

**COPY FOR YOUR
INFORMATION**

© Kevin D. Carriere
Richard V. Ericson
Centre of Criminology
University of Toronto
Toronto, 1989
ISBN 0-919584-65-9

Canadian Cataloguing In Publication Data

Carriere, Kevin D.

Crime Stoppers: A Study in the Organization of Community Policing

(Research Report of the Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto; 24)
ISBN 0-919584-65-9

1. Crime Stoppers (Canada). 2. Criminal investigation - Canada - Citizen participation. 3. Crime and criminals in mass media - Canada. 4. Crime prevention - Canada - Citizen participation.

I. Ericson, Richard V., 1948 - . II. University of Toronto. Centre of Criminology. III. Title. IV. Series

HV8073.C37 1989

364.4'0458'06

C89-093393-6

The research project was supported by many of Crime Stopper's programme. The content of this formative stages of this project were Landau, Clifford is also extended Mrs. R. (Petey) transcriptions of assistance in co

This report is a Deviance and Crime Council grant of the Solicitor General's contribution

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research presented in this report would not have been possible without the support of many people. First and foremost we would like to thank the members of Crime Stoppers organizations who took the time to speak with us about the programme. Many academic colleagues have also influenced the form and content of this monograph by commenting on the research design during its formative stages, and by reviewing earlier drafts of the manuscript. Throughout this project we have benefited from the comments of Jim Hackler, Tammy Landau, Clifford Shearing, Phillip Stenning, and Gordon West. Our appreciation is also extended to Tony Doob for helping arrange access during the fieldwork, to Mrs. R. (Petey) Carriere for providing invaluable assistance in completing accurate transcriptions of many of the tape recorded interviews, and to Dianna Ericson for assistance in copy-editing.

This report is part of a larger research programme, "Understanding News of Deviance and Control," funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (grant nos. 410-83-0748, 410-84-0004, 451-84-3311) and the Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, through its fund for independent research and its contribution programme to the Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto.

Community Policing
University of Toronto; 24)

Canada - Citizen
Canada. 4. Crime

Centre of

C89-093393-6

The relationship of Crime Stoppers' activities to the law is also somewhat precarious. Although legal resources were not explicitly mobilized against the Crime Stoppers programme, one should not infer that the programme's relationship with the law has been entirely unproblematic and uncontested. In Canada, the courts have ruled that information given to the police by means of an anonymous Crime Stoppers tip is not sufficient to justify the granting of a search warrant. In *B. v. Kynluk* (B.C. Co. Ct., Selbie C.C.J., Oct. 24, 1987) the presiding judge excluded evidence obtained as a result of such a search in that it was determined to have been obtained in a manner that violated the spirit of s. 24(2) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Another area of legal concern for the programme, again a function of the anonymity offered to informants, is a process that Crime Stoppers participants refer to as "funneling." Although there has been little public attention drawn to this issue, this process is well documented by Crime Stoppers organizations (Croal, Smart and Jackson, 1987: 37). Funneling occurs when a police investigator encourages an informant to call the Crime Stoppers programme, instead of providing information directly to police officials, so that the informant will receive a cash reward for his or her information. Once an informant's identity is known, Crime Stoppers cannot guarantee anonymity, nor ensure that the informant's investigative techniques will be protected from court scrutiny (Carriere, 1987b). Commenting on the legal problems that may arise from funneling, an interviewee explained:

An undercover guy in the drug squad says: "Look, don't give me the information, phone Crime Stoppers, they'll pay you for it. I can't pay you as much as they do." So the [informant] phones, okay? Now what you've got is an informant who's known. He is known to the investigator ... and that [investigator] has to lie in court [in order to protect the informant's identity]. Okay, now that may not be very much, so he lies. This [informant] could get arrested and he might keep his mouth shut until he gets to court. And then he opens his mouth in court. This [police officer] is looking at perjury ... [name of city] does have some problems with funneled informants and it will haunt people.

Another area in which Crime Stoppers has a precarious relationship with the law is taxation. Crime Stoppers programmes in Canada, as in the United States, are faced with the problem of how to lawfully remunerate informants when the desire to provide anonymity precludes the issuance of a proper tax receipt. Describing this situation in both the United States and in Canada, as well as the role of the Crime Stoppers International organization, an interviewee stated:

A: In the United States itself, they [Crime Stoppers International] have had to go after changes in the law. One little aspect is the, the internal revenue, oh, demanded that any payment of over five hundred dollar - no, any payment over six hundred dollars - has to be considered as declared income. So the anonymity of the person giving the information wouldn't be protected. Now the other thing is, if we don't know who the informant is, the money is paid out to anonymous individuals. In fact, you're breaking the law, because you're not getting his social security number, you're not issuing a tax [receipt] ... So what they have done, they have asked for legislative changes so that, in fact, Crime Stoppers will be exempt from that section of the law.

Q: I see. Is that the situation in Canada and the United States, or is that just a problem in the United States.

A: No. In Canada it's any income.

Q: So the legislation is more stringent in Canada?

A: Yeah, and we haven't, haven't run into that problem, and our Revenue Canada hasn't pushed it, and I don't think it will ever become - they understand fully how the programme operates.

Q: You've spoken to them about it?

A: Yeah, we've had discussions with them and, their attitude is "have a good programme, maintain accurate records, and let's not rock the boat."

Q: If it gets rocked?

A: If it gets rocked then we'll have to ask for changes.

Despite Crim
to the legal status of
seen as legitimate
definitions of the c
subversive, lawless,
legality of a Crime S
commented:

I guess my o
do, he has to
down to the l
society? In c
working, obv
want to fight
But not the p
because it b

It is evident

difficulty. However,
potential legal chal
widely reported, en
programme is main
minor charge of tre
substantial media ne
v. Krynuk was not c

Crime Stop
Guardian Angels' e
police in making di

Despite Crime Stoppers precarious relationship with the law, challenges to the legal status of Crime Stoppers' activities by members of the public were not seen as legitimate by members of the organization. Challenges to dominant definitions of the community and the community interest were viewed as subversive, lawless, or immoral. In relation to efforts directed at challenging the legality of a Crime Stoppers programme in another Canadian city, an interviewee commented:

I guess my own personal feeling is certainly as any defence attorney must do, he has to provide the best defense for his client. But ... [it comes] down to the bottom end: what in hell, in fact, are they doing to our society? In other words, they are attacking something that is obviously working, obviously helping society. Why in hell try and get rid of it? If they want to fight each individual case, then by all means, go ahead and do so. But not the principle because the principle is far too important to destroy because it benefits all of us and them too.

It is evident that Crime Stoppers has considerable potential to be in legal difficulty. However, few legal challenges have been advanced. Moreover, past or potential legal challenges to the Crime Stoppers programme have not been widely reported, ensuring that a consensual image of the Crime Stoppers programme is maintained within the public culture. For example, while a very minor charge of trespassing against a leader of the Guardian Angels received substantial media news coverage, the court decision against Crime Stoppers in *B. v. Kyrlyuk* was not covered by the news media.

Crime Stoppers' business and media supporters were aware of the Guardian Angels' efforts to establish a chapter in this area. They echoed the police in making disparaging remarks about the Guardian Angels. Given the