● (1710)

In time of war or political upheaval, anywhere in the world, the registration of weapons has always ended in confiscation, leaving the people at large unarmed and helpless. The unarmed citizen easily becomes a victim of anarchy, tyranny and totalitarianism. History has provided us with a good many examples.

In Cuba, Batista proceeded also with the registration of weapons in order, said he, to prevent Castro from having them for his guerrilla warfare. Only the loyal Cubans at the time did register their weapons, while Castro's revolutionaries never cared to register theirs, as any other revolutionaries are doing in the world. Today, Castro is in possession of all the weapons, because he confiscated them all after Batista had them registered. The Cuban people are at the present time defenseless and at the mercy of Castro's dictatorship.

Then, it is easy to say for the leftist and communistic propaganda, to say that Cubans are peaceful people. People who are unarmed and defenseless are at the mercy of any tyranny: there is no choice but to be peaceful. We only need to remember what happened in Hungary a few years ago. Hitler once said: The biggest mistake we could make would be to allow citizens of various origins to carry arms, for history is there to show that all conquerors who allowed their native subjects to be armed have prepared their own defeat.

In 1938, Hitler had turned Germany into a totalitarian state and had confiscated all firearms. Only the members of the Nazi Party could own firearms. France, Norway, the Netherlands and Denmark were countries where firearms had to be registered before World War II. As the Nazi armies penetrated further into Europe, they confiscated the weapons registration records in the invaded countries, took over the weapons and thus reduced the possibility of resistance accordingly.

If the opposition disarms, that is all well and good. If it refuses to do so, then we ourselves must do it, as Joseph Stalin said in 1927. For a long time now, th communist strategy throughout the world has been to clamor for disarmament for the sake of a pseudo-détente policy, while they, the communists, accelerate the arming of their troops, for it is quite easy to take over the control of a disarmed nation.

In Europe, the Czechoslovaks laid down their arms while Rumania, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary and several other countries were readily disarmed, firearms being registered and easily confiscated without alarming anyone. In China, the registration of weapons has resulted in the disarmament of the Chinese people, which preceded the reign of terror. Chinese people have been tortured and executed, and today, after having been "broken" in the blood of millions of Chinese, they have come to be respectful of their great leader Mao who, in his spirit of democratic competition, has never called a general election because all citizens must adore him.

Northern Ireland is another tragic illustration of a situation resulting from the registration of the weapons which were confiscated by the government. The *Presbyterian Journal* of February 9, 1972, quoting an Irish newspaper, wrote this: "The government has withdrawn all licensed guns in the province and the police has called on all the owners of weapons and ordered them to surrender their guns." With all their weapons registered and confiscated the population is helpless against the attacks of the IRA. Tyrants never could nor dared invade a country whose population was armed.

In 1939-40, a country with only 4 million people among whom were crack shots who had been trained through a long dedication to sports had foreseen the communist takeover. That country was Finland which managed to stand up to and humiliate the powerful army of Russia with its 170 million people.

In 1940, while the German armies were on the other side of the channel, England begged for Canadian and U.S. weaponry to equip its homeguard, as arm control by the British government had left the British utterly disarmed and unable to protect their families, homes and homeland. It is then that the Canadians and Americans, who were very concerned and had weapons available, offered them to the British who needed them desperately. Switzerland is another country which has placed its security and future into the hands of honest and well armed citizens. That country has not as yet been invaded nor brought into subjection.

Here in Canada, they want to put the destiny of Canadians between the hands of a dishonest and armed minority, against the interest of the honest and disarmed majority. The two nations with the highest percentage of gun owners in the world are Israel and Switzerland and yet they have the lowest homicide rates in the world.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that the argument that guns should be taken away from people to avoid accidents is perfectly stupid and unjustified. How many people know that 5 per cent of the Russian population are real communists? How can 5 per cent of the population control the other 95 per cent? Simple: the 5 per cent control all the arms, leaving the rest slaves and unarmed.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, will allow the civil servants who will be hired to implement this legislation to perpetrate legally the worst abuses of power, while being protected by the law derived from this bill. Therefore, I wish to draw Your Honour's attention to clause 105(z) page 17 of the bill; which states:

> Where, with respect to any person, a peace officer is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that it is not desirable in the interests of the safety of that person, or of other persons, that that person should have in his possession, custody or control any firearm . . . the peace officer may without warrant search for and seize any firearm or other offensive weapon or any ammunition or explosive substance in the possession, custody or control of that person.

This clause, Mr. Speaker, gives any peace officer the powers to do anything to anybody. It gives a discretionary power to the police and will enable any peace officer to discriminate against anybody. This clause states: Where a peace officer is satisfied, which means he may seize without warrant. The word "satisfied" enables any officer to be justified in taking—deliberately or otherwise—any kind of reprehensible and discriminatory action under the mantle of legality. When the peace officer has reasonable grounds for believing, says the bill; it means that a police officer may always argue that he has grounds for taking legal steps, even the most reprehensible ones, deliberate or not.