

playing about with what appears to be an innocuous explosives bill.

I have bought and used more explosives in a month than the FLQ has used in all its existence, and I did this over many years. I know that some quarries, mining companies and prospectors have taken liberties. They have done so only because inspection was not enforced. The government did not enforce the regulations already in existence and was lax in handling problems involving explosives. If this government or country thinks you can eliminate the illicit use of explosives simply by passing this bill, I can only say that the problem of explosives is not being astutely handled. One of these days someone will take a carload of common, ordinary farm fertilizer, dump in enough fuel oil to make it adhesive, put in some kind of primer, and he will make a reasonably big bang pretty cheaply. Most explosives fit into that category. An explosive in itself is not bad; it is only bad when improperly used.

I do not object to regulations requiring us to take every kind of precaution possible in the manufacturing of explosives. We want people handling explosives to know exactly what the results of misuse will be. However, there must be uniformity in legislation. I have worked with people who have handled explosives for long periods of time and their nerves have become very bad. One chap lit a fuse that was supposed to be 18 inches long; when he lit it, it was only 5 inches long. He lit it, jumped off the car, heard the big explosion and the people around there were back on the car in seconds. That was a mistake, and the man made it because his nerves were bad. He had been handling explosives for too long. If the government had not insisted on pretty severe safety restrictions applying to the manufacture of fuses, and if it had not insisted on certain minimum safety requirements, people like that would be in much greater trouble. Therefore, I agree that the government has a responsibility in this field.

I agree that regulations regarding the transporting of explosives should be enforced. Such regulations really will not make much difference, when you consider some of the other substances being transported. For instance, a carload of dynamite being hauled on the highway is not nearly as explosive as a carload of gasoline, and not half as explosive as a carload of liquid propane, or bottles of liquid air or oxygen. The explosive power of many substances is far greater than that of substances we normally use as explosives. For instance, the army hauls high explosives on the highways, and the trucks carry no markings. The army has moved—yes, Mr. Speaker,—even atomic weapons up and down the highway, mostly at night. Nobody has known about it and the trucks were not marked. That is how they moved atomic weapons to North Bay. They were moved in secret, with as little fanfare as possible, and the trucks were not marked. Yet, we make it a point of introducing highly restrictive legislation affecting explosives.

Why is the government doing this? Obviously, it wants to convince the public that it stands for law and order. It is saying, "Let's get rid of all illegal explosives; let's cut out the possibility of bombings taking place; let us cut down on the murders which take place." In short, the government is saying, "We really stand for law and order;

### *Explosives Act*

we are tough, and we are going to do something about it." That, Mr. Speaker, is a lot of tommyrot.

I hope that if we pass this explosives bill the civil servants working in the minister's department understand how explosives can be used. I hope some of them understand the legitimate purposes for which explosives can be used. As I say, there must be inspection. Explosives must be examined carefully. I am not arguing that we should move explosives up and down the road as though they were cords of wood. Every precaution possible should be taken to make sure that people do not run afoul of explosions. On the other hand, we must make it possible for people handling explosives legitimately to have ready access to explosives. Under the old act we excluded explosive cartridges. In the present bill we include in the definition of explosives, propellant powders, ammunition of all descriptions, rockets, fireworks, safety flares and so on. Why are those things in there? I have not heard of cartridges exploding accidentally, save in wartime. Millions of cartridges every day are being filled in Canada in home workshops and basements, and there is absolutely no danger of their exploding. Why should cartridges be included, unless the minister is trying to do something that is not related to explosions?

Why are flares included? Why are we to make it mandatory that storage places are to be built so many feet from any building, that the temperature is to be kept at a certain level, that certain kinds of locks are to be placed on warehouse doors, and so on? Why are the various parts of certain explosives to be separated by so many feet and contained in cement block buildings, and so on? Why must we do that with safety flares? When Canadian Tire decided to sell safety flares, commonly known as fusees, I thought it was a good idea. You can buy three safety flares in a small package. If you are stalled on the road, you put them in front and behind your vehicle. These flares prevent accidents, and I think they are a good idea. Now, the minister decides that there must be the same kind of regulations governing fusees as govern dynamite, cordite, driftite, stopcite, forcite, gelatin and other explosive substances. These little safety flares are to be put in that category. This means that Canadian Tire and other stores in Canada selling these flares will need to keep them in reinforced units specially built for that purpose. The fusees will be kept in these buildings, and it will be hardly worth while selling them. Anybody who wants to buy them will need a licence; and, of course, the people selling them will need a licence.

• (1600)

I would need a four foot sign on the back of my car with flashing lights in seven colours if I were carrying explosives. Well, I would not need a fuse if I were going to all that trouble to create an explosion. The regulations can be that ridiculous. If we were to do exactly what the minister said he wants to do, obviously we should have two kinds of acts, one to handle explosives and the other to limit the use of a number of commodities. I listened to the minister outline those commodities. I suppose this law will put most of the joke shops out of business. I never bought these commodities because I always thought they were stupid. I do not have that kind of a sense of humour. When my car goes bang, it usually means I have to pay \$35 for a