

some difference of opinion. There were 73 amendments moved, and of the 37 which were moved by myself or by other hon. members in the opposition, only four were accepted—and those were very innocuous amendments which really did very little.

The minister says that the gun control part of this bill is a panacea for crime. The minister says the murder of police officers which is taking place across the nation would not be happening if this legislation were in effect. That statement is false and misleading. I doubt whether anybody has an accurate figure as to the number of long guns there are in Canada. Someone in the committee estimated there are 11 million, someone else estimated there are 6 million. I am not here to say whether there are 11 million or 6 million, but I do say that there are millions of long guns owned by people in Canada and many of them have been owned for many years. Some people inherit long guns from their grandfathers. I have a shotgun which I inherited from my grandfather who settled in western Canada before the turn of the century.

I want to make it clear that whether there are 11 million or 6 million long guns in Canada, none of them is included in this bill in any way at the present time. Under Bill C-83 there would have to have been certain documentation in reference to owners of long guns, but that is not so under this bill. I emphasize this because with all those guns in our society "A" can sell "B" a gun—many guns have no serial numbers—and no one has any way of telling who is buying what or who is stealing what. When they say that this bill will stop murder, shootings, robbery with violence, they are misleading the people of Canada. Make no mistake about that.

● (1530)

I am now convinced—I was not so convinced when Bill C-83 came in—after reading a lot of mail and listening to the evidence, that murder committed by firearms will continue. I know long guns are not covered by this bill. I must say, however, that of the last three murders in Calgary at least one was committed by means of a restricted and prohibited weapon. We must recognize that gangsters who want to rob corner stores or hold-up banks will get firearms as long as they have criminal intentions. In the case of the Brink's truck robbery in Montreal, the parts for the machine-gun that was used were brought in from the United States and the gun was built by the robbers.

For the minister or other members of parliament to go across this nation in an election—and there may be one—telling the people that they gave them gun control, is not the answer, because there is nothing in this bill, except one thing which I will deal with in a moment, to stop murder, robbery with violence and the use of firearms. If a crackpot or an alcoholic suddenly decided he did not like his neighbour or a member of his family, and he went to the hardware store to get a gun, he would need a certificate. Once he got the certificate, however, for five years or more he could buy any number of guns—a whole arsenal.

Criminal Code

When it is claimed this bill would stop crime, I must say I have reservations about that. I hope the minister is as fair in future speeches on the hustings as he was this afternoon, rather than being unfair as he was the other night at the scene of probably the most tragic incident that has occurred in this city for many years. Let us be honest and let us be fair. Let us not play politics with murder and the killing of police officers. The House knows where I stand personally on such matters. Where it is premeditated murder, not only of police officers, and where there is a conviction on direct evidence, then I say some penalty other than the one we use today should be imposed. We had a free vote on that matter, however, and I will not get into it today.

I want to deal now with the method used by this government to produce legislation that is a matter of substance, not an administrative act. I realize we have orders in council to appoint George to this job and Nellie to that job, or to set up tribunals.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): George and Nellie both being Grits.

Mr. Woolliams: When I talk about substantive law, and we are legislating amendments to the Criminal Code, that law should be brought before parliament for scrutiny. In committee, 73 amendments were offered to the bill during eight days of meetings when at times we sat ten hours or more. We sometimes hear that members of parliament are not working, but we know that if they are busy on committees, they are working. That goes for members from both sides of the House. I moved an amendment which read in part as follows:

Every order in council, regulation or form made under this act shall be laid before parliament within fifteen days after the order in council regulation or form, as the case may be, is made or if parliament is not then in session, within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session—

I do not say it has to be debated then. Through their representatives, the Canadian people would be able to analyse what kind of law is being legislated by some body or some cabinet minister that may not exist at the present time. According to statements made by the Minister without Portfolio from Alberta (Mr. Horner) I understand there is going to be a cabinet shuffle. He leaves the impression that he is going to get a big job, and if that is so perhaps he will be making the regulations and not the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General. I put forward that amendment honestly, fairly and, I believe, concisely, believing as I do that that is no way to conduct the affairs of parliament and that it is against the democratic process.

Where offences are created in the bill by order in council or otherwise, the onus is placed upon the accused. Under our system of jurisprudence, which is the same in every Commonwealth nation that has adopted the system of the mother country, the onus is always on the Crown. The Crown must prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt. In this legislation the reverse is the case. I have said it is more like the Napoleonic code than the system of criminal justice that has been the rule in Canada since confederation.