurement, comparu devant un tribunal pour délinquance ou indiscipline. En d'autres termes, 50 pour cent de ces familles avaient un enfant qui était
behaviour has to be extreme for you to be judged as a delinquent or ungovernable.

What they found in some of the counties was that "35 per cent of the boys and 44 per cent of the girls reported as delinquent in 1970 had been reported previously as abused or neglected." There is a very high correlation. Their study is conservative because they do not have complete records.

Their fifth finding showed, "Delinquent children who were reported as abused and neglected tend to be more violent than other delinquents." Here we have controlled data which states that if you are abused or neglected you are more violent than the child who has run away for reasons other than abuse or neglect. What they found was a very high association between violent crimes and child abuse. What they found was that of all children who had murdered, 29 per cent had been victims of abuse or neglect. Of those children who had committed arson, the figure was 24 per cent; rape, 29 per cent; assault, 22 per cent; disorderly conduct, 21 per cent; and carrying a dangerous weapon, 20 per cent. If the data could have looked further and asked more questions, it would have been closer to 100 per cent. However, what they found, just at the top level, was this very high association between aggressive, kinds of behaviour and the prior history of abuse and neglect.

The other thing which is important to understand is Finding 6: "Child maltreatment cannot be used as an indicator of a particular type of juvenile misbehaviour." In other words, they cannot say if you are neglected or abused "X" would happen—you are going to start fires or murder or rob. Therefore, "any type of child maltreatment can lead to any type of later behavioural problems. There is no clear pattern of predictability."

I do not know what your data is in Canada, but what they found in the United States was that they were reporting about 400,000 cases a year of child neglect and abuse. In Minnesota the figure just jumped from 1,000 cases a year in 1976 to 1,500 cases in 1977. Increased reporting reflects increased awareness that someone is concerned that the behaviour of the parent is inappropriate.

What they found in New York was that even though 78 per cent of the cases were founded and proven, less than 7 per cent of the children in the 1950s sample led to the provision of any services. Seven per cent got services. What kind of services are you giving for your children in Canada? That becomes a crucial question if we are going to look at the issue.

They also found, in the 1950s samples that fewer than 0.1 per cent of the contact resulted in the provision of any type of service other than case work supervision. Where was the court? Where were the doctors? Where were the child psychologists and psychiatrists? Where were all these teams of people we are talking about? They were not getting any
services. That was really a shocking finding. Alfaro sums it up by saying:

Every abused and neglected child is in equal need of treatment services and the potential social cost of ignoring any of these needs is equally great.

We are going to pay the price on the other end if we don't take care of this. That is what he is saying.

In 69 per cent of those 5,000 cases in 1950 there was no action. Again, 6.9 per cent resulted in supervision services for the family whose child remained in the home. Incredible statistics.

Again, in the 1970's sample, 12 per cent of the protective contacts led to supervision of the parents, and at one point 2 per cent led to provision of some other type of service also. Very few children getting services. We report it, but what happens? Not much. This is really one of the major issues in child abuse and neglect.

One of my last quotations from Alfaro is this:

The lack of services has an important bearing... that means that little, if anything, was attempted to undo the effects of abuse and neglect on the children, and that little, if anything, was done to alter the home environment in which the children lived.

This is a very powerful study.

What they also found to substantiate why understanding of the dynamics is important was that:

The placement rate in child neglect cases was higher than in child abuse cases, indicating that neglect is a more intractable problem.

Sixteen per cent of abuse cases and 20.3 per cent of neglect cases ended in placement.

It is important for the committee to understand the dynamics. You can work with an abused family, because they love their kid and want to care for him. The neglected child is more intractable, more difficult in behaviour, because they have never attached to him, they have never cared about him.

Their Finding 10 shows:

The placement rate for ungovernability was higher than for juvenile delinquency, indicating that ungovernability is a more intractable problem.

If you think about it, what is one of the problems of criminal behaviour? They are out of control and nobody can govern them unless the police and the authorities come in and say, "Stop it. You are out of control." What they are finding out is that kids with neglect are more out of control, more ungovernable, because that is what you would expect, and that is what you would expect from the data. Again, I think that is an important summary.

[Trafuction]

Tous les enfants victimes de négligence ou de mauvais traitements ont besoin uniformément de services de traitement et le prix que pourra... payer la société en ignorant n'importe quels de ces besoins est très élevé. Il dit donc que d'une façon ou d'une autre nous aurons, à payer.

Dans 63 p. 100 de ces 5,000 cas en 1950, aucune mesure n'a été prise. Encore une fois, 6.9 p. 100 des enfants ont profité de services de surveillance de sa famille. Chiffres incroyables.

Encore une fois, dans l'échantillon de 1970, 12 p. 100 des cas de protection ont entraîné la surveillance des parents et à un moment donné, 2 p. 100 ont entraîné également la prestation d'une autre sorte de service. Très peu d'enfants profitent des services. On peut signaler des cas, mais qu'arrive-t-il? Très peu de chose. Voilà un des aspects les plus importants du mauvais traitement et de la négligence envers des enfants.

Voici une de mes dernières citations d'Alfaro:

L'absence de services a une très grande influence... elle signifie qu'on ne fait à peu près rien pour compenser les effets du mauvais traitement et de la négligence sur les enfants, qu'on a fait très peu pour changer le milieu familial dans lequel ces enfants vivaient.

Cette étude est très révélatrice.

Voici ce qu'ils ont trouvé pour étayer la théorie selon laquelle il est important de comprendre le déroulement de ces choses:

Dans le cas des enfants négligés, le taux de placement était plus élevé que celui dans le cas des enfants ayant subi de mauvais traitements; le problème de la négligence est donc plus difficile à résoudre.

Voici le pourcentage des cas qui ont entraîné un placement: dans les cas de mauvais traitement, 16 p. 100; dans les cas de négligence, 20.3 p. 100.

Il est important que le comité sache exactement ce qui se passe. Il est possible de travailler avec une famille où il y a eu un mauvais traitement parce que la famille aime cet enfant et qu'elle veut en prendre soin. Les problèmes de comportement sont plus graves chez l'enfant négligé et ils sont plus difficiles à remédier parce que sa famille ne s'est jamais attachée à lui, ne s'est jamais occupée de lui.

Voici la 10e constation:

Le taux de placement pour les enfants indisciplinés était plus élevé que celui pour les jeunes délinquants, ce qui prouve que l'indiscipline est un problème plus difficile à résoudre.

À bien y songer, quel est un des problèmes du comportement criminel? Les criminels perdent le contrôle et personne ne peut les contrôler sauf la police et les autorités qui interviennent en disant: «Arrêtez. Vous ne savez pas ce que vous faites. On constate que les enfants négligés sont plus aptes à être indisciplinés; c'est entendu, et les données l'indiquent. À mon avis, c'est une constatation importante.
The other thing that supports some of the testimony before this committee is Finding 11:

Children reported as abused and neglected and children reported as delinquent or unmanageable came from similar families, which significantly differ from the general population.

The families are larger—42 per cent versus 12 per cent having more than four kids. Eighty per cent of people with five or more kids in the United States are in poverty, and part of that is related to the causes I have referred to. The more kids you get, unless there is a family around, it becomes a burden on the family. I think that is more so today than ever in the past. There are more illegitimate children in those families—18 per cent versus 4.9 per cent—and more often in one-parent households.

I want to make just one last comment, and then I am going to stop. I will leave you with this quotation:

That those who are not loved are likely themselves to hate rather than love is hardly a discovery for which modern science can take the credit. Man has known this truth and theory for as long as he has disregarded it in practice.

This quote is from Wooten, Seal and Chambers, Social Science and Social Pathology, 1959. Man has known this from the beginning. We have disregarded it, and we are going to continue to pay the price for it.

