

He went on to refer to Hans Mohr who did such excellent work for the Law Reform Commission. He said:

My friend, Hans Mohr, probably had a similar thought in mind when, in the final paragraph of his book "Pedophilia and Exhibitionism" he wrote:

'Because sexual offences evoke an emotional reaction, not only in the general public, but also in those dealings with the offender, it is especially important that judicial and correctional procedures be based on what the problem is, and not on what it is feared to be.'

I am certain that that admonition of Professor Mohr, reinforced by Professor Greenland, has not been met by the proposed amendment to the act.

Professor Greenland went on to say:

The real problem in Canada, as in other jurisdictions, is that the public are being cruelly deceived into believing that the law protects them and their children from assault by vicious sexual criminals. Dangerous sexual offender legislation does nothing of the kind. What it does—often in a mockery of justice—is to give the public a false sense of security by incarcerating, virtually for life in conditions of appalling degradation, a pathetic group of socially and sexually inadequate individuals.

Legislators, jurists, lawyers and psychiatrists must be convinced that punitive action is no solution for that most painfully human condition called sexual deviation.

I suppose that these words are not popular and that Professor Greenland and Professor Mohr are not listened to by governments. But I for one feel that in any sensible debate of an act to change the Criminal Code, these words should be considered.

My last point is about the penitentiary section of the bill, Mr. Speaker. It is somewhat ironic that we should be dealing with some changes in the parole and also in the penitentiaries section of it a day or two before the subcommittee on penitentiaries of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs is expected to bring in its report. I would have thought that this section might have been hived-off and the subcommittee at least extended the courtesy of waiting for their recommendations, which we all know are coming—I suspect in a rather cross-party way—in respect of some needed reforms. Yet the government bulldozes on with this hodge-podge of legislation covering six or seven statutes, several of them in a retrogressive way; and in no way that I can see, except perhaps in the provincial prisons section, is there any reform in the law that is worthy of being considered liberal.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) began his remarks by saying that not very many members have read this bill. I want to say at the outset that I have read all 80 pages of it and I cannot help but think that the premise of the legislation is that more laws will make more law-abiding citizens. That is certainly far from the truth. If it were so, Canadians ought to be the most law-abiding people in the world. But presumably the government has introduced this bill because it is a security package.

Mr. Peters: There are more people in our jails than in any other country in the world.

Criminal Code

Mr. Friesen: That may be so, and perhaps some of them should not be in jail.

My objection is that this is an omnibus bill containing five separate and distinct pieces of legislation which ought not to be yoked together. Parliament deserves an opportunity to debate and decide upon them separately, and the public has a right to know exactly what is contained in the legislation. With this kind of package we will never know for sure.

Hon. members will recall that when we were discussing the old Bill C-83 in committee last spring some members complained that certain sections got scant attention just because the package was too big. If the government were really serious about passing the measures contained in this bill then it would separate it into the logical components into which it already falls, and let us debate them separately.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) has already been quoted as saying that he is afraid this bill has been watered down too much and the public may think it will have very little effect upon society. That simply underscores what I have said—that the bill is based on the premise that more laws will make more law-abiding citizens. If this bill has been watered down so much, why introduce it to the House in the first place?

The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco) handed me a note just before I began to speak, Mr. Speaker, with a message from the B.C. Wildlife Association which is holding its convention at Williams Lake today. The message reads as follows:

B.C. Wildlife Association at convention today voiced total opposition to Bill C-51. Disgusted with Basford's incompetence and insincerity and convention demands his resignation.

The Minister of Justice met with the B.C. Wildlife Association last year and presumably listened to them.

An hon. Member: They also got their Liberal memberships.

Mr. Friesen: That is right, at the nominating meeting. Maybe that is why the minister has announced he does not plan to run again. Perhaps the minister does not want to run again because he knows the difficulties he would face from the avid hunters in his part of the country.

● (2110)

An hon. Member: Perhaps he'll be made a judge.

Mr. Friesen: Perhaps he will be made a judge. Mr. Speaker, if this law is necessary, it should contain provisions which will make it effective.

I noticed two days ago an article entitled "New Gun Law Measures Are 'Just For Show'" printed in the *Vancouver Province*. The author is Mike Cramond who, for all I know, may be one of the minister's constituents. I wish to quote part of his article. He begins by saying that he met a member of the police administration in British Columbia and asked him what he thought of the amendments to the Criminal Code. According to the article: