

These measures will, we believe, go a considerable way toward ensuring that those inmates whose presence in the community constitutes a threat to citizens' security will in future be more securely confined. Release will occur only at such time and in such circumstances as best serve the need for protection of the community.

In conclusion, I have attempted to outline in a rather general way the policies, and the principal measures designed to implement them, provided for in Bill C-83 and to explain how I believe they represent a measured and reasoned approach to dealing with a number of basic problems apparent in our criminal justice system. In the ensuing debate and committee consideration many differing views and proposals will be advanced on the measures. I would like to assure hon. members—I think they know me well enough to know, from my record in the House, that such is true—that I will be, of course, open to all constructive criticism and proposals for further improvements both from them and from members of the public.

I would only like to add that the formulation and implementation of criminal justice policies is very much an ongoing process and is continuous, and the measures set forth in this legislation reflect but one part of the continuum. It is also a process that to be fully effective requires close and continuing consultation and collaboration with the provinces and their attorneys general. On the present measures there has been, and will continue to be, such co-operation and this will, of course, continue to be my policy in future initiatives.

There are many things yet to be done to bring about further improvements in the policies and the system. Evidence of this exists, among other places, in the many proposals for reform that are emanating from the Law Reform Commission. We have now received from the commission its first two final reports, one on the laws of evidence and the other on principles of sentencing, and look forward to a number of others in the months ahead. I will shortly be discussing with the provincial attorneys general the problems of the present pretrial procedures in criminal cases and have requested the Law Reform Commission to bring forth proposals for consideration of this matter on a priority basis.

We are now examining closely their reports on a code of evidence and on disposition and sentencing with a view to reaching early decisions, after consultations with the provincial ministers, on which of their recommendations can be incorporated, at the federal level, readily into our criminal justice policies to improve the quality and operation of the criminal justice system. Some of the recommendations in the report on sentencing are aimed at the most basic considerations of all: how to resolve conflicts without resort to the criminal justice system; how to prevent people getting enmeshed in the system in the first place or, once involved, how the system can be used in a restorative and reparative way.

I am also particularly concerned about the system as it relates to our native population. My department is developing a number of projects and measures, in concert with the provinces, designed to adapt the system to their particular needs and concerns. In these and other initiatives my goal will be to foster a criminal justice system that will best serve the interests and merit the respect of

Measures Against Crime

all the people of Canada, and I invite parliament's careful examination of this objective and of these proposals.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, first I wish to congratulate the minister on making an excellent case out of such a bad bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: Now I would like to file a caveat and a notice to you, Mr. Speaker, that at the end of my address I will move a motion, which I have studied very carefully and for the preparation of which I managed to obtain the best experts I could on the subject, knowing full well the difficulty of moving any amendment on second reading. Before I start my address I wish to bring to Your Honour's attention that the bill which we are now debating, Bill C-83, contains 73 pages, 39 of which deal with one matter, namely, gun control. There are five distinct changes in the law in this bill, but only one brings in a substantive new law on gun control. In other words, 39 pages out of 73 deal with the new law on gun control and the other sections, on which I will speak in a few moments, are merely amendments to the existing law. Because of that, I hope that when I complete my remarks the minister will agree with the motion which I will put forward.

In a bill of this nature the minister has brought in an extensive change to the law on gun control, a new law contained in 39 pages deliberately mixed with other amendments. This was done deliberately. You are damned if you do, and damned if you do not, and that is the reason the bill was drawn up in this fashion. I serve notice that I will move a motion that the bill be not read a second time because of the mixture of a brand new law and amendments which are merely a patchwork and which should be separated from the new law. We should have a separate debate on gun control and another one on the patchwork of amendments to the Criminal Code. This would give an opportunity to every member in the House, wherever he sits, to express himself on his will and his conscience—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams:—and, above all, on the conscience of the people of this country who are very concerned about this problem. As one newspaper man put it to me today, it is a big bundle in a big chunk, and most of that chunk deals with gun control.

An hon. Member: Some journalist.

Mr. Woolliams: He might be a favourite of yours, so be careful. He wrote a pretty good article about you recently. I believe that this bill should be severed. In my comments I will show why it should be severed, why gun control should be separate from amendments on dangerous offenders, from amendments on wiretapping and provisions for a special inquiry, giving provinces certain jurisdiction, and from changes in the Parole Act.

● (1600)

My first words on this subject are to clear up immediately the misunderstanding which has crept across the nation, and even into the media, that the debate today will include a discussion on amendments and new laws to be added to