

problems with this provision, but I am asking that the government put forward regulations that would define as a minimum the secure storage requirements in a person's residence for a firearm for which a certificate has been issued. It should be secure, it should be locked, and they should be able to provide evidence that that is the case.

It would be a minimum, if a firearm were reported stolen from a principal residence, that evidence of break in of a secure storage device be proven, and for those who have concerns about children using firearms that are owned by their parents, it would enable them to have the comfort of knowing at least the parents were under some legal obligation to establish that they had a secure means of storing the firearm.

The next thing I propose with this bill is that the fee for a firearms acquisition certificate be increased from \$10 to \$100. We could argue about the amount. In Bill C-80, the government proposes \$50. It just strikes me that the fee of \$10 is so ridiculously low that it does not come close to generating revenue to pay for the system of firearm acquisition certificates. It is a simple matter to me that if we agree that such a system should exist in Canada, then those who wish to possess firearms should pay for the system and support it with their fees. So, \$100 is what I suggest. The government suggests \$50. It seems to me that an increase is clearly warranted.

The next suggestion I make is that the firearms acquisition certificate identify the type of firearm in relation to which it is issued and be valid in respect of one such firearm. The importance of this is that currently when an individual obtains a certificate, they are able to go out and acquire as many firearms as they wish with that certificate. Consequently, when the police are contacted with respect to a quarrel in a residence, they may from their computers be able to determine that a firearm acquisition certificate has been issued to a person residing at that address. When they arrive at that address, they do not know if there is one solitary weapon or firearm, or perhaps a whole arsenal, behind its doors and windows. It strikes me that in our society we require people to have one ownership certificate for each motor vehicle they possess. I fail to understand why we would not require a similar law for each firearm that they possess.

Private Members' Business

I have taken the trouble with the provisions of this bill to seek out the reaction of police forces across Canada. What I have discovered is that by and large police forces have been eager to support the provisions of Bill C-273. I will not endeavour to review all of the correspondence that I have received. I have received it from every part of Canada. I will give some examples:

[*Translation*]

For example, William D. Patterson, from Mascouche, Quebec, says: "We want to inform you of our support for the reforms proposed in Bill C-273 and we wish you good luck in your efforts."

[*English*]

Similarly, D. J. Crowell, chief of police in Kentville, Nova Scotia, regarding the proposed changes in Bill C-273: "Please be advised that I support these changes fully." Similarly, from David J. Sherwood, chief of police in Saint John, New Brunswick: "considering that guns play a large part in the occurrence of crime in our country, I most certainly will lend support to your proposed changes in Bill C-273."

[*Translation*]

Normand Bergeron, a police officer in Quebec City, writes: "We fully support Bill C-273 on gun control."

Christian Harvey, from Chicoutimi, Quebec, says: "I can assure you of my support for the proposed reforms—"

[*English*]

There is correspondence from Trois-Rivières, Leamington, Barrie, Bradford, Ontario, New Westminster, B.C., Victoria, B.C. There are many others who support these reforms.

When one considers the fact that crime with firearms continues to increase at an alarming rate in Canada, one thinks of the unnecessary deaths of many people. I suggest that these somewhat modest reforms ought to be accepted in our society.

I would like to respond briefly to the argument that is undoubtedly going to be made by those who oppose stricter firearms control, that criminals do not apply for firearms acquisition certificates. Some people will say: "If you are going to commit a crime, one does not go out and apply for a certificate to get a gun." I think Marc