

to any law passed by this House. I really cannot accept that premise.

It may appear to us here that it is impossible to place into the Criminal Code methods of dealing with root causes of crime. However, I suggest to that hon. member, and to the chiefs of police association to which he referred, that what they should not be attempting is to correct, amend or change this legislation through the media or by writing letters. We should be challenging those individuals, be it the chiefs of police, gun control lobbyists hunting clubs or gun collectors, as well as encouraging and inviting them to appear before the committee to state those changes that they see as necessary to this legislation. That, of course, cannot be done until this House puts the legislation before the committee so it can be dealt with there. Therefore I encourage all members to send this legislation on to the committee as quickly as possible.

The hon. member for Elgin described this legislation as being a registration. I suggest to him, as I suggested with relation to the comments made by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling), that it is a misnomer to suggest registration. We are not registering guns, we are not registering owners. We are licensing individuals to possess a firearm.

I suggest there is a deterrent effect. There is the ability to determine whether the individual is the type of person who should or should not have the use of a firearm. There are certain deterrent effects as a result of the imposition of fines and so on if you do not comply with the regulations. To argue it is ineffectual is to argue there is no deterrent effect in legislation. If we argue that, surely we argue that the entire Criminal Code has no effect.

I would now wish to deal very briefly with the subject of electronic eavesdropping or wiretapping and I believe, shortly put, I would argue in the same manner as the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan) when he states his concern that the proposed provisions would allow a judge to defer giving notice on the basis of a continuing suspicion when an investigation has, for all intents and purposes, concluded. I, like that hon. member, have substantial reservations about allowing notice to be deferred when we are only proceeding on the basis of continuing suspicion and when the investigation has actually finished.

Members have spoken of the need to balance various and competing factors, the need to protect individual privacy on the one hand and the ability by police to pursue organized crime. In reading the provisions of the bill regarding electronic eavesdropping I am concerned that we not undo some of the best features of the protection of privacy act. I am not convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the power given by parliament in 1973 to the judges to admit secondary evidence has not been working. I fully support the admissibility of derivative evidence within the confines of judicial supervision. Such supervision guarantees a rather healthy tension and a proper balance between the right to privacy and the ability to pursue crime.

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka made a rather interesting comment today when he spoke of wiretaps. He suggested they appear to be O.K., particularly to those in rural areas who are used to party lines. He spoke of the acceptability of wiretapping, provided it was judi-

### *Measures Against Crime*

cially done and there was consent of the court. He spoke about reasonable length of time and notice being given. I suggest there is a grave concern with which we must look at this legislation, that is, whether in attempting to give police officers increased ability to tap we do not in fact encroach upon the individual rights of citizens to which they are entitled.

In summing up, I am supportive of whatever measures we can reasonably provide to our police and criminal investigative forces while simultaneously assuring the individual of the right to privacy. I would be most zealous in not providing officers of the law with the legal wherewithal to erode the rights of individuals. I believe that this legislation brings with it the substantial potential for what might broadly be termed illegal wiretapping by that element of society which is supposed to be protecting us from criminals. If we cannot be assured that wiretapping is to be done and if in fact it is being done, without taking advantage of us, our position would be untenable.

The minister has made it clear that he is prepared to listen attentively and with an open mind to the submissions which are to be made with respect to this bill in committee, in the House, and I anticipate participating further in the ensuing debate that takes place in committee. May I once again suggest and invite hon. members to ensure that this piece of legislation is made available to the committee as soon as possible.

**Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on Bill C-83 we are dealing with a quite emotional subject, with varying beliefs held by citizens, one point of view being to the effect that if there were no guns at all, crime would vanish, and the other point of view being that if guns are controlled, crimes with violence will increase because the criminal element will have the ability to procure guns and law-abiding citizens will have no means to contest the criminal.

It seems as though reports and statistics on murders are based on overstated opinion and overworked emotions. At one end of the interest groups are individuals and lobbies taking the position that stricter gun legislation would have the effect of augmenting the crime rate. Some people at this end of the scale even suggest that the forced registration of all guns would weaken the public and make it the target for violent criminal activity. In the United States this group has gone so far as to form a strong lobby to uphold the second amendment of the U.S. constitution:

● (2150)

A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

At the opposite end of the scale is a group which proposes stricter gun control legislation. Its members base their stand on a belief that tighter legislation would make it almost impossible for a criminal to purchase a gun to use in committing a crime. The fact is that legislation or none, a criminal will obtain any weapon he desires.

To cover the issue of gun control legislation fully we must look at the cause of increased violence and the relationship between that increased violence and the use of firearms. It might be advantageous to examine some of the factors on the basis of which we, as legislators, are now