Finally, I want to reinforce the significance of what this committee is doing if you are serious in your desire to do something to try to make those linkages and change the system for the benefit of children.

The Chairman: Thank you very much for that excellent presentation. Before asking the members of the committee if they have questions, I want you to answer this question. You

Alfaro's statement is one of the messages I want to leave with the committee:

The time has come to undertake the monumental task of examining the entire system of categorical programs in order to realign them with reality. This is not a task to be undertaken lightly, and it will upset established or vested interests who will fear the uncertainty of change.

I notice that you have had coming before your committee police, school people, psychiatrists, psychologists, and on and on and on. Are they talking to each other? Are they building programs together? Are they looking at other things that interrelate? That really is an issue. In our community we have trouble getting the doctors to talk to the social workers and to the teachers. Everybody has got a piece of the action but nobody wants to do anything about it, because they are so stubborn, or because they don't want to change, or they are not sure that what they are doing is right—and on and on it goes.

I want to make just one last comment, and then I am going to stop. I will leave you with this quotation:

That those who are not loved are likely themselves to hate rather than love is hardly a discovery for which modern science can take the credit. Man has known this truth and theory for as long as he has disregarded it in practice.

This quote is from Wooten, Seal and Chambers, Social Science and Social Pathology, 1959. Man has known this from the beginning. We have disregarded it, and we are going to continue to pay the price for it.

Finally, I want to reinforce the significance of what this committee is doing if you are serious in your desire to do something to try to make those linkages and change the system for the benefit of children.

The Chairman: Thank you very much for that excellent presentation. Before asking the members of the committee if they have questions, I want you to answer this question. You

The other thing that supports some of the testimony before this committee is Finding 11:

Children reported as abused and neglected and children reported as delinquent or unmanageable came from similar families, which significantly differ from the general population.

The families are larger—42 per cent versus 12 per cent having more than four kids. Eighty per cent of people with five or more kids in the United States are in poverty, and part of that is related to the causes I have referred to. The more kids you get, unless there is a family around, it becomes a burden on the family. I think that is more so today than ever in the past. There are more illegitimate children in those families—18 per cent versus 4.9 per cent—and more often in one-parent households.

I want to make just one last comment, and then I am going to stop. I will leave you with this quotation:

That those who are not loved are likely themselves to hate rather than love is hardly a discovery for which modern science can take the credit. Man has known this truth and theory for as long as he has disregarded it in practice.

This quote is from Wooten, Seal and Chambers, Social Science and Social Pathology, 1959. Man has known this from the beginning. We have disregarded it, and we are going to continue to pay the price for it.

Finally, I want to reinforce the significance of what this committee is doing if you are serious in your desire to do something to try to make those linkages and change the system for the benefit of children.

The Chairman: Thank you very much for that excellent presentation. Before asking the members of the committee if they have questions, I want you to answer this question. You
mentioned the difficulty in starting moral development. Moral development would start with the development of the conscience in a child. I read from Anthony Storr:

The development of conscience, that is, of an internal regulator of behaviour, appears to depend much more upon the wish to preserve love than upon the fear of punishment.

How would you start to describe how a conscience develops? How does a young child develop a system in which he avoids doing wrong things and practices doing right things? How does he develop that? Is it a teacher/pupil process in which you must have a teacher and a pupil?

Dr. ten Bensel: That is a good question. I will just review basically Laurence Kohlberg's work at Harvard, the work we have learned from the effects of television, that probably the things that do not develop morality, do not develop a conscience, are preaching, praise or punishment. They are finding that what develops the conscience is a role-model, children learning from their parents. So this again hooks in directly with what I said. If the child never tests its parents it is not getting the role-model from its parents, learning from its parents. They are finding that democratic families have a higher value system, say, than an authoritarian family in which the child works in community and dialogue with the family. From the developmental work a child does not really know right from wrong until about age seven or eight years. By the second grade they are able to separate the right from the wrong. Up until that time they need support from their environment, consistency and structure, which is known as discipline. A child must have discipline to survive. They need to know what the rules are, what the structure is, and get the needs in that relationship. So that uneven development as we have described it means that criminals do not have a conscience; they do not know right from wrong.

The Chairman: Because they were never taught?

Dr. ten Bensel: No; they were never taught.

Senator Cottreau: Does the criminal not know that, a thing is right or wrong, or does he not want to accept the fact?

Dr. ten Bensel: Well, on the question of knowing, or not knowing, again the data is that once you have got to a certain level of moral development you never slip backward; in other words, once you become developed—and, by the way, to develop to the maximum morally is around 31 years of age—when you have got all your stuff together and can make good decisions across the board, which speaks something for age and maturity, which has a minimal level. They have never been there. As a matter of fact, Kohlberg has studied criminals for over 20 years and shows that they do not change very much, and this is one of the keys to therapy. When a person is arrested in his development, when he is stuck in the role, how does he get unstuck, to change to a higher developmental role

M. ten Bensel: Voilà une excellente question. Voyons simplement le travail de Laurence Kohlberg à Harvard, dont nous avons entendu parler à la télévision, selon lequel il est dit que les choses qui ne développent probablement pas la moralité, la conscience, sont les sermons, les éloges ou les châtiments. On constate que ce qui développe la conscience est un modèle, l'enseignement que les enfants retirent des parents. C'est encore, cela se rattache directement à ce que j'ai dit. Si l'enfant ne met jamais ses parents à l'épreuve, il ne retire aucun enseignement du modèle qu'ils lui proposent. On s'est aperçu que les familles démocratiques ont un système de valeur plus élevé que, disons, une famille autoritaire, dans laquelle l'enfant travaille en communauté et dialogue avec la famille. Du point de vue développement, les enfants ne distinguent vraiment pas le bien du mal avant d'avoir atteint l'âge de 7 ou 8 ans. A partir de la deuxième année scolaire, ils sont en mesure de distinguer le bien du mal. Jusque-là, ils ont besoin de l'aide de leur environnement, de la logique, de la structure, bref, de la discipline. Un enfant a besoin de discipline pour survivre. Il a besoin de connaître les règles, la structure, et perçoit les besoins dans le cadre même de ce rapport. Si bien qu'un développement inégal, comme nous l'avons dit, signifie que les criminels n'ont pas de conscience, ils ne distinguent pas le bien du mal.

Le président: Parce qu'on ne leur a jamais enseigné à le faire?

M. ten Bensel: Non; on ne leur a jamais enseigné à le faire.

Le sénateur Cottreau: Le criminel ignore-t-il que quelque chose est bien ou mal, ou s'il refuse d'accepter le fait?

M. ten Bensel: Pour ce qui est de connaître ou d'ignorer, les données indiquent que quand l'individu atteint un certain degré de développement moral, il ne régresse jamais. En d'autres termes, lorsque vous avez acquis votre développement, et je précise que le développement moral maximum se situe vers l'âge de 31 ans, lorsque vous avez tous les éléments en mains, que vous pouvez prendre instantanément une décision, ce qui prouve un certain âge et maturité, donc, vous avez atteint un niveau minimal. Les criminels n'ont jamais atteint ce niveau. En fait, Kohlberg les a étudiés pendant plus de 20 ans et démontre qu'ils n'évoluent pas beaucoup, ce qui constitue une des clés de la thérapie. Lorsque le développement d'une personne est arrêté, lorsqu'elle est enlisée dans le rôle,
morally, to know right from wrong? We do not know the answer to that.

The Chairman: You say he does not want to know. A person would not know that two and two make four unless someone taught it to him or demonstrated it to him; and unless it has been demonstrated to a child that certain things are right, then we cannot expect it to ever pick that up as a principle and go on with it. Is that the answer?

Senator Cottreau: As you say, you can teach some children that two and two make four, but what I had in mind is a child who does revolt against knowledge, and does not accept a fact as it is. I wonder whether it is not connected with the knowledge of what is right and what is wrong.

