

5. What, if any, provisions exist for (a) internal review of any such decisions, (b) appeal against any such decision by employees?

Return tabled.

NEW IMMIGRANTS

Question No. 4,927—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue)**:

1. Since January 1970, how many new immigrants were (a) hired as professionals, (b) hired as non-professionals, (c) given non-specialized jobs, (d) unemployed in (i) rural, (ii) semi-rural areas and what was their ethnic origin?

2. What percentage of immigrants decided to settle in rural and semi-rural areas in (a) Canada, (b) each province?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Blais: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

● (1520)

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[Translation]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notice of motion for the production of papers No. 68?

[Text]

CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO FRANCE OPTING OUT OF
NATO

Motion No. 68—**Mr. Marshall**:

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence, minutes of meetings, letters and telegrams relating to Canada's \$11 million claim against the Government of France as a result of the opting out by France of the NATO military alliance and the eviction of participating units in 1966.

[Translation]

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the information requested is confidential. Its publication would be prejudicial to the conduct of the international relations of Canada and to the current negotiations. I therefore regret to be obliged to ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

[English]

Mr. Marshall: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate. Shall the remaining notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Measures Against Crime

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT (NO. 1), 1976

MEASURES FOR BETTER PROTECTION OF CANADIAN SOCIETY AGAINST CRIME

The House resumed, from Wednesday, March 31, consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-83, for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Alan Martin (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to conclude my comments of last Wednesday in connection with the gun control aspects of this particular bill by reiterating the main features as I see them, and as they have been enunciated in the bill.

First, the bill basically will involve the addition of a licensing system for all persons who now possess or will possess firearms in the future.

Second, there will be a stronger definition of prohibited and restricted weapons.

Third, there will be strengthened penalties for related activities such as importing, possessing, and handling.

Fourth, there will be a strengthening of the permit provisions for businesses which deal in weapons.

Fifth, there will be higher maximum sentences where offensive weapons are involved.

Sixth, the provisions relating to police seizure will be extended in order to enable our security forces to seize without warrant where it is in the interest of safety.

Seventh, there are broad avenues of appeal to any person who feels discriminated against in the course of carrying out this legislation.

Eighth, the measures will be phased in over a three year period, particularly referring to the licensing provisions.

I would like to move on next to that aspect of Bill C-83 which deals with crime detection and electronic surveillance, otherwise referred to as the wiretapping provisions. At present there is a restricted list of offences to which this particular provision can be applied, but the courts will now be empowered under Bill C-83 to grant authorization to interrupt communications for all indictable offences. The problem at the present time is that the list is really too restrictive to permit appropriate surveillance at times when the public interest would be better served by permitting the courts to grant permits in such cases.

I think there is perhaps a legitimate concern being expressed in connection with the apparent elimination of some safeguards of the rights of individuals who come under this bill in its present form, and this aspect, I suggest, is bound to receive considerable discussion in committee. I am referring to the provision which states that evidence derived directly or indirectly will be admissible evidence when the lead has come from an illegal wiretap. The illegal wiretap itself will still be inadmissible under Bill C-83. However, at present anything that is