

disparity. Then we are told: "For example, the first year, could see the scheme implemented in Ontario." The registration scheme is to begin here, in Ontario, not in any other part of Canada.

Then we are told that in the following year the scheme will be implemented in western Canada and the territories. Clearly, there is to be open season for guns for a whole year in the western provinces and the territories until the gun law applies to those parts of the country. We are told that in the final year the scheme will be implemented in Quebec and the maritimes.

I have just referred to the last paragraph on page 11 of the "Peace and Security" booklet. Did you ever hear such nonsense? What will be a crime in Ontario in 1976 and part of 1977 will not be a crime elsewhere because the law will apply in Ontario but not to western Canada through to the Pacific coast. There will be no registration requirement there for the first year. There is to be one law for Ontario and a different law for all the other provinces and territories. The paragraph ends with these words:

This breakdown roughly divides the national population into three regional groups. Any implementation scheme would be subject to consultation with the provinces.

I have never seen a more asinine division of responsibility under law than that set out in the pamphlet purporting to deal with questions and answers regarding proposed gun control legislation. The government knows how costly this scheme will be. At first, 900 inspection officers will be needed. Who will pay for them?

An hon. Member: Ontario.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This is an imposition upon taxpayers and another way of imposing a tax. It is a way most indirect, yet it will directly affect all. The three million gun users must get licences. Sir, the government did not consult the Canadian game federations; they did not solicit the views of 200,000 members, decent, responsible Canadians who are anxious to support an effective law.

In this country there are ten million rifles and shotguns, 700,000 revolvers and pistols, and approximately 2,800,000 gun owners. How long will it take to register them and to secure that full information to which I have referred? This is a preposterous bureaucratic plan which cannot work. I have already said it will be brought in piecemeal. What is to happen to the man who carries a gun during the commission of an offence? That is where the government should strike. We are after the criminal who carries a gun. That is the man we are trying to go after. How will the gun law affect thugs? In February, 1975, I tried to bring before the House a bill to amend the Criminal Code. It was a simple bill and provided in proposed section 83.1 of the Criminal Code as follows:

Every one who carries or has in his possession a firearm for the purpose of or while committing an indictable offence, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for not less than five years.

That provision would suffice. Wherever similar provisions were brought in, the "gunsters" ran for cover—except the desperate ones; they are in a different category. The sort of plan now before the House has not worked in New York. Decent people register, but do you think thugs are going to register the gun and give names of two respon-

Measures Against Crime

sible citizens as references? Does that not show how ridiculous this proposal is? When I brought my proposal to the attention of the then minister of justice, who has since been promoted to a higher sphere as Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), he brushed it aside. It shocked his finer sensibilities. I point out that under my bill the five-year sentence would not be subject to parole. But the government would not accept that idea; they would not borrow it because that would have been taking an idea from the opposition.

If you let thugs know that they are going to get five years on top of any other sentence they may get, you will strike terror into their hearts.

An hon. Member: Remember what the Law Reform Commission said?

Mr. Paproski: Are you for the thugs?

Mrs. Holt: Don't forget what the Law Reform Commission said.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) has the floor.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I hope I am not interfering with any of the hon. gentlemen's friends. Thugs fear punishment.

Mr. Poulin: What does the bill say? Read the bill.

Mr. Korchinski: You had better read it in both languages.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have never seen so many on the Liberal side of the House protecting the wrongdoer. Such solicitude deserves special mention.

Mrs. Holt: You obviously don't know the bill.

An hon. Member: Simmer down, Simma.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The cost of the scheme will be tremendous. Do you know what the government has provided? It says that if you carry a gun in the commission of an offence, or attempted offence, you will be liable for from one year to ten in prison.

● (1530)

An hon. Member: Fourteen.

Mr. Diefenbaker: All right, make it 20. But one year is the minimum. What terror that will strike in the hearts of wrongdoers! They would get a year. What is that in a life? Why does the government not act directly in accordance with the recommendation of game associations and also the experience in the United States that that type of legislation is ineffective?

I go from there to summarize this bill. I am not going into detail because I have already said that it has been well covered. I repeat, it will not work. It is an additional tax. It