

*Criminal Code*

can obtain and conceal a weapon. In fact, in some cases this is done so that identification will not be too easy.

I do not think that the immediate objective of preventing crime or reducing the number of violent crimes would be met by what the hon. member has suggested. Since the hon. member put this motion on the order paper we have had an incident in this house. I am sure that had he put the motion down after that incident he would have included a reference to explosives. Following the incident here we found that explosives were extremely easy to obtain without licence, and apparently without difficulty. I think this shocked many people.

The second point arising out of that incident was that the man in question was encouraged to do what he did by having spoken to someone who suggested that it would be very easy to throw dynamite or a bomb into this house. There is something to be said, therefore, for a form of licensing which will not make violent weapons so easy to use. The hon. member has brought before the house a suggestion meriting consideration, but I do not think anyone feels that we should go as far as he suggests.

To bring my remarks to a conclusion, may I summarize. First, I think there should be a better system of licensing offensive weapons, not for the purpose of eliminating them or reducing their numbers or use but merely so that it will be known where they are. Second, the use or ownership of such weapons should not be limited. Finally, in connection with and in addition to licensing, instruction on safety measures ought to be given.

I think that the bringing of these questions before some interested body would be well worth while. I am not sure that a special committee is the proper place. I think that this sort of thing should originate with the Department of Justice and the Attorneys General. The government on its own responsibility should bring in legislation. Following that, I suppose the matter would be referred to a committee.

I feel that we are doing too much by way of committee work on some matters that are strictly for the administration of justice to deal with. In this case I believe the better thing would be for the government to ask the

Minister of Justice to consult with all the persons interested, the Attorneys General, sportsmen's clubs and so forth, so that some consensus will be reached about what is actually required in order to bring in legislation.

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker as I do not believe in the principle that a bill or a motion should be talked out, I shall forego my right to speak.

**An hon. Member:** Six o'clock.

**Mr. Robert Stanbury (York-Scarborough):** Mr. Speaker, I concur with the hon. member that too many bills in this house are talked out. However, we have before us today a motion which, as has been pointed out, is somewhat imperfect. The hon. member who has introduced it also has a bill on the order paper. I presume there will be an opportunity of discussing the specific suggestions at the time it is debated.

With respect to the motion I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) is excellent. I am glad he has not taken the attitude of airily dismissing this problem in the way the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Kindt) did. I think the matter should be carefully examined to make sure that better safety measures are found. This is our first concern. I believe it ought to be examined in the Department of Justice. When the hon. member for Laurier brings forward his bill I hope at that time it will appear in the interests of this house and of all citizens of Canada that it be referred to a committee, perhaps to the committee on justice and legal affairs.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hour for the consideration of private members' business has now expired.

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Winkler:** I should like to ask the acting house leader what the business will be for tomorrow.

**Mr. Pennell:** Mr. Speaker, we shall again attempt to call item 82, commonly known as the medicare bill.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.