

Measures Against Crime

will not get the thugs. Has it any support from the mounted police and those in authority? I have spoken to one after the other, and I did not do it by dialling policemen.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Without exception, including former RCMP commissioner Nicholson, they are all agreed that it is simply a joke. It is designed to allay public fear that crime is multiplying, and at the same time it brings in a system that cannot be effective. One may ask what can be done. The Fish and Game Association made a very reasonable and responsible presentation. This is general across the country of that great organization. I quote:

The policy of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation as regards to firearms legislation, is to:

1. Oppose legislative programs that prohibit or unnecessarily discourage the ownership and use of firearms by responsible citizens.
2. Support legislative programs that provide stringent and mandatory punishment for the criminal misuse of firearms.
3. Encourage the development of programs concerned with gun safety and with legitimate recreational uses of firearms.

Going on from there, we come to the next phase dealing with the legalization of provincial crime commissions. The Quebec crime commission has done the most effective work that I have ever known, on the part of any commission, to meet the problem. What happened? The authority of the province of Quebec to set up the commission was challenged and it went to the Supreme Court. Where did the Government of Canada stand? Where did the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice stand? They joined with the thugs in arguing in the Supreme Court of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: They argued that what was done was not within the jurisdiction of the provincial government or the legislature of Quebec. A howl went up. It did not take long. The government then said it would bring in legislation to legalize that which it said was beyond the legislative authority of the province. In the meantime, the Quebec crime commission has virtually been made inert. This is not the first time they have done that. I have never known a government that can argue one way in the House of Commons and a different way in the Supreme Court of Canada. The first example was in the Drybones case. An order was made. Drybones had been discriminated against by that wonderful judge in the Yukon who is now about to retire.

Mr. Nielsen: Northwest Territories.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Northwest Territories judge. The government said it did not believe in discrimination. Lo and behold, when the case came to the Supreme Court of Canada the lawyers for the government of Canada argued that what had taken place was not discrimination and that in any event it did not come within the purview of the Bill of Rights. What manner of nonsense is this?

An hon. Member: Liberal nonsense.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Liberal nonsense? It is no longer a Liberal government; it is a Trudeau government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is tremendously interesting to see what stand the government took with reference to women. This has been women's year, when they were showing their best—and I am referring to the government. A woman in Alberta had worked for years building up for her husband a very tidy amount of land, cash and the like. She was foisted out. When she asked for a fair share, where did the Government of Canada stand? They argued in that case that she was not entitled because, constitutionally, it was not appropriate or proper. Where are we going, is the question I ask.

I have other things I could deal with, but I am not going to deal with them except to say this. No one of responsibility that I know in the Mounted Police is for this gun legislation in its present form. Goodness knows, this government does not like the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I know that argument will not gain any sentimental support because they tried to get rid of "Royal Canadian". When I raised this last year and said they were removing it, the Prime Minister said that was all wrong, they had never even thought of it. When it was pointed out by tens of thousands of people all across the country that mounted police barracks, detachments and the like had "Royal Canadian" removed, then even the government could see. They then decided that they would not remove the words "Royal Canadian".

However, there are still some ministers opposite who do not have that affection for the mounted police which one would expect. I think of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand) when he was minister without portfolio last November. He has gone from transition to transition. After saying he was sure that the RCMP tipped off the press in advance that they would be meeting with him on Thursday—

[Translation]

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the House that we are debating Bill C-83. The hon. member is discussing quite a different matter.

[English]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, there are none as blind as those who cannot see.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: If the hon. member really wants a recommendation to be a minister, I will give it to him, because he has all the qualifications of many others around him.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: The minister said, last November:

The RCMP are using public opinion to get a strength they would not get otherwise...

I do not want to see another CIA (the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency) in Canada.

That shows the attitude of some ministers of this government. To the credit of the Solicitor General, the next day he said, "My cabinet colleague was unfair and unjust in his allegations about the RCMP." But they do not like the RCMP—and that applies to quite a few who sit opposite. They are really deeply disturbed by Sky Shops and other