Dr. ten Bensel: Well, I might clarify it this way. People say they have told a child this and they have told a child that. We know that it is not a good way for children to learn. The best way to learn is from the environment and the interaction with another mature, loving adult. That is the basic issue to which we get back, that certain children do not have this mature, loving adult caring to show them on a day-in-day-out basis what the values of life are.

Senator Bird: We accept your premise that violence begets violence and the child brought up in the violent home thinks that is the rule, that you beat the child because you were beaten and your parents were God. We establish that this is one of the many causes of violence. How do we get at coping with this? There are two things which you said. One was you discussed a control group, one group being visited and other group having medical care. The one that had medical care had a high degree of battering and so forth, while the group that was visited did not. We have visiting also, but it does not always seem to alter the situation. What kind of visiting was this?

Dr. ten Bensel: This is the concept of health visitor which is used in Europe, of a person, not necessarily a public health consultant—it could be a public health or visiting nurse who would go into the home to get support to the new family, to give them instruction in child care, in changing the diapers, nutrition, pick up on the anxiety, to be a friend and outreach. It is a lifeline where you have someone you can call when things get tough. For example, I have had three mothers who have committed suicide on me, partly because I could not reach them fast enough. The phone call came on Saturday night: "I can't stand my kids any more; I have just taken 60 barbiturates. Help!"

[Traduction]

Le président: Vous dites qu'il ne veut pas savoir. L'individu ne saurait pas que deux et deux font quatre, si on ne le lui avait pas enseigné ou démontré; et à moins de démontrer à un enfant que certaines choses sont bien, on ne saurait attendre qu'il en fasse un principe et l'adopte. Cela est-il la réponse?

Le sénateur Cottreau: Comme vous le dites, on peut enseigner à l'enfant que deux et deux font quatre mais s'il se révolte contre le savoir et n'accepte pas les faits. Je demande si cette réaction n'est pas reliée à la connaissance du bien et du mal.

M. ten Bensel: Je pourrais vous expliquer la chose ainsi: les gens disent qu'ils ont dit ceci ou cela à l'enfant. Nous savons que ce n'est pas pour les enfants une bonne façon d'apprendre. La meilleure façon provient de l'environnement et des rapports avec un autre adulte faisant preuve de maturité et d'affection. Voilà la question fondamentale à laquelle nous revenons, c'est-à-dire que certains enfants n'ont pas tous ce privilège d'avoir un adulte possédant de la maturité pour prendre soin d'eux avec affection et leur inculquer le sens des valeurs jour après jour.

Le sénateur Bird: Nous convenons avec vous que la violence amène la violence et que l'enfant élevé dans un milieu violent prend pour acquis que c'est la règle; qu'un adulte maltraite un enfant parce qu'il a été maltraité par ses parents qu'il avait placés sur un piedestal. Nous avons établi que cela constitue une des nombreuses causes de la violence. Comment peut-on y faire face? Vous avez dit deux choses: la première concerne l'expérience qui a été faite avec un groupe de contrôle, un groupe qui recevait la visite d'un représentant du ministère de la santé et l'autre qui recevait des soins médicaux. Dans ce dernier groupe, de nombreux enfants étaient victimes de mauvais traitements, tandis qu'il n'y en avait aucun dans le groupe qui était visité. Nous avons fait la même expérience, mais il ne semble pas que cela ait changé la situation. Quel genre de visite était-ce?

M. ten Bensel: C'est le concept de visites du ministère de la Santé qui est courant en Europe, il ne s'agit pas nécessairement d'un conseiller en santé publique. Mais d'une personne qui pourrait représenter la santé publique ou une infirmière visituse qui se rendrait à la maison pour aider la nouvelle famille, pour donner des instructions quant aux soins pédiatriques, comment changer les couches, donner des conseils en nutrition, les aider dans le cas d'anxiété; en un mot, être un ami et une personne qui peut leur venir en aide. C'est un moyen de salut auquel une personne peut parfois avoir recours dans des moments de détresse. Par exemple, j'ai connu trois mères qui se sont suicidées. C'était un peu de ma faute parce que je n'ai pu me rendre chez elle assez rapidement pour les sauver. J'ai reçu un appel téléphonique le samedi soir disant: "Je ne puis supporter mes enfants plus longtemps; je viens d'avaler 60 pilules de barbiturique. Aidez-moi!"
The health visitor is in the community and available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This is the same principle as that behind Parents Anonymous, Inc., where there is a hot line; if you are in crisis there is a number and person you can call.

**Senator Bird:** Like the Distress Centre?

**Dr. ten Bensel:** Yes, it can be a parental distress centre concept, but it is also to supply the day-to-day maintenance that these families need, but it is something that as a paediatrician I do not do.

**Senator Bird:** But someone must do it?

**Dr. ten Bensel:** Yes, someone has to do it in the public health field. Then it comes down to a question of assessing the skill of the health visitor and of the nurse who will be making those visits so that they know the dynamics and what they are looking for. I have learned from experience and I am very direct with families in saying: “Are you afraid that you are going to hurt your child?” We have a rule at our hospital that if a mother comes in three times in one week and the child is well we will hospitalize that child for its own protection. I often ask the mothers: “Are you afraid that you are going to hurt your child?” And they say: “Yes, doctor; if you don’t keep that child in the hospital I am going to beat him up.” So they are seeking help indirectly. So, with those high-risk families to have a support system is one of the factors which I think determines whether someone gets violent and out of control. We know that one of the ways to reduce violence is to have someone else in the home, such as an uncle, an aunt or a grandparent. One finds out from all the data, whether looking at wife abuse or child abuse, that the more isolated he is and just having someone in the home reduces violence. It is what I call the “radar effect.” The last time I got a speeding ticket from the radar, I then knew that around the next corner there is a radar trap so I drive slower and I think that most people when they know something of what is coming tend to slow down on a few things.

**Senator Bird:** We have had a number of cases in which the visitors or the Children’s Aid representatives have known it was a high-risk family, have taken the child away and then given it back and the child has been killed. This is something that has been concerning a great number of us very much because, on the other hand, there is a theory, and we have had it said to us during our hearings, that a bad home is still better for the child than a foster home or institution, and no one wants institutions. Could you tell us a little about this?

**Dr. ten Bensel:** Yes; I think it is a very good comment, senator. The data does support the fact that a child is better off in its own home, even if it is a totally lousy home, than in someone else’s home, and, again, there is some data from New York that behind Parents Anonymous, Inc., where there is a hot line; if you are in crisis there is a number and person you can call.

**Senator Bird:** But someone must do it?

**Dr. ten Bensel:** Yes; I think it is a very good comment, senator. The data does support the fact that a child is better off in its own home, even if it is a totally lousy home, than in someone else’s home, and, again, there is some data from New York that behind Parents Anonymous, Inc., where there is a hot line; if you are in crisis there is a number and person you can call.

**Senator Bird:** Like the Distress Centre?

**Dr. ten Bensel:** Yes, someone has to do it in the public health field. Then it comes down to a question of assessing the skill of the health visitor and of the nurse who will be making those visits so that they know the dynamics and what they are looking for. I have learned from experience and I am very direct with families in saying: “Are you afraid that you are going to hurt your child?” We have a rule at our hospital that if a mother comes in three times in one week and the child is well we will hospitalize that child for its own protection. I often ask the mothers: “Are you afraid that you are going to hurt your child?” And they say: “Yes, doctor; if you don’t keep that child in the hospital I am going to beat him up.” So they are seeking help indirectly. So, with those high-risk families to have a support system is one of the factors which I think determines whether someone gets violent and out of control. We know that one of the ways to reduce violence is to have someone else in the home, such as an uncle, an aunt or a grandparent. One finds out from all the data, whether looking at wife abuse or child abuse, that the more isolated he is and just having someone in the home reduces violence. It is what I call the “radar effect.” The last time I got a speeding ticket from the radar, I then knew that around the next corner there is a radar trap so I drive slower and I think that most people when they know something of what is coming tend to slow down on a few things.

