

*Criminal Code*

way to get around this is to not have your telephone listed. Then you are not subjected to those telephone calls to which some people are subjected.

Then there is the question of juries, court jurisdiction, trial by magistrate by consent, evidentiary value of certain documents and the way proof may be made in the courts. These are all matters of little or no consequence except in so far as an accused is concerned who, not knowing his rights, consents to have a summary trial to save time, which is often the explanation given to him, the result is often a longer sentence than otherwise would have been the case. Then there is the matter of proof of previous convictions, which is simply a matter of a certificate, and the directing of a new trial in the case of a sentence of preventive detention. I think this is a good principle and I would like to see the minister go a little further. I find that among those who are habitual criminals there is a loss of hope on their part once they have qualified to be designated as habitual criminals. They lose hope. I would like to see the addition of a condition by way of an incentive to rehabilitation whereby after a period of five or six years the individual might look forward to a review of the order made and an opportunity for rehabilitation provided the individual in question has shown this desire. The rehabilitation and Parole Act amendments are also worthy of support.

I think that pretty well covers the matters before us. I have scarcely been able to join with the minister in the hallelujah chorus about the wonders of the amendments that have been provided in this bill. Never in my lifetime have I felt the degree of fear regarding current conditions that I feel today. There is public concern in the United States and Canada over the expanding and tremendously developing field of crime. The number of convictions aside from traffic infringements shows a marked increase in our country. In 1957 the number of convictions in Canada, excluding traffic infringements, amounted to 387,437, and in 1966, the last year for which figures are available, 548,533. Crime is increasing two and a half times faster than the population.

Indictable offences increased from 31,000 in 1956 to 45,607 in 1966. In a period of 17 years the number of juvenile delinquents increased by 14,000 or roughly three times. Population in the same period increased by 30 per cent. One is concerned about the disregard for the law. We live in an age when various people join together and become

power groups, and law-abiding citizens are in the dangerous position of being subject to the power of a visual minority who deny and defy by force that which the law proclaims to be wrong.

● (3:20 p.m.)

We live in an age in which there is an increase in mob conduct. I believe in the right of individuals to agitate for change, but there is as vast a difference between agitation for change and contempt for the law as there is between liberty and licence. Organized anarchy, which is not being punished within our country and except on very odd occasions is not being punished in the United States, is dangerous to freedom. The right to dissent must be preserved but the right to civil disobedience must be frowned on. It is dangerous to a nation when groups, relying on their numbers, contend that the rule of law must be abrogated for them because it is unacceptable to the groups to which they belong. This has become epidemic. It is epidemic in the United States. We can no longer say it is restricted. That spirit of lawlessness, that spirit of contempt toward police officers is becoming epidemic in Canada. We see it on every hand, in the refusal of passers-by to participate in any way in the assistance of policemen carrying out their responsibilities. This is something that requires the best efforts not only of the minister, not only of the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) but of the Attorneys General of the various provinces and of law officers generally. What are we going to do about it?

At this very time when these things are happening in our country we are permitting second-hand revolutionaries and prophets of political dissolution to come into our country. We have opened the doors to them. Recently in answer to a question on my part the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) said that even if they come to Canada to advocate changing the government by force, as long as they speak to selective groups and do not make their message one to all Canadians there is no reason they should not be admitted. The United Kingdom has found out otherwise. It has closed the door to several of them. The republic of France has followed the same course. But we have opened the door.

We let these professional agitators come here, people like Jerry Rubin, Rapp Brown and Stokely Carmichael. We allow them to speak openly in Canada about bloodshed, and the Minister of Manpower and Immigration