

*Criminal Code*

will say "forgive thy brother until seventy times seven". This represents forgiveness across the board, and therefore it rules out entirely any argument which may be put forward regarding vengeance.

I maintain there is no room in the modern world for vengeance. There is only one excuse for corporal punishment, and that would be that it would be a deterrent to crime, either individually or collectively. In so far as the individual is concerned, and I can only speak for myself of course, I do not believe that corporal punishment ever did me any good. I have never seen any case where it ever did anybody else any good. There may be occasions where it has, but they have not come to my attention. I speak in this connection as a result of some experience, because I have been directly and indirectly connected with law enforcement, being an officer of Her Majesty's peace forces for some 23 years.

I cannot see that fear of corporal punishment is very much of a deterrent. I would say also that in order to understand how to prevent crime we should understand the causes of crime. In my opinion, the greatest single cause of crime is lack of affection, and the second cause is lack of money. These two causes often go hand in hand because in a poverty-stricken home there is often little affection.

I come now to the underprivileged. According to the statistics which I have studied, and I have looked through this large volume of evidence collected by the investigating committee, 90 per cent of the crimes of violence are committed by the underprivileged. These are the crimes which, upon conviction, generally lead to whipping. The greater percentage of these people come from what I might call economically underprivileged homes. It is difficult to secure statistics on affection, and for that reason I concentrate on the economic aspect. I think it is true, and I have observed this in my own experience, that crimes of violence, robbery and theft, arise from these two sources. The people accused come from broken homes in which there is no affection or from poverty-stricken homes.

When a man is poverty-stricken I think he will do nearly anything to get enough money to survive. If we could do away with poverty and near-poverty, I am quite sure that, regardless of any ideologies which may be involved or appear to be involved, we would do away with a major cause of crime. In so far as punishment is concerned, I do not believe the threat of corporal punishment would deter anybody from stealing if he is hungry. I do not think it would keep

him from stealing if his loved ones were hungry. Therefore, the punishment of a man who has stolen because he is hungry or because his loved ones are hungry can be nothing but revenge. It will not prevent the crime.

There is another situation which arises, and it is this. Supposing he steals once and we punish him with the lash. I think that we are pushing him farther into the mire. All our efforts should be directed towards raising him out of the mire. We can only do that by convincing him that he is wrong and society is right. We may be able to show him, with patience and with true understanding, that society is right. Society can only do this by, first of all, forgiving him for his offence and, secondly, trying to show him some way out of the position in which he finds himself.

There has been a great change in penal institutions and in punishment. We no longer inflict what some people call barbarous sentences of punishment such as they inflicted in the British navy a little more than a hundred years ago. Still, I claim that the infliction of the lash is cruel, regardless of the weight. These engines of torture which the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) described to us—you cannot call them anything else—are horrible. I have seen them. I would not want any human being to be punished with those instruments, particularly when he is tied on the table and unable to defend himself. He feels he is already in the clutches of the law. Then, too, there is a possibility, and it may only be a possibility, that he has been unjustly arrested and hastily tried and then condemned to this inhuman punishment.

I will agree there is a great deal of difference between a brutal sex offence—if such an offence is ever committed by a sane man—and purse snatching or pocket picking. Nevertheless, I maintain that the lash should never be used because we can never be sure that this person actually committed the offence. Certainly, we can never be sure we know what went on inside his mind while he was committing it. I do not believe it is a common thing for a peace officer in this country to arrest a young man for the joy of arresting him, but he could be over-zealous. It is not a common thing for the prosecuting counsel to persecute a man in our courts, but it is possible and it has been done. Then, we do not know the mental background of this person, this boy or young man, because as we know we do not flog the women.

I might digress at this point for a moment or two. We do not flog women, and why