**Senator Bird:** We have had a number of cases in which the visitors or the Children’s Aid representatives have known it was a high-risk family, have taken the child away and then given it back and the child has been killed. This is something that has been concerning a great number of us very much because, on the other hand, there is a theory, and we have had it said to us during our hearings, that a bad home is still better for the child than a foster home or institution, and no one wants institutions. Could you tell us a little about this?

**Dr. ten Bensel:** Yes; I think it is a very good comment, senator. The data does support the fact that a child is better off in its own home, even if it is a totally lousy home, than in someone else’s home, and, again, there is some data from New York that behind Parents Anonymous, Inc., where there is a hot line; if you are in crisis there is a number and person you can call.
York which shows that to be the case. That is the Fanchell Study conducted by the Columbia School of Social Work with 28,000 children. It showed that if the child was out of the home and had contact with the parents, they adjusted better in school, obtained higher I.Q.'s and were less surly and angry. That study pointed out the importance of keeping the child, even if the child is out of the home, in contact with the parent on an ongoing basis.

One of the things I am called upon to do, as an expert witness in a legal sense, is to make that judgment. The question comes up: How bad is the abuse? Is it stress factor overload, or is it the internal lack of control by the parent placing the child at risk or death? I am often called in to say that I think, because of XYZ, that this family is out of control and needs help and that the child should not be in the home.

The judgment I use in talking to the family is whether the child was ever "disciplined" to the point where the child stopped crying—abused. If the child tells me that he was disciplined over and over again and stopped crying, and that he invented a fantasy world where he literally started to split their personality—and the most famous book on this is Sybil, the story of a girl who had 21 separate personalities. She was the classic case of the abused child.

If it is the alcoholic is to blame and he tells me he has a problem, I get him to the AA or refer him to some other type of treatment. If I am told that there is no problem and the blame is projected on to someone else, I often say that the issue is "that parents take care of the children and are responsible." I often hear the story that it was the one-and-a-half year old brother who hit the child with a brick. The question is never love. Abusive parents love their children; they simply do not know how to take care of them. That is the issue.

So, when I ask those questions and the answers indicate that the family seriously abuses itself and they deny doing so or project it on to someone else, then my recommendation to the court is that faster care must be taken into consideration and that family treatment services must be implemented.

We are getting better data together so that we can make those decisions. It is the same type of decision a physician must make as to when to cut someone open because he thinks there is a possibility of appendicitis.

Senator Cottreau: I believe this is the first time mutism has been mentioned in the evidence before us. I am very familiar with that, but I take it that that child can speak but he or she does not speak in school, and sometimes that will go on throughout the entire school experience of that particular child.

[Traduction]

et, ici encore, nous avons des données de New York à l'appui de ces faits. Il s'agit de l'étude Fanchell menée par la «Columbia School of Social Work» sur 28 000 enfants. Cette étude démontre que les enfants à l'extérieur de leur foyer qui ont des contacts avec leurs parents, s'adapteraient mieux à l'école, ont un quotient intellectuel plus élevé et sont moins maussades que les autres. Cette étude souligne l'importance du maintien du contact de l'enfant avec ses parents de façon continue, même s'il est à l'extérieur du foyer.

Une des choses que l'on me demande de faire à titre de spécialiste dans un sens juridique est de porter un jugement. La question qui se présente est la suivante: Quelle est le degré de gravité des mauvais traitements? Sont-ils dus à un facteur de tension accru, ou à un manque de contrôle des parents qui est cause de danger ou de mort pour l'enfant? Je dois souvent être obligé d'avouer qu'à cause de XYZ, cette famille ne peut plus se contrôler et a besoin d'aide et que l'enfant ne devrait pas être laissé dans ce foyer.

Le jugement que je porte en m'adressant à la famille est de savoir si l'enfant a déjà été discipliné au point où il a cessé de pleurer,—c'est-à-dire maltraité. Si l'enfant me dit qu'il a été discipliné maintes fois et a cessé de pleurer pour s'évader dans un monde imaginaire où il a commencé un dédoublement de personnalité—et le livre le plus célèbre à ce sujet est «Sybil», l'histoire d'une petite fille qui avait vingt-et-une personnalités différentes. Elle représentait le cas classique de l'enfant maltraité.

Si le père est alcoolique et qu'il me dit qu'il a un problème, je l'envoie à une association de lutte contre l'alcoolisme ou à d'autres sources de cures. Si j'apprends qu'il n'y a pas de problème, et que la responsabilité incombe à quelqu'un d'autre, je dis souvent que finalement c'est aux parents de s'occuper de leurs enfants et d'en être responsables. J'entends souvent dire que l'enfant a reçu une brique projeté par son frère âgé d'un an et demi. La question ne se situe jamais sur le plan de l'affection. Les parents brutalement aînés leurs enfants, mais ils ne savent pas comment s'en occuper, et c'est là que se situe le problème.

Ainsi, lorsque je pose ces questions et que les réponses m'indiquent que des membres de la famille subissent des mauvais traitements même si les autres le nient ou en rendent quelqu'un d'autre responsable, je recommande alors aux tribunaux d'envisager de placer les enfants en tutelle et de faire appel d'urgence à des services d'aide aux familles.

Le sénateur Cottreau: Je crois que vous êtes le premier témoin à nous parler de mutisme. Je connais très bien la question, mais je crois que l'enfant est capable de parler même s'il ne dit rien à l'école et cette situation peut se prolonger pendant toute son éducation.
Dr. ten Bensel: That is correct, or outside in dealings with the court or the police or professional people. These children are very quiet and withdrawn.

Senator Cottreau: What is the reason behind that? What is the significance of this?

Dr. ten Bensel: One of the areas that seems to get arrested at an early age is speech and language. They may not verbally stimulated. We know from child development studies that it is very important that a child hear a human voice and not a TV set or a record player. There is something that is unique in the quality of the human voice.

I get concerned with statistics which indicate that 80 per cent of the children living in the United States are being babysat by television sets. I know of parents who turn on television sets for children at two weeks of age, and this concerns me very much.

So, one of the developments is the delay in the speech, and another is that they do not trust anybody. This goes back to the dynamics I referred to where they are unwanted. In this case, they are almost always abused. They do not trust other people.

Perhaps you can remember as a child being in an uncomfortable situation and withdrawing from a situation. These children often berate their parents and go after their parents verbally, because they are trying to be intimate with their parents in the home situation, but when they get to school they do not trust anyone. Perhaps they are pseudo-retarded. Most children are not retarded but are pseudo-retarded because the tests measure primary verbal intelligence. They don't trust you; they are isolated and they just clam up.

One of the most interesting studies in this regard is social isolation. This goes back to Anna Freud's observation of the six children who survived the concentration camps with peer raising; they raised themselves. This also goes back to the Harbour monkey studies.

Dr. Hartup, at the University of Minnesota Institute on Child Development, took 24 children who did not talk and put these children with other children. He put one group into play therapy with children the same age in an attempt to resocialize them; and a group with children who were younger. What is exciting about that study is that it substantiated the Harbour monkey studies. The children resocialized and started talking when placed with children younger than themselves. So, the same age group put pressure on them; the older children put pressure on them; and adults certainly put pressure on them. The only way to get them talking again was to put them with the younger children.

I am very excited about the selective mutism study and the peer rearing study of Dr. Hartup, because now there are tools to resocialize these children back into the school and the community.

The Chairman: That is what he did with the monkeys.

Senator Cottreau: What is the reason behind that? What is this significance?

