

Measures Against Crime

victims, not the masters of their environment. The bad environment becomes the heritage of the next generation. In order to launch a major assault on crime we must attack the despair and denial of human opportunity which makes crime grow. I know that crime also thrives under conditions of affluence. White-collar, economic crime is eroding our system of society and promoting more controls and less freedom. That is why I felt the government ought to introduce separately the gun control law and the other provisions. We should discuss them separately and vote on them separately.

In brief, the police, our courts and prisons cannot long control crime. We must deal with the underlying causes of crime, the immense and stubborn forces pervading our environment, measuring our character and determining the quality of our lives. With long-range efforts in a new land of bountiful resources we can conquer poverty, ignorance, disease, discrimination, family breakdown, injustice, social tension and despair. While we must strive to uproot the causes of crime, we must put our practical minds to work to amend the various sections of the Criminal Code and guarantee that the law is respected, not shaped and planned to protect the rich and create injustice for the poor.

The law will only be respected as long as our judges are respected. It is absolutely intolerable that ministers of the Crown should interfere with the courts. What happened recently is without precedent. A minister admitted that he talked to a judge concerning another minister who had been found guilty of contempt of court. At least I can say one thing about the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury). He is honest. He stated the case. Others hid behind various precedents as though pleading the American fifth amendment. The Minister of Public Works, in answer to a question I raised, said in part, as reported on page 11457 of *Hansard*:

If it were not for the fact that I consider the associate chief justice of Quebec, whom I have known for a number of years, to be uninfluencible, in a pejorative sense, I would have refrained from intervening or from having any conversation with him.

In other words, he talked to the judge because he knew he could not influence him; he knew he could not interfere with his decision.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should like the Chair to indicate to the hon. gentleman that the topic he has dealt with in the last minute and a half has nothing to do with the bill before the House.

An hon. Member: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, we know why the Liberals understand gun control. When they are wounded verbally, they cry.

An hon. Member: Who wrote that phrase, Eldon?

Mr. Woolliams: The Minister of Public Works went on to say:

Indeed, the only intervention that would be contemplated by me would be one to see that he was in full knowledge of the facts and did his duty—

I will let the matter rest. There cannot be peace and security in this nation if our courts are not respected.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Crime is a national problem according to our constitution, while law enforcement is a provincial and local responsibility. Parliament must direct its processes so as to ensure criminal justice. We must bring excellence to every aspect of the administration of criminal justice—to corrections, to courts, to law enactment in every jurisdiction of Canada. The law must be reformed, or repealed. If enforcement is impossible and law enforcement permits laws to be broken like dishes because the majority of people find them unjust and no one wants to obey them, they must be repealed. I will in a few moments be showing the anomalies in respect of gun control so that hon. members will understand the background of what I am building up to at this moment.

● (1620)

Surely this is the purpose of many of these code amendments. The law will be obeyed only when it is respected. The law will be obeyed only when it is just. The law will be obeyed when those in high office respect and carefully guard our traditions and constitution, the dignity the law demands and the dignity which we expect from the judiciary, the executive, parliament and the administration of justice. Nothing short of that standard is acceptable to this side of the House. We will have a free vote in my party on capital punishment. We demand the fullest examination by a standing committee on all of these matters. In my motion we will demand that the question of gun control—which is brand new law, not an amendment to the code—be severed from the bill so that both these matters can be discussed in an intelligent and able manner.

What about the gun control legislation? Let us have an examination of it. Apart from the argument as to whether gun control will stop the massive increase in crime, what are some of the farcical anomalies contained in the clauses of Bill C-83? The government has never taken the trouble, even with all its studies on gun control, to determine the cost of administering it, the number of bureaucrats it will take to licence all the guns in Canada, to issue permits for restricted weapons, as well as the certificates, licensing and other documentation in order to obtain ammunition. They never thought of looking into that. When I asked the Solicitor General questions about this, he said they have a big study going on with regard to gun control and are looking into this question. In these days of anti-inflation, one would have thought they would have considered the cost as well as the number of bureaucrats it will take, in addition to looking into the effect this will have on the law-abiding citizens of this country.

We should be able to determine the number of people needed to administer the legislation, such as issuing licences for all guns, issuing permits for restricted guns, issuing certificates, etc., and to administer control of the sale and use of guns, together with the same for ammunition. I put these questions to the Minister of Justice:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice, the answer of which may assist us in the second reading debate on the peace and security bill. As sportsmen of Canada assess that about six million guns will be affected by the legislation, has the minister assessed how many public servants, including police officers, will be needed to issue permits for restricted guns and licences for all guns, and what the cost in this regard will be to the Canadian public?