

*Criminal Code*

six occurred in the six abolitionist states, and four of these latter states did not record a single killing.

If I felt there should be an exception, if anywhere there were statistics to support it, then much as I would regret doing so I would support an amendment to take into account the danger to police and custodians. In the United States they found out in the course of their examination that the municipal police of 240 cities, 75 per cent from the death penalty states, did not believe there was any connection between the death penalty and the use of lethal weapons by criminals. Finally, when this exception was moved in the United Kingdom it was turned down by both houses of parliament, as all hon. members know.

Let us examine the record. Who would you think would be able to give the best evidence in this connection? Who but the wardens of these institutions in which executions take place? I refer to page 242 of "The Death Penalty In America", reporting the results when the wardens are asked specifically to determine the effect of the death penalty so far as police or custodial officials are concerned. Would hon. members not think that these people who have the responsibility for executions and for the custody of individuals who have been reprieved would hold strong opinions? The official views presented and analysed were collected. The responses to inquiries mailed to all state prison wardens and four federal prison wardens in the United States—a total of 55—were analysed. What was the answer? The attitude was that the death penalty was not a deterrent, and this answer was an overwhelming one. The percentages clearly showed that those in the abolitionist states had gone as far as to contend that their police officers and custodial officers were in less danger than those in states where there was a death penalty.

This was the finding of the select committee of 1928. Those were the views which were expressed when they stated that no evidence had been received showing that the abolition of capital punishment in other countries had in fact led to the consequences apprehended by the police.

Certainly in the United Kingdom unarmed police officers have a reputation for fairness and integrity which our own have to the same extent, and they would not have abolished the death penalty if they or any of them, including outstanding leaders such as the Lord Chancellor and the Lord Chief

Justice, had not concluded that there was no basis for the fears which had been expressed.

What does the Lord Chancellor say? At column 703 of the House of Lords' debates of July 20 last he is reported as stating:

It is said: Ought we not to protect the police and prison officers? Well, of course we should. Abolitionists are very used to being told they do not think of the police and they do not think of the victims. That is really quite untrue as I know from my own experience.

The Lord Chancellor went on to say that in his own opinion, based on his own experience at the bar and as Lord Chancellor, there was no basis in fact for this fear.

We come now to the next question, the tremendous increase in crimes of violence. The increase that is taking place in Britain, in Canada and in the United States is almost incredible. Everyone has an explanation. I do not say mine is any better than anyone else's. But I know that as a boy, if we got hold of a little paperback about Jesse James—it would not be looked at by a boy today—we would creep under the barn to read it. Today, hour after hour on television pictures of terror and murder, firearms and rapine are seen. No one wants censorship. But there should be a censorship of reason within those institutions. There can be no other embracing explanation for the tremendous increase in violent crime. Guns, weapons, terror—psychologists say they do not greatly influence the minds of the young. It may not influence the minds of the young but, to echo Lord Wellington's description of his troops, "they scare the hell out of me" when I see some of these things. I am using an expression of Wellington's and it is therefore appropriate for parliament.

● (4:30 p.m.)

What is the increase in crime? The increase is so large that it seems almost incredible, some 70 per cent in the United States in a period of 13 years. What about our own country? I have not been able to secure the figures for 1964 and 1965. My staff endeavoured to get them today from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics but they are not prepared yet.

I do not want to read all this into *Hansard*, but I have a statement here compiled by D.B.S. and I am going to ask leave to put on the record the portions that are not in ink. The inked parts were placed on it by my office, but I shall give the figures in round numbers.

In 1945, not taking in Newfoundland where crime is always at a very low percentage and