Dr. ten Bensel: One of the areas that seems to get arrested at an early age is speech and language. They may not verbally stimulated. We know from child development studies that it is very important that a child hear a human voice and not a TV set or a record player. There is something that is unique in the quality of the human voice.

I get concerned with statistics which indicate that 80 per cent of the children living in the United States are being babysat by television sets. I know of parents who turn on television sets for children at two weeks of age, and this concerns me very much.

So, one of the developments is the delay in the speech, and another is that they do not trust anybody. This goes back to the dynamics I referred to where they are unwanted. In this case, they are almost always abused. They do not trust other people.

Perhaps you can remember as a child being in an uncomfortable situation and withdrawing from a situation. These children often berate their parents and go after their parents verbally, because they are trying to be intimate with their parents in the home situation, but when they get to school they do not trust anyone. Perhaps they are pseudo-retarded. Most children are not retarded but are pseudo-retarded because the tests measure primary verbal intelligence. They don't trust you; they are isolated and they just clam up.

One of the most interesting studies in this regard is social isolation. This goes back to Anna Freud's observation of the six children who survived the concentration camps with peer raising; they raised themselves. This also goes back to the Harbour monkey studies.

Dr. Hartup, at the University of Minnesota Institute on Child Development, took 24 children who did not talk and put these children with other children. He put one group into play therapy with children the same age in an attempt to resocialize them; and a group with children who were younger. What is exciting about that study is that it substantiated the Harbour monkey studies. The children resocialized and started talking when placed with children younger than themselves. So, the same age group put pressure on them; the older children put pressure on them; and adults certainly put pressure on them. The only way to get them talking again was to put them with the younger children.

I am very excited about the selective mutism study and the peer rearing study of Dr. Hartup, because now there are tools to resocialize these children back into the school and the community.

The Chairman: That is what he did with the monkeys.

M. ten Bensel: C'est exact, il peut aussi ne pas parler à l'extérieur de la cellule familiale, dans ses rapports avec les tribunaux, ou des agents de police ou des spécialistes. Ces enfants sont très calmes et très taciturnes.

Le sénateur Cottreau: Pour quelles raisons? Qu'est-ce que cela signifie?

M. ten Bensel: La parole et le langage sont l'un des domaines qui semblent être freinés à un très jeune âge. Ces enfants ne sont peut-être pas stimulés sur le plan verbal. D'après les études sur le développement de l'enfant, nous savons l'importance à cet égard de la voix humaine, et je ne parle pas du son de la télévision ou de disques. Il y a quelque chose d'unique dans la qualité de la voix humaine.

Je suis préoccupé par les statistiques selon lesquelles 80 p.: 100 des enfants qui vivent aux États-Unis sont «sous la garde» de télévisions! Je peux citer le cas de parents qui branchent leur télévision pour des enfants de deux semaines, et cela m'inquiète énormément.

Ainsi, il y a d'abord chez ces enfants des retards au niveau de la parole, et par ailleurs, ils n'ont confiance en personne. C'est ce que je disais précédemment lorsque je signalais que ces enfants n'avaient pas été désirés. Dans ce cas, ils sont presque toujours maltraités. Ils se méfient des autres.

Vous vous souvenez peut-être qu'enfant, étant dans une situation difficile, vous préfériez vous isoler. Ces enfants sont souvent très proches de leur parents sur le plan verbal, parce qu'ils essaient d'être près d'eux dans la cellule familiale, mais lorsqu'ils sont à l'école ils ne font plus confiance à personne. Ils sont peut-être, non pas retardés, mais pseudo-retardés, parce que les tests mesurent l'intelligence verbale primaire. Le fait est qu'ils n'ont pas confiance en autrui, 1'u'ils s'isolent et qu'ils ne disent rien.

L'une des plus intéressantes études à cet égard concerne l'isolement social. Cela remonte à l'étude qu'avait faite Anna Freud sur six enfants qui avaient survécu à l'expérience des camps de concentration en restant ensemble ce qui leur avait permis de se soutenir. Cela remonte aussi aux études de Harlow sur les singes.

A l'Institut de développement de l'enfant de l'Université du Minnesota, M. Hartup a réussi 24 enfants qui ne parlaient pas. Il a placé un groupe en thérapie de jeux avec des enfants du même âge, pour essayer de les resocialiser, et un autre groupe avec des enfants plus jeunes. Ce qui est intéressant dans cette étude, c'est qu'elle allait dans le sens des travaux de Harlow sur les singes. Les enfants ont réussi à s'intégrer au groupe et ils ont commencé à parler lorsqu'ils étaient placés parmi des enfants plus jeunes. En effet, ceux qui avaient le même âge leur faisait peur, de même que des enfants plus âgés, et évidemment les adultes. La seule manière de leur rendre la parole était de les placer avec des enfants plus jeunes.

Je m’intéresse énormément à l’étude sur le mutisme sélectif et aux travaux de M. Hartup sur les groupes du même âge, parce qu’actuellement ce sont des moyens de réintégrer à l’école et à la collectivité ceux qui en souffrent.

Le président: C'est ce qu'il avait fait avec les singes.
Dr. ten Bensel: I am a little concerned about your one statement where you say that we are going to have to wait a generation.

Senator Bird: I want to do it right now.

Dr. ten Bensel: In terms of prevention, the story I use is that of the man standing by the bank of the river pulling one dead body out of the river after another. A person comes by and asks him what he is doing, and he replies that he is pulling dead bodies out of the river, to which the passerby says, "Well, why don't you go upstream to where the bodies are falling in and prevent it at that point?" the reply being, "I can't do that because I am too busy pulling bodies out of the river." That is very much the way our system works. From the data we now have, we can identify 80 per cent of the victims of abuse at birth. Our approach should be to get the families together at that point and, as well, modify the childbirth experience. We are going now to more homelike delivery room settings. Hospitals are more and more going to the home-type situation, with midwives and the husbands sharing in the birth experience.

Senator Bird: What can you recommend to these young girls so that they will not have babies? I suppose we might have to wait a generation for this, but is there any way you can prevent them from having children they do not want?

Dr. ten Bensel: I took the monkey model and applied it to human beings.

Dr. ten Bensel: I cannot define goodness in all cases. I can define badness. I can tell you what is bad for you. I cannot tell you what is good for you. I think we need some programs that will assist in increasing an awareness of these issues at the high school level.

Another factor is the breaking down of the mistrust and isolation. A lot of children do not like teachers. In answer to that, what we have developed at the Centre for Youth Development Research is having kids teach other kids. It has been found that the best way to teach kids about drugs, about sexuality, and so forth is to use other kids as the change agents. In other words, they train a select group of motivated agents. In other words, they train a select group of motivated agents.

In addition to improving the general public awareness of this problem, I think it has to be added to the school curriculum. I have spoken to children as young as the junior grades. A curriculum has to be developed that takes this subject to children even younger than that.

I cannot define goodness in all cases. I can define badness. I can tell you what is bad for you. I cannot tell you what is good for you. I think we need some programs that will assist in increasing an awareness of these issues at the high school level.

M. ten Bensel: II avait pris le modèle des singes pour l’appliquer aux êtres humains.

Le sénateur Bird: Je voudrais que cela se fasse tout de suite.

M. ten Bensel: Pour ce qui est de la prévention, l’exemple que je donne est celui d’un homme qui s’active au bord d’un fleuve pour en retirer une série de cadavres. Un passant lui demande ce qu’il fait, il lui explique, et l’autre lui demande pourquoi il ne va pas plutôt là où les gens se jettent à l’eau pour les en empêcher. A cela, l’homme répond que c’est impossible parce qu’il est trop occupé à sortir les cadavres du fleuve.

