

*Measures Against Crime*

We on this side of the House have carefully examined this legislation, and we along with our constituents, have come to the conclusion that it is bad legislation. It is legislation which has been hastily drawn up, improperly drafted, and thrown into the legislative hopper as a divisionary tactic in order to take people's minds off the real and threatening problems of the day, namely, the state of the economy brought about by the mismanagement of the government. It is for this reason that our justice critic, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), who made an outstanding speech on this bill, moved the following motion:

Bill C-83 . . . be not now read a second time but that the subject-matter thereof be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for the purpose of considering a more proper legislative division thereof.

This motion was not moved without considerable thought being given to its substance by the hon. member and by all members of this party. I support the motion, and in view of the importance of the subject matter, I urge the cabinet—and in fact I urge the supporters of the government—to give serious consideration to this proposal.

Quite frankly, I did not think it would be necessary for me to speak on this bill. I say this because of the hundreds of letters I received from my constituents opposing the measure, letters which were endorsed and forwarded to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). Upon checking with my colleagues I found that they too have received hundreds, and in some cases, thousands of letters, and in checking with friends across the way who are supporters of the government I found that they too have received hundreds of letters in opposition to this bill.

In light of this strong opposition any normal government would have altered course, changed direction and in fact would have withdrawn the bill in order to amend and improve its wording. But I submit that we are not dealing with a normal government; in fact, we are dealing with a very abnormal one. We are dealing with a government which says one thing and does another. We are dealing with a government which made a mockery of our prices and incomes policy during the 1974 election campaign and which later turned around and introduced a monster to the Canadian working man and businessman.

We are dealing with a government which claims the working man cannot receive any more than 8 per cent of an increase in salary under its Anti-Inflation Board regulations, while it increases its own spending this year by something like 18 per cent. The rules laid down by the Anti-Inflation Board apparently apply to everyone but the government.

We are dealing with a government which condones, for example, aggression in Africa by Cuban communist troops, while we indirectly support the Castro regime by direct grants under CIDA, outright gifts of money, as well as loans over something like 30 years at 3 per cent. Who would not like a deal like that? But it is not available to everyone.

We are dealing with a government which has made a mockery of justice in Canada by finding it acceptable for ministers of the Crown to telephone judges in an effort to arrange suitable decisions and to make sure, as the Minis-

ter of Public Works (Mr. Drury) said in the House, that they understand the facts and that they do their duty.

The crime is not only misconduct, but even more damaging is the fact that the government, on the surface at least, implies that it has done no wrong. In Canada we have a double standard of justice, one for the rich and privileged, and one for all the rest of us. No state can long survive under this kind of hypocrisy.

As I stated earlier, hundreds of letters opposing Bill C-83 have been received in my office. Many letters are different, but through each one runs a similar and familiar thread. The people I represent can well remember—as I do—living under the Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, living under the Right Hon. John George Diefenbaker, as well as under the Right Hon. Lester Pearson. It would be unfair to say to this House that they loved these men, but I submit they did not hate them. I have a feeling they were universally respected by most of my constituents. However, this is something I cannot say about the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). As a result of his four letter words inside and outside this House, his address over the New Year with regard to the need for changing our society, his economic policies and wasteful bureaucracy, and his gun control legislation, I submit that the thread which runs through my mail about the Prime Minister is one of distrust and fear.

They ask point blank: why does this man want to seize my gun collection, and when is he planning to declare that the entire nation is faced with an armed insurrection and that the state must step in with its armed forces to take control? These are only a few of the fears which are expressed to me, but they are, nonetheless, genuine and sincere, and they are questions which I cannot answer. They are not only reflected in the correspondence I receive, but they are also reflected in the headlines of the newspapers of our nation. I have in my hand the *Chronicle-Herald* of March 25, and the headline reads: "Gun Law Could Lead to Police State Action." The story reads in part as follows:

"Police state" confiscation of all privately owned firearms "could happen here" under the peace and security package of legislation proposed by the federal government, Murray Covert, a director of the Kings County Wildlife Association, said at a meeting of the association.

I will not read into the record all which is stated in this release. It is damning enough of the government. However, there is one paragraph which concerns me greatly. Mr. Covert also said:

"No country in the world that has compulsory gun registration for more than 5 years has not followed with gun confiscation."

Let us look carefully at Bill C-83. It 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 special new law on gun control. In other words, 39 pages out of 73 deal with the new law on gun control, which may well explain the fear of my constituents over the attitude of the Prime Minister and the government.

I said earlier that basically this is bad legislation because the minister, when introducing 29 pages of new law, deliberately mixed it up with other amendments. In Nova Scotia we would say to him that he is deliberately and intentionally fogging the issue. In my opinion we should have a