

Almost half of the women killed by their husbands are shot.

Ms Jill Hightower of the B.C. Institute on Family Violence stated that:

Front-line transition house staff report that women are frequently threatened by their partners, and many of these threats involve firearms.

Ms Virginia Fisher of the Provincial Association of Transition Houses Saskatchewan said that "...46 per cent of women killed by their husbands are killed with guns" and that, "There are 50,000 women living in households with guns who feel their lives to be in danger."

When asked about the number of women served by them who have been killed by husbands using firearms, they declined to give numbers, stating such reasons as, "I do not have that figure off the top of my head" or "We do not have funding to do follow-up work on what happens to women after they leave the shelter." These individuals never supply hard, precise or accurate data to support their assertions because supporting data does not exist.

Further, most of these individuals know little about spousal homicide. Spousal homicide is a terrible occurrence, the understanding and treatment of which eludes most agencies and helping professionals. Moreover, the data collection mechanism at many shelters is indeed questionable, since many shelters view data collection and research compilation as male-dominated preoccupations. Many gender feminists are resistant to scientific inquiry and investigation. Moreover, imagination and fantasy have resulted in profit and lucrativeness, rather than reason.

Some gender feminists told the Senate committee that children are at risk of abuse with firearms in the home. I note that among the numerous witnesses before the committee, there was not one witness from child protection agencies or children's aid societies. I spoke to child protection agency officials in Toronto. Metro Toronto's Children's Aid Society, the largest children's aid society in Canada, informed me that they have no concern that children in Metro Toronto are at risk of abuse with firearms in the home. I spoke to executive director Bruce Rivers. If children were at risk, child protection agencies would have been active in appearing before the Senate committee.

I also observed that not a single witness appeared from community crime prevention agencies in Toronto, and I also note that not one witness was black. The illicit use of firearms by certain black criminals in Toronto is commanding attention and intervention.

The frolics and caprices with data and statistics were revealed when one particular witness, Dr. Katherine Leonard, gave testimony stretching credulity and scientific inquiry. On conclusion of her testimony, another witness, Dr. Judith Ross, herself a psychologist and a target shooter, overheard Dr. Leonard say to someone, "How did you like the science fiction?" Dr. Ross, on September 27, 1995, wrote to me as follows:

I find it appalling and disgraceful that a witness at a Senate committee would knowingly present material that was a fiction cloaked in a pretence of scientific validity.

I read Dr. Leonard's testimony. I pondered about the reliance on such testimony by any minister of the Crown.

Honourable senators, certain gender feminists insist that firearms are a gender issue; that firearms are a vehicle for male violence and aggression. Central to the belief system of radical gender feminism is the maxim that firearms constitute the phallic symbol of male violence, and are symbols of the patriarchal society. In a patriarchal and heterosexist society, the allowance of guns is a sign of misogyny.

Honourable senators, this is patriarchal nonsense; it is patriarchal rubbish, and supports the notion that women should live in fear and trembling, not only of men but of men's instruments — guns. Needless to say, they view heterosexuality as an oppressive state for women.

Gender feminist theory is an example of intellectual fraudulence and is a theory based on philogyny, tribadism and misandry. This theory currently stalks the social and political life of this country. It is predatory, and seeks to dominate and terrorize. It is a personality disorder in the body politic of this nation.

During the Senate committee hearings on Bill C-68, the Manitoba Attorney General, the Honourable Rosemary Vodrey, testified. I asked her:

I should just like to know how many wives were killed by husbands in your province last year by firearms, and how many children in your province alone?

She replied:

I can just tell you women on homicides by firearms. I gather the figure is zero.

Ms Vodrey gave more detail. She said:

The statistics I have are for 1994, and they relate to deaths due to domestic violence: Three by stabbing; three by strangulation; two by beating; one by asphyxiation; none by firearms.

Honourable senators, it is no simple task to identify the actual and precise number of women killed by spouses using firearms. I have studied this question using Statistics Canada's published data on homicides. In 1994, the actual number of women killed with firearms by conjugal intimates was 23. I repeat: The precise number of women killed by spouses using firearms was 23.

Statistics Canada defines "conjugal intimates" as including spouses — legal, common-law, separated, divorced — boyfriends, extramarital lovers or estranged lovers. Neither feminist groups nor the Minister of Justice have placed the number of 23 on the table in this debate. I am unsympathetic to the act of toying with or exaggerating the true numbers.