

100,000, a considerable drop after stricter controls on guns and as well the abolition of capital punishment in 1976.

I will deal with some of the myths raised during the hearings of the committee, one being if we control guns more strictly only criminals will have guns. Sixty-six per cent of homicides are committed by people with no prior criminal record. In other words, 66 per cent were law-abiding until they committed homicide. Marc Lépine, who killed 14 women at l'École polytechnique, had no prior criminal record. Valery Fabrikant, who killed four professors at Concordia University, had no prior criminal record.

• (1620)

We will never control professional gangsters or professional criminals; they will always get their guns. The great majority of our murders are not committed by those people but by people who were previously law-abiding.

The other myth is that guns do not kill, people kill. That is true but people kill more easily and more effectively with guns than with other weapons. Guns are the most lethal of weapons. When a gun is readily available what might have been an assault becomes a murder.

There is considerable evidence from Canada, the United States and all over the world that where guns are more available there are more crimes with guns. The bill will restrict the availability of guns to many who might use them criminally. It will also put barriers in the way of those who want to acquire them quickly and irresponsibly. The bill will reduce crime with guns. It will control not only guns but crime.

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the hon. member.

I find it very interesting how they can look at some of the statistics from around the world and twist them to suit their own purposes. The member cited statistics from Europe. England embarked on a campaign against guns and he is perfectly aware that violent crime increased in England as these laws were put into effect. I am making him aware that it depends on how one twists these statistics.

I agree with him when he says we need to get at the root of the problem. This is not getting at the root of the problem. We are simply seeing someone bleeding on the rug and we are saying please bleed over here. Instead of trying to stop the crime, instead of trying to stop the problem we are simply shifting it somewhere else. We are not targeting the problem of crime.

Prevention is the principle. If we are to spend hundreds of millions of dollars and save lives, which the government stated

### *Government Orders*

is the intent of the bill, would it not be better to spend it in some other way? Would it not be more cost effective?

Why does the member oppose my amendment to have a review of this legislation by an independent auditor to see whether it is meeting the goals and objectives the government has set? I cannot understand why he would object to that.

The statistics he quotes beg the question of how many more lives could be saved if we would spend the money in other ways. Another key question the government has never addressed is how many lives will this cost. I presented evidence to the government that showed guns have saved many lives.

This legislation will tie up our police. How many lives will it cost because the police are no longer on the street but are tied up with law-abiding citizens registering guns? How many jobs will be destroyed because of the increase in taxes this will make necessary? What will those people without jobs do? Some of them may possibly turn to a life of crime.

We as parliamentarians sometimes forget to look at the secondary aspects, the secondary effects our legislation has. Could the hon. member address those two questions I have raised?

**Mr. Allmand:** Mr. Speaker, I do not know what statistics the hon. member is looking at. I do not have them here before me today but I looked at some this morning because I have to give another speech tonight on homicide at another place.

The rate of murder in the United Kingdom is less than 2 per 100,000; less than in Canada where it is 2.19 per 100,000. In the United States the rate of murder is 9.6 per 100,000. I do not know what the hon. member is talking about. Let us hear his figures.

The rate of murder in the United Kingdom is lower than in Canada and the rate of murder with guns is much lower than in Canada and much lower than in the United States.

• (1625)

The member has not presented us with any facts. I challenge him. I will come back to the House tomorrow under a standing order and put the facts on record. In all of Europe the rate of crime committed with guns is substantially lower than in the United States and in Canada. He cannot state otherwise. There may have been a slight increase, but the slight increase is nowhere near that of the United States which has open access to guns.

He asked why we do not spend the money on other programs which might deal with the causes of crime. I am rather surprised by that. Every time the government has put proposals to the House in that direction members of his party vote against them. Not only do they not approve of the cuts the government has made in social programs, they want to cut them even further—what hypocrisy.