C’est très proche de la manière dont notre système fonctionne. D’après les renseignements que nous possédons, nous pouvons déterminer à la naissance 80 p. cent des victimes de sévices. Notre méthode devrait consister à parler aux familles à ce stade, et aussi à modifier l’expérience de la mise au monde. Nous en arrivons maintenant à installer des salles d’accouchement qui sont moins impersonnelles; les hôpitaux vont de plus en plus se rapprocher de la situation familiale, où sages-femmes et époux vivent aussi la naissance.

Il y a encore beaucoup de tabous au sujet de la manière dont nous sommes éduqués, de notre sexualité, etc. A la fin de chaque conférence que je donne au grand public, il y a toujours des gens qui viennent me voir pour me dire qu’ils étaient des bourreaux d’enfants en puissance. Ils veulent changer. Il nous faut joindre ces personnes et nous pouvons le faire par l’intermédiaire de la presse, du système scolaire et de tout autre moyen existant. Je vais parler aux élèves. Je leur décrits les dommages physiques que peuvent subir les enfants sans parler des dommages psychologiques à long terme qu’ils subissent dans ces cas.

A mon avis, il faut non seulement sensibiliser la population à ce problème mais encore l’inscrire au programme scolaire. J’ai parlé à des élèves des écoles primaires. Il faut mettre au point à l’intention des élèves, même plus jeunes, un programme qui comprenne ce sujet.

Je ne peux pas définir le bien dans tous les cas, mais je peux définir le mal. Je peux vous dire ce qui est mauvais pour vous. Je ne peux pas vous dire ce qui est bon pour vous. Nous avons besoin de programmes qui permettent de sensibiliser davantage les élèves des écoles secondaires à ces problèmes.

Il faut également vaincre la méfiance et l’isolement. Bien des enfants n’aiment pas les enseignants. Pour pallier cette situation, nous avons mis au point un Centre de recherches pour le développement de la jeunesse, un système où les enfants enseignent aux enfants. Nous avons trouvé que la meilleure façon de renseigner les enfants au sujet des drogues, de la sexualité, etc, consiste à recourir à d’autres enfants.
adolescents in these areas, who then infiltrate the youth culture. So, rather than having an adult laying on his or her set of values and having them rejected, the centre trains youths to be the change agents.

A third means of dealing with these problems is through Parents Anonymous. Parents Anonymous is a self-help group. It was developed along the lines of Alcoholics Anonymous. It is made up of people who consider themselves abusers. We have chapters of Parents Anonymous blossoming all over the United States now. I think the last count I had was some 800 chapters, involving 10,000 people.

This program has government support in the United States. They have developed a crisis hot line, and the follow-up studies show that it is much more effective than the traditional child protective services, simply because it is a 24-hour a day, 7-day a week lifeline. Also, they do not experience the mistrust that these people have towards professionals. Very often the professional operating in this area finds that people do not want him. They do not want to talk to the professional. I am very much excited about the potential of Parents Anonymous for the motivated person who is looking for self-help.

Another big issue is that people have to know the rules of child rearing. We all know the general traffic rules of life, but what are the child rearing rules? What is the standard for Canada? What is the standard for the United States? What is the standard for Minnesota or Minneapolis, where I live?

I have great problems with the police and school authorities about the mixed values that we are giving kids. What are the rules? The English rule was that you never hit anybody in the face. You never hit anyone in the abdomen or the genitals. We don't tell people that. Another thing is shaking. We know that many of the injuries caused to babies result from shaking. You should never slap anyone in the face. You should never use any instrument on a child. You do not hit people in the genitalia. You do not bite people. These are the rules.

If one studies murderers, one finds that a large percentage have bite marks. There was oral aggression. As I look at the data, if one is hit in the mouth, slapped in the mouth, or has been the victim of oral sodomy, that individual may exhibit oral aggression.

Senator Inman: Why is it that young children have a tendency to bite?

Dr. ten Bensel: Very often this is the only means by which they can communicate. An 18-month old or a 2-year old cannot get the attention of the parent or parents by shouting or pinching. It can, however, by biting. The child has a set of teeth, and it is at an age when it is exploring its environment.
I had a case where a 2-year old bit a 1-year old 40 times. I called up the child protective services about this case and they took the position that it involved a child as the abuser. They were not interested in it. I insisted that they follow up the case, and they called me up a few days later to thank me for reporting the case. They found that the 2-year old who had done the biting was a battered child. He was a known child in the child protective services. The only way that child could take out his aggression on other people was with his teeth.

The Chairman: But biting is something all children do during the exploratory years.

Dr. ten Bensel: Yes, but there is a high relationship between oral aggression and murderers. It is very interesting.

The Chairman: Our educational system is geared, for the most part, to teaching people how to earn a living, not how to live with other people. Education should be the training of a child to grow up and live in his or her environment, which is made up of people, animals, plants, and so forth. The child should be taught to live with his or her environment in mutual respect. That being so, what would be your first step in that education? How old would the child be when you start his or her education?

Dr. ten Bensel: The question is a complicated one. Ideally, one starts before the child is conceived. We start with this generation of parents.

Getting back to Senator Bird's point, some of the churches now are refusing to perform the marriage ceremony unless the participants take a course in marital relationships.

The Chairman: What I am really interested in is the point at which the child should be taught some values.

Dr. ten Bensel: Well, we know now that breast feeding is more important than bottle feeding from the points of view of nurturing, closeness, the bonding—and I do not want to get into that—than bottle feeding. Children acquire a lot of values during the period of toilet training. It is during that time that they really get the emotional feelings of their parents. One of the questions I ask all my students in class is, "At what age were you toilet trained?" I was toilet trained at 10 months of age, and when I grew up I asked my mother about this. I said, "Well, why did you train me so early?" And she said, "Because there was a competition among the mothers in the community to get their babies trained at an early age, because if you did not have your baby trained by the age of one year you were not a good mother."

I think I still have some residuals from early toilet training. I have seen kids strapped to their toilet chair for 36 hours, and

[Traduction]
de dents, et c'est à cet âge qu'il commence à explorer son milieu.

J'ai connu le cas d'un enfant de deux ans qui a mordu un enfant d'un an quarante fois de suite. J'ai appelé les services pour la protection de l'enfant à ce propos et ils m'ont dit que le cas ne les intéressait pas, car c'est un enfant qui fait subir le mauvais traitement. J'ai insisté pour qu'ils prennent l'affaire en main, et ils m'ont appelé quelques jours après pour me remercier d'avoir signalé le cas. Ils ont découvert que l'enfant de deux ans qui avait mordu l'autre avait été maltraité. Il était connu des services pour la protection de l'enfant. La seule façon pour l'enfant de se défoncer consistait à se servir de ses dents contre les autres.

Le président: Mais tous les enfants mordent au cours de leurs années d'exploration.

M. ten Bensel: Oui, mais il existe une relation étroite entre l'agression orale et le meurtre. C'est très intéressant.

Le président: Notre système scolaire consiste essentiellement à apprendre aux gens à gagner leur vie et non à vivre avec les autres. Il faudrait apprendre à l'enfant à se développer et à vivre dans son environnement, qui est composé de personnes, d'animaux, et de plantes, etc. Il faut lui enseigner à respecter tout ce qui fait partie de son environnement. Cela dit, quelle première mesure prendriez-vous pour ce genre d'éducation? Quel devrait être l'âge de l'enfant que vous voulez éduquer?

M. ten Bensel: La question est complexe. L'idéal serait de commencer avant la naissance de l'enfant. Nous commençons avec la génération des parents.

Pour en revenir à la question du sénateur Bird, dans certaines églises, les prêtres refusent de célébrer la cérémonie du mariage si les participants n'ont pas pris de cours matrimoniaux.

Le président: Ce qui m'intéresse vraiment c'est de savoir à quel âge il faut enseigner certaines valeurs à l'enfant.

