

I have hundreds of letters from my constituency and all across Canada asking me that question. What was the answer? I quote:

Mr. Speaker, there has been a careful analysis, but it is impossible to say what the result will be and how many people will be involved because this will depend to some extent on special arrangements made in each province.

Let me pause during my reading of this quotation. Will the provinces have to take this financial load in the same way as they did with the health program of this country?

Naturally, we hope to keep the administrative and licensing staff to a minimum—

That is easy to say, but what is the minimum?

—but, at the same time, make licensing personnel available in communities throughout Canada so that there will not be difficulty in obtaining licences. I anticipate that we shall use provincial and federal police forces—

By the way, the police forces do not want this obligation and responsibility. I asked further about the staff. I will not read all the answer. However, I was told that the government does not know how large a staff is needed or what the cost will be. That is something they did not consider. We know that if the government needs more money it will tax the Canadian taxpayer to death.

**An hon. Member:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Woolliams:** I hear a laugh. I wonder if the hon. member's constituents would laugh. Do you think they would laugh, Mr. Speaker? There are many anomalies in this guns control legislation. If I mentioned them all it would take longer than a speech in the United States Congress during a filibuster. Let us examine the definition of "ammunition." It's a humdinger. It is defined as follows:

Ammunition means ammunition for a firearm and includes any component, element or part such as a bullet, pellet, cartridge case, primer or propellant powder that is primarily useful as a component, element or part of ammunition.

That really means that ammunition is ammunition in whole. It is a shotgun shell, the powder, the pellet-casing and the cartridge. If it is a rifle bullet, it is the whole casing. It is the bullet, the powder and everything or any part thereof. What does the definition clause mean? Does this mean, when you read the clauses of the bill keeping in mind the definition, that if hunters find empty cartridges on the ground expelled from a shotgun, the finder has an obligation, as a finder of a component of ammunition, to turn in the empty cartridge to the police? If he should put it in his pocket absent-mindedly, and on the way home be stopped by the police, it is found as part and parcel of ammunition which is not his licensed ammunition, and he is guilty of an offence. He could be fined or sent to jail.

Let us take a second example. Clause 106.3 (11) on page 28 of the bill states that farmboys who go gopher hunting—they all do that on the prairies and, I assume, in other rural areas of Canada—with a 22 rifle to protect their fathers' grain crops will be classified as game hunters. In another clause it states that young people under 18 are only permitted to use guns if the families need the game as part of their living. Who eats gophers? What a farce.

Third, let us examine clause 106.5 on page 33 of the bill, which provides that everyone who, without lawful excuse, fails to obtain a licence or fails to get a registration certifi-

### *Measures Against Crime*

cate or permit, as the case may be, shall be liable to be charged with an indictable offence. If convicted, such a person would be liable—I believe this is the maximum—to two years' imprisonment, a fine or, as an alternative, guilty on summary conviction and fined. In this regard, the law is an ass. It will not be obeyed. If the law is not just, practical and workable, it will not be obeyed. That is one more reason these clauses regarding gun control should be severed from the other amendments.

Are law-abiding citizens to be put in jail because guns have been outlawed, except if they prescribe to the rules and regulations of this government? It will be the law-abiding citizens who will be subject to jail and fines, while the criminals will break the gun law as easily and as quickly as they commit violence, rape, robbery and murder. This is the reason gun control in this bill should be severed from wiretapping and other parts of the bill. Members of parliament should be able to disapprove, approve, and certainly improve gun control legislation as laid down by the government, without being controlled by the other terms of the bill. I might say you are damned if you do, and damned if you don't. Of course, that is the reason the government put it this way. It is enough to make the "Dynamic Duo" turn in their tights in disgust and mutter in the imaginative words of Boy Wonder, "Holy poultrice policy, Batman, the Trudeau government is at it again."

● (1630)

In summary, may I say that the provisions for licensing, through federal government machinery, of rifles and shotguns may accomplish little more than a build-up of bureaucratic activity. The number of extra officials needed cannot be estimated by me and is ignored by the government. What will the cost amount to? What are the alternatives to this legislation? What are the suggestions which have been made? Perhaps better results could be obtained by using machinery already in existence by way of hunters' safety courses and courses conducted by recognized gun clubs. I should like to see the committee investigate this aspect. We might be looking toward the expansion of facilities which already exist. Tests in competence of handling handguns could easily be conducted by gun clubs as they are today in connection with hunters' safety courses.

The bill has repealed, without comment, section 101(b), previously the saving clause for youths who wanted to use guns under parental guidance for hunting or associated activities. Clause 106 leaves the way open for future restriction by way of government regulations. We have been giving no indication of what might eventually come out of those regulations. Too much power is being left to the governor in council. Another question is, what will be the cost of all this? Will a licence fee of \$10 be charged to everyone who owns a gun? Are the law-abiding citizens of this land the ones who will have to pay the shot? Will only those who are not law-abiding get away free? I saw a sign the other day, "When guns are outlawed, only outlaws will have guns." Not bad. That was sent to me in the mail.

Now I want to turn to another subject the Minister of Justice mentioned—special crime inquiries in the provinces. I believe this is a good step in the right direction. Every province will be able to hold inquiries with respect to crime within its borders, and those tribunals will have the power to subpoena witnesses. But it is my comprehen-