

*Gun Control*

admit that exceptional and constraining circumstances may indeed justify searches and seizures without a warrant.

In the case of *Hunter et. al C. Southam Inc.*, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that, in certain cases, searches without warrants do not constitute a breach of the Charter. The same rationale applies to urgent situations where police must intervene quickly.

For my own benefit and on behalf of my constituents, I have been trying to follow the evolution of the situation with respect to firearms control. I have yet to hear of a case where someone allegedly abused Criminal Code section 101(2). If ever this provision were to be the source of many instances of human rights abuses I would be the first one to advocate the necessary amendments.

● (1620)

Under the second amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton), firearms acquisition certificates would no longer be required for people living in the federal electoral ridings listed in Schedule III of the Canada Elections Act. These include Kenora—Rainy River, Thunder Bay—Nipigon, Yellowhead, Prince George—Peace River and the riding of the Hon. Member.

To my mind this is a discriminatory provision. Firearms acquisition certificates should be mandatory for all persons seeking to acquire a firearm, no matter how. The Hon. Member would extend special privileges to those whom he refers to as the “residents of the more northerly and remote regions of Canada”.

In my opinion, such cities as Prince George, Thunder Bay or Gander cannot qualify as remote regions.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to support this Bill. One of its provisions could result in needless injury or loss of life, while the other is clearly discriminatory on the basis of the area where one chooses to live.

[*English*]

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate this afternoon. It is somewhat ironic that we are discussing this particular issue at this time today. A while ago, we ended temporarily a discussion on the death penalty, knowing of course that a large proportion of murders are directly related to firearms, and we began to discuss a private Member's Bill on firearms. We will then return a little later to the debate on the death penalty.

I should begin my remarks by saying that I am one of those individuals who does his absolute best to stay as far away from firearms as possible on every possible occasion. I am one of those people who has never owned a firearm and I believe I have only shot a firearm two or three times in my life.

I do not have much use for them personally, but I recognize that some people use firearms for sports and for hunting and, as my hon. friend from Skeena pointed out very appropriately,

some actually require them for their protection if they live in very remote areas. As well, some who hunt for a living require firearms for their livelihood.

Having recognized the need for firearms as expressed by the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton), I nevertheless have two particular concerns that I must raise with him and the House. First, it is a fact that the number of firearms in existence and their availability is unfortunately very closely linked with the murder and crime rates.

● (1630)

I will digress for a moment to point out that it is well known that a number of U.S. Presidents have been assaulted with firearms over the years. I believe three were killed while in office, all of them by firearms. Not too long ago I read a newspaper article which referred to the fact that it cannot just be a coincidence that every one of those assaults on a President involved the use of a firearm. No President was ever choked, stabbed or anything else. They were all shot or shot at. I think there is a frightening message in that, which leads me to believe that firearms should not be as available as they generally are in this country.

I know the Hon. Member is very well intentioned with his Bill. I support him in his good intentions. I do not support his Bill but I certainly commend him for bringing before this House an issue which is obviously important to people in his constituency. However, that does not mean this is a good Bill for Canada as a whole. Nor is it a good Bill for those constituencies listed in Schedule 3 of the Canada Elections Act.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I see that some ridings are listed in Schedule III to the Canada Elections Act. Let me give you an example. There is for instance the federal constituency of Thunder Bay—Nipigon. What our colleague is saying is that in the heart of the city of Thunder Bay, there would be exemptions which the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) may feel are necessary in remote areas of his own riding, but which are not required in the downtown Thunder Bay.

Here are other examples. Among the other constituencies which the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) feels should be exempted from this section of the Criminal Code, I see the riding represented by the Hon. Member for Cochrane—Superior (Mr. Penner); I know that there are areas in that riding which are quite distant from major urban centres. However, we should not overlook the fact that it includes cities such as Timmins and communities such as Cochrane, even if they are located in Northern Ontario. Because of other similar examples, and although its intentions are good, I am not going to support the Bill introduced by the Hon. Member for Skeena, a man very familiar with the administration of justice for having worked in it for a great many years, as I feel that the list of constituencies which he has proposed and his geographic approach to this legislation are both unacceptable.