M. ten Bensel: Nous savons maintenant que l'allaitement au sein est meilleur que l'allaitement au biberon du point de vue de l'épanouissement, du rapprochement et du lien affectif, et je ne voudrais pas trop m'engager dans cette question de lien affectif, si ce n'est d'affirmer qu'il est très important. En ce qui concerne la faculté cognitive de l'enfant, l'éducation commence dès le comportement de l'enfant se heurte à celui des parents. C'est le début des pleurs, des pantalons sales. Les enfants acquièrent de nombreuses valeurs au moment où ils apprennent à être propres. C'est à ce moment là qu'ils perçoivent vraiment les sentiments de leurs parents. L'une des questions que je pose à tous mes étudiants en classe est la suivante: à quel âge vous avez-vous appris à être propres? J'ai appris à être propre à dix mois et plus tard j'ai posé des questions à ma mère à ce sujet. Je lui ai demandé pourquoi elle m'avait appris à être propre si tôt et elle m'a répondu que c'était en raison d'une certaine concurrence entre les mères des enfants que si leur enfant n'était pas propre à l'âge d'un an, elle n'était pas une bonne mère.

Je crois que je me ressens encore de cette expérience. J'ai vu des enfants attachés à leur siège de toilette pendant 36 heures,
they have been beaten and they have had faeces pushed down their faces. No child in the world was ever toilet trained before 200 years ago.

Senator Bird: You mean they just acquired the habit?

Dr. ten Bensel: Well, if you go to other countries, particularly in the Middle East, you will see animals, children and adults urinating and defecating along the side of the road, all in public. There were not any diapers 200 years ago.

According to the date we have, the child probably needs to have consistent, structured and predictable environments all through childhood.

The Chairman: But he has to live with other people and with other forms of life.

Dr. ten Bensel: That is correct.

The Chairman: What would be your first introduction and at what age within the first year and a half would you teach that child that he has to have respect for other people?

Dr. ten Bensel: He has to pick it up indirectly, senator. You teach it by having it there in the family. I don't think that you just set down a child at 18 months and say, "Now, it is time to do this," or, "It is time to do that."

The Chairman: Teaching by example.

Dr. ten Bensel: Teaching by example or by role modelling. Where pets are concerned, the information is that little kids respond more to big animals like elephants and so forth, and you have to be careful about leaving a child too much responsibility for his pet too soon.

The Chairman: But pets do have worms and different other things that are a danger to a child's health, and you have that problem all the time.

Dr. ten Bensel: But in our society today animals are dewormed.

Senator Bird: But don't you have to take a chance someplace? We have always had pets and we managed.

Dr. ten Bensel: Yes, that is a problem. I don't know if I have answered your question that there has to be role modelling and you have to be with other people. Children do learn how to be humane from the care of animals and pets. I think those are good experiences.

The Chairman: You mentioned to me that all the great leaders of the world had a certain amount of humaneness in their makeup and they taught humaneness.

Dr. ten Bensel: Let me clarify that statement. The statement was that a genius is a person who is able to see things as they are and who can look into the future for 100 years. Hogarth was a genius; Henry Berg was a genius; Abraham Lincoln was a genius. In the middle of the Civil War,
Abraham Lincoln made statements, humane statements about children and that the fate of humanity was in the child's hands. The children grow up and they will take over the universities and the schools and the churches. And so we had better start being decent to children. As I said, this is an area of concern for all human life, and when you move to the high moral levels you get people like Albert Schweitzer and very high religious moral development.

Senator Bird: And Gandhi.

Dr. Ten Bensel: That is right.

Senator Bird: You mentioned television earlier, and this concerns us all very much. I can understand very well why parents let the children sit and watch television. If the mother has been extremely busy all day and then the husband comes home, it is the only chance she has to sit down and talk to him and have a drink. They put the small fry in front of the television, and it is "the happy hour." It affects everyone. But how are we teaching our children kindness to animals, kindness to each other and loving-kindness in this world, with the things that you see in any news report, or the war in Vietnam, or some of these murders that are carried out? These are all good people, and you have the bad guys kicking people in the groin. How important is all this?

Dr. Ten Bensel: I think that the television set and its introduction into Western society is significant. The point has been made that it is as significant as the introduction of the written word and books into human life. The television set is now part of the family and is responsible, as a member of the family, for making the next generation of human beings. It is responsible for their humaneness or inhumaneness. Now the issue with television is not the television set per se. There are two studies that are very important. One shows that how delinquent and how violent you were at 18 was directly correlated to how much television you watched at ages seven and eight. And then there are follow-up studies.

The second just came out of Belson of CBS in England where they studied 1,500 boys and it showed again a direct correlation between the amount of television watched and how violent they were. The problem is this: Why are they watching that kind of program unsupervised? Where are the parents? The current recommendations of the Academy of Pediatrics and the Action for Children's Television—a consumer group working on improving television—is that there should be only one hour of TV watching at a time for a child who is a pre-schooler. He becomes exhausted. The current data, just to clear the record, is that in the United States the average U.S. child watches 34 hours a week and by age 14 will have seen 18,000 violent deaths and will have seen 350,000 commercials which, in my view, are of rather dubious value. The positive aspect of television is miniscule. There have now been 2,400 scientific research studies done on the impact. We know that

La deuxième étude a été faite par Belson de la chaîne CBS en Angleterre; une étude de 1,500 garçons a démontré qu’il existait un lien direct entre le nombre d’heures passées à la télévision et l’indice de violence. Mais le problème est le suivant: pourquoi les enfants regardent-ils ce genre d’émission sans surveillance? Où sont les parents? Les recommandations actuelles des groupes Academy of Pediatrics et Action for Children's Television—un groupe de consommateurs s’efforçant d’améliorer la télévision—are the suivantes: les enfants d’âge préscolaire ne devraient regarder qu’une heure de télévision à la fois. L’enfant se fatigue. D’après les données actuelles, pour ne donner qu’un exemple, l’enfant américain moyen passe 54 heures devant la télévision par semaine; à l’âge de 14 ans il aura assisté à 18,000 morts violentes et regardé 350,000 messages publicitaires lesquels, à mon avis, sont d’une valeur plutôt douteuse. L’aspect positif de la télévision est minime.
television instigates violence, and it will be maintained if the society condones it. What we are finding from television is that the child cannot tell right from wrong. You can jumble up a television program and insert a commercial here and there and put it all out of sequence. They get the same amount of information out of it whether you run it in sequence or not. After age 7 you may be mature enough to watch it, but up to age 7 you are not. By the way, the American Medical Association (1976) has declared television an environmental hazard. They are saying in the United States under the First Amendment there is a restriction on freedom of speech for what you put on television, but they are also holding you responsible for it. I can say what I want, but I am held responsible for what I say, and I may be sued for slander or libel. There is a court case now in California where two girls raped another girl because of a scene they saw on a television set. ABC studies show that 22 per cent of all juvenile crime is patterned directly after television programs. So now they are going through the courts in the U.S. Sure, you can put anything you want on television, but you are responsible. This very case has gone to the California Supreme Court.

The Chairman: Before television came into use, the crime comics did the very same thing.

Dr. ten Bensel: No. Let me make a clarification on that. The cartoon comics, the science fiction comics, the slapstick comics are not as serious as the more real-life situation. In other words, the more real-life the situation the more the violence gets transmitted to the child.

There seems to be a battering ram effect. The old movies where 100 Indians get wiped out, or a war movie, are devastating because children are overwhelmed and it appears to break down resistance to violence. So there is good reason not to watch the mass murder type of program. But they clean them up on television. There is no blood, or very little blood on television. If you see the same movie in a movie theatre and on television, you will see that they have taken out the blood on television. I think on the major U.S. networks there are only three "damns" and one "hell" between 8 and 10 o'clock, or during prime time. So they have some kind of minor rules.

Senator Bird: On colour television the blood is much more terrifying than it was on black and white.

Dr. ten Bensel: Well, they have done studies on that, and there is really very little difference in violence seen in colour and seen in black and white.

