

same time you create difficulties for quite a number of people.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks by saying that if the minister proposes amendments which will improve certain clauses of this bill, I will support those amendments right away; but if the amendments are not adequate, or if no changes are made, I will have to oppose this bill.

We support the freedom of the individual so much that it is not our role I think to make access to progress, work and so on, difficult for most people, simply in an effort to curb harmful acts, because it is well known that these harmful acts will be committed anyway if we keep the same hotheads. And to correct those hotheads, we shall have to devise other legislation that will offer better safeguards for freedom.

[English]

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate on Bill C-7, I must begin by saying I agree wholeheartedly with much of what the previous speaker said in respect of his concern and his views about this piece of legislation. First of all, I believe this legislation should receive a very thorough examination in the committee because it touches upon the very freedoms of the individual which all of us cherish so much. One really should ask oneself why such an act is necessary and why the government is bringing it forward. In this particular case, I believe most members will come to the conclusion it is partly or mostly because of the uprising in Quebec of October 1970. Then, of course, in considering whether or not this piece of legislation would halt or forever prohibit similar uprisings in the future, one can only come to the conclusion that it would not. In fact, I would be led to believe that if another uprising were to take place, the next would be much better organized and much better planned.

One learns by experience, no matter in what field he is. He may be a demolition expert, an expert at making bombs or an expert in terrorist tactics. Certainly, the next uprising may be carried out by the same people or may be led by the same people. One can be sure that it would be better planned, better organized and perhaps much more extensive because the leaders would have a far larger following before the uprising is initiated. So if you follow common logic, and I think that is the only thing to do, this bill does nothing to stop a well planned, organized uprising or insurrection against the state, against the municipal government or against any authority.

• (1640)

Would this act prohibit a well planned, well organized uprising? No, it would not. Similar legislation is not doing it in Ireland, as somebody suggested. Makarios of Cyprus recently had a large amount of arms and ammunition in his possession. He had them shipped in from Czechoslovakia. I understand that since then he has turned them over to the authorities. Arms and ammunition can be acquired from other countries. Quebec has a particularly rugged coastline and any amount of ammunition, arms and dynamite could be smuggled into the province by a well organized group of people who wanted to terrorize the authorities. So, this act comes too late. What is it

Explosives Act

attempting to accomplish and what will be its harmful effects?

Actually, this bill will make life more complicated for the average Joe who perhaps likes to do a little hunting on his weekends or in his time off. Hunting is becoming one of Canada's biggest pastimes, aside from skiing and taking part in spectator sports such as football and hockey. Many people find a great deal of pleasure in hunting. We have large areas in Canada which lend themselves to hunting. There are a number of gun clubs, hunting clubs and sports clubs which encourage the development of this sport. This bill will only make it more difficult for them. Also, in many of our schools across Canada a great interest in rockets is developing. It might interest the House to know that one such rocket club is operating in my constituency. They are having a showing of their rockets on April 1; they have invited me to attend and I have accepted. This group of young high school boys is under the guidance of a teacher. Last winter they enjoyed building and launching their rockets and they are pretty proud of their achievement. Clause 3 of the bill would cause a great deal of trouble for them. It reads in part:

—no person shall

(a) make or manufacture explosives either wholly or in part except in a licenced factory.

I have yet to go to the demonstration, but I believe that it would fall within the terms of that provision.

We really should analyse our society. Back in October, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) asked if we were a bunch of runny-nosed, weak-kneed kids who could not manage our society. I believe the government and the minister should analyse that question, because it is the duty of the elected bodies to make laws to protect society. What have we done in that regard? This House has passed the Criminal Code, which provided capital punishment only for the murder of policemen and prison guards. The government has even neglected to enforce the wishes of the House with regard to society. As an hon. member near me suggests, 37 policemen have been murdered cold-bloodedly since 1961, with no repercussions from society.

What are the repercussions from such an attitude? We find law officers who are inclined to take the law into their own hands. They shoot first and ask questions after, particularly if they see someone coming at them with a gun. I do not blame them, this is natural. Let us look at the effect this attitude has had on our citizens. There is a growing fear in Canada that too many citizens are acquiring guns, pistols and the like to protect themselves and their homes. Does this not mean that society or its governing bodies have failed to provide the security which the citizens want? That is how I understand it.

This bill does not help the ordinary citizen; it does not bring him a greater degree of security. In fact, it creates a situation where crooks and murderers can acquire weapons while ordinary citizens cannot. The policeman is not inclined to defend them because his life is not protected. So, security is not provided to the individuals in our society. I think this is terrible. To go back to the October 1970 uprising in the province of Quebec, let me point out that the greatest fear at that time was that army depots and arsenals would be robbed, that guns would be stolen