

We need more care and restrictions in the use of firearms. As we all know, the use of firearms by people engaged in crimes of violence has reached terrible proportions. We can hardly go too far in providing penalties for such cases. But the section we have here is foolish. If a person is in a motor car with another person who has a concealed weapon, or even a weapon that is not concealed, is he to ask him whether he has a permit in Form 76, and if not to get out of the vehicle? The idea no doubt is to catch groups on marauding expeditions, in which only one of the group has a gun but all intend to use it. This section does not cover that kind of case only. This covers the odd case when someone in a vehicle has a firearm and no permit, in which event all the persons in the vehicle at the time are guilty. And the penalty on summary conviction is a fine not exceeding \$500 or imprisonment for six months or both fine and imprisonment. I simply suggest that the section has been ill thought-out.

I am in hearty accord with a good many other sections dealing with possession of firearms.

Next I call attention of honourable members to the proposed new section 128, on page 8 of the bill. Paragraph (a) of subsection 2 of this section exempts any person engaged in the business of repairing firearms from the necessity of having a permit to possess firearms. Now, I do not know any more questionable business in Canada than that of repairing firearms. It does seem to me that any man who repairs firearms might very well be required to ask a person who brings a firearm to his place to be repaired whether he holds it under permit or intends to use it for the purpose of marauding on the streets of our cities, holding up banks and so forth.

When I was mentioning a previous section dealing with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police I should perhaps have mentioned also the proposed new section 132A, on page 9 of the bill. Just listen to this.

Everyone is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for five years who wilfully

(a) interferes with, impairs or influences the loyalty or discipline of;

(b) publishes, edits, issues, circulates or distributes any writing that advises, counsels or urges insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny or refusal of duty by; or

(c) advises, counsels, urges or in any manner causes insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny or refusal of duty by a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Canadian forces or the naval, army or air forces of a State other than Canada that are lawfully present in Canada.

This section groups the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, a civilian police force, with our military forces and the naval, army or air forces of another country that are law-

fully present in Canada, and it places a restriction on the freedom of our people to counsel, advise, urge, or in any manner encourage, the insubordination of any member of this police force. Well, honourable senators, are we living in this fine, free Canada of ours, or in Germany, where the ordinary citizen has to be careful about what he says to a policeman lest he encourage him to be insubordinate to his officers? This section would have been a perfectly good one for Mr. Hitler to have promulgated when he was building up the reputation and power of his S.S. force, but it is utterly out of keeping with this fine civilian nation of ours, where everybody is free to speak his mind and to act as he thinks he should, so long as he does not commit any immoral or other act prohibited by the Criminal Code. We should treat our police force, particularly one that is policing the provinces, in the ordinary way, just as we do the "flat-foot cops" on our city streets. I use that expression in a joking way, for I have the highest respect for the ordinary policeman. He is a very intelligent citizen, a skilled artisan pursuing his occupation efficiently, and usually in a very kindly and good-natured way. We have no finer class of citizens than the policeman of our municipalities, including, if I may say so, the police of my own city of Toronto. We should keep the Royal Canadian Mounted Police a civilian force, and not hedge its members around with restrictions of the kind proposed here, and thereby try to make them look upon themselves as sacrosanct.

Now I wish to refer for a moment to the new subsection (4a) of section 285 of the Act, on page 10 of the bill. This is the subsection that provides a penalty for driving while the ability to drive is impaired. Now, there is nobody in the world who condemns more strongly than I the driving of a motor car by an intoxicated person. I remember one terrible New Year's Eve that we had in Toronto, when several deaths—I forget just how many—were caused by accidents involving drunken motorists. I was Attorney General of the province at the time, and on the day before the next New Year's Eve I published a statement recalling the tragedies of the previous year, and asking the good citizens of Toronto, the reputable business and professional men and others to refrain from drinking or at least from driving after they had drunk. Well, on New Year's Eve I was in a club, and the bottle was passed around. I was invited to join in the celebrating, but I expressed my views in no uncertain way. However, the gentlemen present said: "That's right Roebuck" and