

*Criminal Code*

other day when I heard Mrs. Jones talking about Mr. Smith?" Perhaps that would not have been done because people did not want others to know they were listening in, even though almost everybody did it.

The only way bugging can be effective is if people are unaware their conversations are being overheard. The police are foolish if they think otherwise or that it will help them very much. It will help them catch the small penny criminals, but so far as organized crime is concerned the government is barking up the wrong tree if it thinks this kind of surveillance will stop organized crime. It will only catch the little old lady trying, as somebody said, to sneak some underwear across the border; it will not do much to prevent organized crime. That surely is not really the main purpose of the police.

● (1750)

Police would like the elimination of firearms in the hands of the public. One of the police chiefs speaking on a radio program last night said that he wished there were no guns in the hands of individual citizens in Canada. I think that if you controlled all guns, that would be effective, but this is Utopian and it will not happen. There would be not much point in trying to achieve it. Perhaps that would be suitable in Canada, but people in Canada treat guns differently than they do in the United States.

In the United States there has always been a great deal of confusion about the right to use guns to protect one's property, under their constitution. We never had such problems. Very early in our history we established military law. The militia controlled the laws in the early history of Canada, in both French and English Canada. The militia acted as policemen in the colonies until we developed a police force. Our police force was not the same as in England or in France. It was a relatively mobile police force and some of its aims, among others, were to put down revolutions and to protect the properties of merchants. The police took part in the war of the English and French fur traders. Later the mounted police was formed. That was its background, so we in Canada have not developed the same attitude toward guns as they have in the United States. It has usually been a necessity here to carry a gun. On many occasions Canadians have been called upon to pick up guns in the defence of their country. Canadians have used guns as tools of their trade.

Listening to the program "Cross Country Check-up" last night I heard some interesting comments. One was from the Northwest Territories. A caller said that guns there were not treated with particular respect and care, but at the same time they were not misused. He said that there was no difference between the way a gun and a butcher's knife were approached. Children are taught early on in their lives that they must not pick up a butcher's knife because they might cut themselves, or a gun because it is dangerous. No particular care is taken of either a butcher's knife or a gun, but neither are they misused. Many murders that were committed in that area did not involve the use of a gun, although a gun was easily accessible to those involved in the crimes.

[Mr. Peters.]

The police want to outlaw guns. In the bill preceding this one the minister indicated that he wished to outlaw guns. "Get them all out of the way, and there will be no problem", he seemed to say. Many of those who called in on "Cross Country Check-up", said, "We do not have guns over theah and therefore we do not want guns over theah". My tendency would be to say, "If you want to go over there, we will help to get you over there, because we like it here and we want to stay here". Much of it is that British nonsense, and the kind of people who go with that.

They fight their social wars here because over there they were not allowed to join the hunt club. Over here you can join the hunt club and chase foxes if you want, or you can shoot foxes at your own leisure—you do not need to belong to a social club or come from the right side of the tracks. There was a caller from Manotick who said, "We don't like these guns around, they are dangerous". That is a lot of nonsense. If they do not like them, they can go home and take their arguments with them.

There are many people in this country who are prejudiced either for or against guns. We all agree that the use of guns should be controlled to some degree, and one of the ways to control them is to improve ways of storing them. The way in which guns are stored in many parts of the country is atrocious.

We are worried about the one extra gun which one fellow used in the incident which took place in Ottawa the other day and which, they say, he would not have bought when on parole had the legislation been in effect. But no one said how he used other guns before that incident. They are talking only about the control of the gun he used this time. What shocks me about the police is that they seem to have known when and where he bought the gun, they knew all about it. Obviously they did not need this kind of legislation. Why did they let him buy it? Why did they not send a better trained policeman with a warrant to pick him up? In my opinion they are not really doing anything to prevent people from misusing guns, but they are really doing a number of things that are detrimental.

May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m. tonight.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

**AFTER RECESS**

[English]

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

**Mr. Peters:** Mr. Speaker, before the recess I was talking about the fact that the police chiefs of Canada are not particularly happy with the minister because they do not believe the wiretap legislation he is proposing is sufficient. They are also quite upset about the watering down of the bill with regard to gun legislation. In their brief the police chiefs