

without lawful excuse, and his gun was loaded, would not give him a lawful excuse: under section 99 he was liable to five years by way of indictment. The odd thing is that if he had pointed an unloaded weapon at the foreign invader, that would have been quite lawful: he was entitled to carry an unloaded weapon, but not a loaded one. This would add five years to the two years he had already racked up.

The Canadian soldier, in a friendly argument with the foreign invader, pointed out that he, the Canadian soldier, came from the great riding of Notre-Dame-de-Grâce in Montreal. He thought his member had something to do with the government, and that indeed his member was the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand). One would have thought the Solicitor General would know the law. The foreign invader pointed out, "Really, my dear fellow, back home we call him a necessity." On the way to the prison camp, the Canadian soldier and his foreign captor wandered through a former rifle range where they found some cartridges scattered about. The Canadian soldier was willing to continue on his way, but the foreign invader pointed out that he had committed another offence. There was ammunition obviously lost or abandoned, and under section 101 of the Criminal Code as proposed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford)—

Every one commits an offence who, upon finding a prohibited weapon or restricted weapon or other firearm or ammunition that he has reasonable grounds to believe has been lost or abandoned, does not forthwith

(a) deliver it to a peace officer—

When he pointed out that they were only used cases from ammunition, the foreign invader was again able to up-end him by pointing to the definition section of Bill C-83 section, 82(1), which reads:

"ammunition" means ammunition for a firearm and includes any component, element or part—

Of course, the cartridge would be such a part. The foreign invader said, "For this, my good fellow, you are liable to another five years as being guilty of an indictable offence." The war has not taken place very long, but in the first half hour the poor Canadian soldier has racked up 12 years in one of Her Majesty's penitentiaries.

They continued on their way to the maritime command, passing through some of the most beautiful parts of Canada, namely, the streets of Halifax. The Canadian soldier, by then thoroughly nonplussed, entered into friendly conversation with his foreign captor. He suggested that maybe some of the large weapons used in a very brief war should some day go into the war museum on Citadel Hill. The soldier turned out to be a member of the board of governors of that great institution. The foreign invader pointed out that the museum on Citadel Hill was really a private institution. It was not part of the armed forces of the country; therefore, it could not contain within it prohibited weapons. As we all know, prohibited weapons are what they say they are in the definition section, 82(1). The prohibition is also set forth in 86(1) as follows:

Every one who has in his possession a prohibited weapon

(a) is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for five years—

The poor soldier, by working as a member of the board of governors in a non-department of national defence-owned museum on Citadel Hill in Halifax, was guilty of another

indictable offence if he should so much as take any automatic or prohibited weapon to that museum. That would add another five years. It is now 17 years that has been racked up against the poor Canadian soldier, and he has not even had the pleasure of firing a shot at his tormentor. He suggested they could perhaps go down to the Point Pleasant park commission. In the south-end of Halifax there are a number of weapons from foreign wars that are much admired by the citizenry when they go there. The foreign invader pointed out, "No, it is not a governmental commission" and that he would be liable to five years, or anybody at the commission if they took some of these prohibited weapons within their control.

They passed by the legislature in Halifax. Outside were some of the guns left over from the gun battle in which the Shannon overcame the Chesapeake. The foreign visitor pointed out it was perfectly legal for the government of Nova Scotia to have those guns there, although the Canadian soldier said that the war that goes on between Gerry Regan and John Buchanan, the premier and the leader of the opposition, sometimes gets more explosive than any other situation than you can imagine. But no, the Chesapeake and Shannon memorabilia may remain on the grounds of the provincial legislature because that is government and not some privately run organization. Finally, the Canadian soldier turns to his captor and says, "It really would have been simpler if I had shot you dead." The foreign captor says, "I will forget that I heard that remark, my good man. After all, on top of the 17 years you have already racked up, you could be put on a peace bond by one of the local magistrates." That, Mr. Speaker, is the fantasy.

Do not expect me to illustrate some of the rather improbable drafting that has gone into the measure we are dealing with today. However, I want to state that the story did have a happy ending. The Canadian soldiers did win the war against these foreign invaders who came armed with the Canadian Criminal Code as amended by Bill C-83. Some of our Canadian soldiers were bright enough to break into a museum which contained medieval crossbows. As we all know, medieval crossbows are one of the greatest weapons ever invented by man. They found that these medieval crossbows had not been placed on the prohibited weapon list as defined by section 82(1) of the act, nor had they been included as prohibited weapons by the regulations made by the governor in council pursuant to this act. Therefore, it was perfectly in order to use medieval crossbows. The enemy was routed, and Halifax-East Hants and the rest of Canada was kept for Canadians.

I will now deal with the philosophic approach to Bill C-83 and to the matter of what is popularly called gun control. I suppose anything that in itself that can be dangerous should have an element of control by the state. Certainly we think that control is necessary when we deal with drugs and alcohol. It would, therefore, seem to be a simple matter, if one asks oneself the question, "Should there be some control over weapons which could be dangerous?" to reply, "Yes, of course there must be". But what sort of approach should be taken? It is here that the bill bothers me. I read through it, come to clause 4 on page 37 and see that some draftsman—and I hope the Minister of Justice finds out who he is and strings him up by his thumbs, because I think this is a horrible example of drafting—has set down words permitting the governor in