figure is 54 per cent. Does that not prove the necessity of registration and control of guns? In Canada, 46 per cent of all murders are of the domestic kind—murders committed within the family, among acquaintances or neighbours. Of that 46 per cent, 72 per cent are committed by people with rifles which are not registered and are easily available.

All of us are in agreement with the expanded powers of judges to restrict the use of guns. There are mandatory provisions and there are discretionary provisions, and power is given to a peace officer to take away guns without a warrant in disputes involving the family, acquaintances or neighbours. That is not in issue, Mr. Speaker. What is in issue is what is contained in this bill. I respectfully submit the minister has caved in; he has shifted responsibility to the provinces and, in doing so, has endangered the lives of Canadians. This government will have to accept responsibility for deaths in the future caused by carelessness with and failure to control the availability of guns. Those are my comments with regard to firearms, Mr. Speaker.

With regard to electronic surveillance, the House will recall what I said about the famous speech of the Minister of Justice of March 8, 1976, in which he said he wanted to protect the legal rights and dignity of individuals. He set forth that there should be no invasion of privacy, but he said that we had to make certain exceptions. What are these exceptions, Mr. Speaker? The minister said, "I think there should be a right to wiretap in regard to indictable offences carrying a sentence of over five years"—I think it was. In this bill the minister wants to expand this provision to bookmaking and smuggling as well as to organized crime.

With regard to notification, the minister said, "I think a person should be notified not after 90 days have expired but any time between 90 days and three years". On the subject of intercepts, the minister said, "It should not be 30 days; experience has shown the average has been about 54 days; therefore it should be 60 days for intercepts, with the right of renewal". Then the minister comes right to the nub of it and talks about derivative evidence. The minister says that use will not be made of the complete transcript of illegal wiretaps, but part of the transcript may be used.

If I were living in the United States, perhaps I would feel that that type of legislation is appropriate; but this very provision is totally opposed there. We now have a movement in England which claims that experience has shown that derivative evidence obtained from illegal wiretaps is not a good rule and that in no time at all changes regarding that type of evidence will be made. We have had some experience of wiretap laws in Canada—and what has been the performance? The performance in 1974, 1975 and 1976 shows that there has been almost no refusal to tap on the part of the police. Last year, 614 applications were made under the legislation, none of which was refused. More importantly, last year 1,062 people were arrested as a result of taps yet there were only 13 convictions. Surely, the obvious inference from that is that there are very few charges laid, and very few convictions obtained. It is also obvious that the police are not reaching the so-called untouchables in crime.

One reason put forward when the wiretap legislation was presented a few years ago was that we had to get to the heart of criminal activity. I should like to quote to the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General some of the remarks of Ramsey Clark, former U.S. attorney general and opponent of electronic surveillance, in his testimony before the justice and legal affairs committee in 1973. Please remember, Mr. Speaker, that these are the remarks of a former attorney general of the United States who worked very closely with Senator Edward Kennedy who wanted strong electronic surveillance provisions.

He said that wiretapping was not used between 1966 and 1969, yet indictments against members of organized crime tripled. He concluded that wiretapping is a wasteful and inefficient means of investigation and is not, moreover, effective against organized crime. Having had very wide experience, Mr. Speaker, a former U.S. attorney general has gone on record as saying that indictments against members of organized crime tripled, yet no use was made of electronic surveillance. He also said wiretapping destroys the professionalism of investigators, that electronic surveillance encourages, not investigation but just sitting and waiting for something to happen.

● (1610)

This is what a good number of the members of our police force will be doing. It is enormously expensive; for example, the use of laser beams that can pierce walls up to 12 feet thick. Such all-encompassing eavesdropping evades human dignity. This is the example he gave: the listening in on the sexual activities of Martin Luther King and the subsequent use of this information to smear Martin Luther King's reputation.

I have heard the spokesman for the Conservative party speak, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), and the spokesman for our party. They spoke in very eloquent terms in regard to how it destroys the basic freedoms of people, how it endangers, how it infringes and how it destroys the human dignity—not only of the police but of the public. This is why we are concerned about the firearms' legislation and the electronics' legislation.

The next subject I am going to deal with is something the Solicitor General will also deal with. That is, dangerous offenders. We have learned from experience the shortcomings of the present provision of habitual offenders and dangerous sexual offenders. Experience has shown that some of these people were not violent. The best case was the Klippert case which finally went to the Supreme Court of Canada. We have also seen lack of uniformity with regard to application of the legislation concerning habitual offenders and dangerous sexual offenders.

The Ouimet report studied this in depth wherein it was stated that we are now going to change the habitual offender and the dangerous sexual offender to one title—"dangerous offender". I would have thought the minister would have