Senator Cottreau: Doctor, a widespread practice today is child adoption. From various witnesses who have appeared before us, I understand that behavior patterns of children tend
Dr. ten Bensel: That is a tough question, senator. On the data that we have on adopted children, I doubt whether they are capable of sensing a blood difference. As one of the witnesses who appeared before your committee stated, everything has an equivalent in genetics. If we had all the statistics we would have to relate it to genetics. If you look, for example, at obesity and adoptive parents, if your one natural parent is overweight and you are adopted, you run a 40 per cent chance of being obese, even though you go with thin parents who are on a thin diet. If both of your natural parents were obese, and you go into an adoptive home, you run a 70 per cent chance of being obese, even though both adoptive parents are thin and have not an excessive carbohydrate-fattening diet.

Other studies have been done on transracially adopted children, and these indicate that non-white kids being adopted into white homes still had a lag in their development, even though they were with parents of high IQ, etc. They related that to the fact that there was probably a genetic factor that can be compensated for somewhat by the environment, but not exclusively.

As a matter of fact, even the process of becoming criminal, or not criminal, relates somewhat to reasoning. In other words, if we traced it back to the next step, there might be a biological equivalent. In other words, when you say a moral value, not knowing right from wrong, not knowing what the boundaries are, perhaps in some way that is related to how well you process information coming into your nervous system through you eyes, you ears or whatever. It may depend on how you reason. How are all those things hooked up in how you reason.

No one has done the genetic studies on child abuse. However, with respect to alcoholism there seems to be a genetic factor involved. It is not a single disease. Alcoholism in families parallels divorce rates. Maybe there are some people who should not be married. Maybe because of their nervous systems they are not going to live well with someone else.

These kinds of research theories are complicated, but I would say that in an adoptive situation, attachment and bonding do occur. The environment will influence the child to a degree. There is that inter-relationship between the genetics, the biological and the environment.

The general feeling from the World Health Organization, from the data that I have read—and I have to believe this as a therapist and someone who wants to help—is that you can modify the biological behaviour with a good environmental support system. From the studies I have seen, I think that is true.
There are some individuals who, no matter what their parents, what their home, their environment, their time and place in the world, would be criminals, and there are some people who ought to be locked up because they cannot deal with other people, for whatever reason. Maybe it is a little brain tumour, or their chemistry, or something else. The same is true with respect to geniuses and creators. We just do not have the answers to that.

The alienation of affection issue of adoptive parents is one I cannot give you an answer to, because I just don't know what the answer is. There is the problem that people do want to know what their roots are; they want to know where they came from, who they are and how they came into this world.

Senator Cottreau: That is what made me ask my question in the first place. It was just that one point.

Dr. ten Bensel: Yes. That may be part of the trend. There have been several things in the last few years that have accentuated people finding out who they are.

The Chairman: I should like to take you back to the question of blood on television and whether black and white is worse than colour and so on. We are in a great period of stress on this continent today. The Vietnam war was evidence of that stress. I have read recently that the social conditions in Germany were responsible for the pathological political characters that developed. The Black Death was a period of great stress in Europe and it was followed by tremendous pathological political people. Witch hunts in northern Europe followed certain stresses; the Spanish inquisition followed certain fears and paranoia. We are now in a period in which the western world is uneasy, the eastern world is uneasy, the Third World is uneasy, and these great stresses may be responsible, individually, for certain stresses in our society. Do you believe in that?

Dr. ten Bensel: I think there is some validity to that, senator. Certainly, what is going on in the general society affects the family and the individual.

I am not enough of a socio-scientist and I have not studied that, but I would think there is some validity to that kind of discussion.

The Chairman: Are there any more questions?

I think we should invite you to come back.

Senator Cottreau: I think you should, Mr. Chairman. I have a number of other questions.

Senator Bird: That is my feeling too.

Dr. ten Bensel: I will be happy to send you a syllabus of all my notes.

The Chairman: I think the witness should come back and help us write our report.

Dr. ten Bensel: I really think that the work you are doing is extremely important, and, as I said, I really was jumping over the mountain tops today.

[Text]

There are some individuals who, no matter what their parents, what their home, their environment, their time and place in the world, would be criminals, and there are some people who ought to be locked up because they cannot deal with other people, for whatever reason. Maybe it is a little brain tumour, or their chemistry, or something else. The same is true with respect to geniuses and creators. We just do not have the answers to that.

[Traduction]

Il y a des gens qui, quels que soient leurs parents, la famille dont ils viennent, le milieu dans lequel ils évoluent, l'époque et l'endroit où ils vivent, deviennent criminels, et il y a des gens qui, qu'ils faudrait enfermer, car ils ne peuvent pas cohabiter avec d'autres pour une raison ou pour une autre. Cela est peut-être dû à une petite tumeur au cerveau, à leur composition chimique ou à d'autres choses. Cette constatation s'applique également dans le cas des génies et des créateurs. C'est encore pour nous un mystère.

En ce qui concerne le problème du manque d'affection auquel se heurtent les parents adoptifs, je ne peux pas vous répondre, car je ne connais pas la réponse. Il se peut que les gens ne désirent pas connaître leurs racines, savoir d'où ils viennent, qui ils sont et comment ils sont venus dans ce monde.

Le sénateur Cottreau: C'est ce qui m'a d'abord poussé à poser la question. C'était juste ce point-là.


Le président: J'aimerais revenir à la question des bains de sang à la télévision et vous demander si un appareil en noir et blanc est pire qu'un appareil en couleur, etc. Nous traversons actuellement une grande période de tension, comme le proc. ve la guerre au Vietnam. J'ai lu récemment que les conditions sociales en Allemagne expliquaient la poussée des personnalités politiques extrêmement pathologiques. La peste noire constituait une période de grande tension en Europe et elle a donné lieu à des personnalités politiques extrêmement pathologiques. La chasse aux sorcières en Europe septentrionale a fait suite à certaines tensions; la paranoia et certaines craintes furent à l'origine de l'inquisition espagnole. Nous traversons actuellement une période de malaise, qu'il s'agisse du monde occidental, oriental ou du Tiers-monde, et chacune de ces grandes tensions expliquent probablement certaines autres que connaît notre société. Croyez-vous en cette théorie?

M. ten Bensel: Je pense qu'il y a certains points valables, monsieur le sénateur. Il est certain que ce qui se passe dans la grande société influence sur la famille et l'individu.

Je ne m'y connais pas assez en sociologie et je n'ai pas étudié cette question, mais je pense que ce genre de discussion contient des points valables.

Le président: D'autres questions?

Je pense que nous allons vous inviter à revenir.

Le sénateur Cottreau: Je le pense également, monsieur le président. J'ai un certain nombre d'autres questions.

Le sénateur Bird: C'est également mon avis.

M. ten Bensel: Je serais très heureux de vous envoyer le résumé de toutes mes notes.

Le président: A mon avis, le témoin devrait revenir pour nous aider à rédiger notre rapport.

M. ten Bensel: Je pense vraiment que vous accomplissez une œuvre extrêmement importante et, comme je l'ai dit, je n'ai fait qu'effleurer le problème aujourd'hui.
Senator Bird: What you have told us has been most illuminating, and I congratulate you on your delivery; you really drove your message home.

Dr. ten Bensel: Senator McGrand gave me permission to preach a little today.

The Chairman: Thank you very much. You are our last witness for the time being.

The committee adjourned.

[Traduction]

Le sénateur Bird: Ce que vous nous avez dit aujourd'hui nous a beaucoup éclairé et je vous en félicite.

M. ten Bensel: Le sénateur McGrand m'a donné aujourd'hui la permission de faire un petit sermon.

Le président: Je vous remercie beaucoup. Vous êtes notre dernier témoin pour le moment.

Le comité suspend ses travaux.
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