

must pay a fee, not stipulated. If the fee levied on such applicants does not pay the entire cost of the bureaucracy, all taxpayers will be called upon to make up the difference. It has been estimated that the implementation of Bill C-83 would require 500 additional policemen, 50 in the province of Alberta, plus necessary administrative staff. That is another example of how the government exercises restraint.

What is meant by "safe storage?" On whose interpretation of "safe storage" will the record of a citizen depend? There could be any number of definitions applied to what is or is not "safe." Locks can be broken on firearm cupboards or cases, doors can be forced, weapons held by licensed persons can be taken at gunpoint by those brandishing illegal or unlicensed firearms. When a home without firearms, or with firearms "safely" stored, due to the persuasion or enforcement of this legislation, is robbed, and its inhabitants are beaten, murdered, threatened or kidnapped, it is a little bit late to start defining whether or not their weapons of defence were safely stored or whether or not they should have been granted a licence. The government will have rendered them helpless and defenceless. Too often innocent bystanders are victims of criminals, a fact apparently acceptable to this government.

What is meant by "need" of a firearm? Depending on conditions, area, situations, and countless other factors, who can really say whether or not a firearm is needed? This must be clarified because even collectors and dealers possess guns and other firearms as a "need" in their business or hobby.

What constitutes suspicion in the minds of policemen that a firearm might be used to commit a crime? How will police control firearms which have not been registered or licensed—do they have to search every household in Canada? Anyone who holds a grudge, who covets another's right to own a firearm, or for some other reason, could inform a policeman, or even a licence officer, that a neighbour or an enemy had acted in a suspicious manner,—and that person's home could be searched, without a warrant, and his licensed weapon seized without any legitimate reason whatsoever. Why harass law-abiding Canadians in a so-called aim at controlling the use of firearms?

What is the ruling for Canadians who work outside this country or who are employed away from their homes and perhaps only return there once or twice a year, or less often? Their firearms are in their homes. Is another member of an owner's family permitted to purchase a licence or register a gun in his absence? If the owner must take these steps in person, how long does he have to comply with these regulations? My constituents have submitted too numerous doubts and complaints to mention in the time allowed here.

How can any member of this House be so naive and disinterested in his electors to accept this bill in its present form? To add to the sham embodied in this bill, some government members have given a very weak excuse to get it into committee where necessary changes can and will be made when various organizations present their views. I refer to the offer of the Alberta Fish and Game Association to help in the preparation of this legislation. That offer was refused. My hon. friend from the Yukon has already brought this aspect to the minister's attention. Perhaps

Measures Against Crime

some Canadians can be fooled by that statement, but fortunately I know a little too much about the way standing committees operate under this government. We all know here that, on more than one occasion, when government back-benchers did not agree with a bill being studied in committee, they were removed from that committee. This is democracy Liberal style.

Perhaps it would not be unreasonable, either to remind everyone in this House that government members outnumber opposition members on every standing committee. That could be an understandable policy since the government has a majority, but the deplorable fact is that those Liberal MPs either will not or are not permitted to accept or approve suggestions of opposition members, regardless of their merit or what positive effect they would have on the majority of the general public. To say that my faith in the procedures followed in committees has deteriorated considerably each year in the short period I have been here is nothing but the truth. Most members are on committees because of their desire to work to improve legislation. I am well aware of their disillusionment.

It is not hard to figure out why the government enforced closure on Bill C-83 to get it into committee where those who oppose any part of it will not be given an opportunity to express their opinions. The government should know the people do not want this type of legislation; the government does not want to listen to elected representatives outline their constituents' opinions or perhaps offer positive changes; no, the government only knows how to abuse the privilege of power; to silence those trying to do their duty; to shove legislation into committee; to pretend it is concerned about the many clubs, associations, and individuals who oppose some of the gun control clauses of Bill C-83 by extolling the virtues of committee amendments. That is the thinking of the cabinet, of the Minister of Justice, (Mr. Basford) and indeed of most of the Liberal backbenchers.

● (2120)

The government can exercise punishment when dealing with Canadians, most of whom are good citizens, but the same government backs off and cringes because it is inhuman to punish criminals, the law-breakers, those who feel this country owes them everything even though they give it nothing, and if they cannot obtain what they want without exerting themselves, they tote a firearm to be sure they do. Oh no, it would never do to hand out stiff sentences to that type of person—this government prefers to hinder and hamper, harass and frustrate a large portion of the population!

The bill sponsored by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) makes sense and conforms to the wishes of the people who have made their views known to me, and they are not all within my constituency either. Place the law where it can and will deter crime, and make that law a law which can fulfill its purpose.

I say that Bill C-83 would remove some of the security legitimate citizens of this country still have in today's so-called "Just Society." In the last eight years our society has deteriorated morally, physically, mentally to a degree, as a direct result of the permissive and ineffective legislation shoved through by the government. Government policies have encouraged immorality, indecency, obscenity;