all the problems about which we are concerned. However, we know up-front, based on the New Zealand experience, the Australian experience and the U.K. experience, that gun registration does not work. The maximum that they were able to achieve in New Zealand and Australia was approximately 60 per cent registration. The key feature in all those jurisdictions was the same: They had to take from resources that could have been used for policing.

I would support a tougher crime control bill in a single, pure form, which would include: tougher penalties, no plea bargaining for those who use a gun, and some training for judges. On one occasion, a judge on the Supreme Court of British Columbia had a career criminal before him, an old bank robber who had been charged with armed robbery with a gun. The judge said, "I must give you 14 years. Do you have anything to say before I pass sentence?" He said "Yes, judge. I am 70 years of age. I just cannot do 14 years." The judge replied, "That is different. Just do as much as you can."

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, according to the rules, the honourable senator's time has expired.

Senator Lawson: I have one sentence in conclusion.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Is it agreed, honourable senators, that the honourable senator be allowed to finish?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Lawson: If the government ever puts together a tough crime control bill, they will have my support. In the absence of that, and given the deficiencies of this bill, which misleads ordinary Canadians, I will support Senator Sparrow's amendment and the amendments in the report of the committee in the hope that, upon returning the bill to the other place, they will look into a crime control bill separately.

We do not have to punish one group of Canadians for what we want to do to another group of Canadians. Therefore, I will oppose Bill C-68.

Hon. Leonard J. Gustafson: Honourable senators, I rise to speak on Bill C-68. First, I want to congratulate the committee for the work it did. Second, I want to congratulate the senators who travelled to hear from Canadians across the country. People of the rural areas, in particular, were very appreciative of the fact that those senators had come to hear what they had to say. I want to clarify one thing — and several comments have been made about this point: These people are the best educated people when it comes to firearms safety. Many of them are sportsmen, farmers and natives who have taken training in the use of firearms. They are not illiterate people when it comes to the use of firearms.

As farm boys and girls, they have been raised to handle firearms in a safe manner. They do not have the fear of a gun that you might find in an urban centre. Unfortunately, this is becoming a rural/urban situation. That is not good. We in rural Canada are in the minority. I speak for native people, farmers and ranchers, hunters and trappers. We are a minority.

I should like to remind honourable senators of something that the Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau said. He said: "A nation can be judged on the way they deal with their minorities."

While we farmers, ranchers and native people may be in the minority, we are very important to Canada. We are good citizens who produce for this country, and who happen to see things in a little different light. I ask you for one thing: Give us a little consideration in this bill.

Senator Sparrow gave an excellent exhortation here on the practicalities of agriculture and of the native people. I will not take up a lot of your time because I know that other senators on both sides want to speak about this matter. However, I want to place a couple of things on the record.

We heard from the people in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia and Whitehorse, Yukon. I remember particularly a couple of young native fellows, perhaps 18 or 19 years of age, who made an excellent statement. They said something to the effect: Does it come as any surprise to you people that we do not live in four-storey apartments? Many times we are out in a tent in the summer; or we are in a one-room cabin. We have been taught from a young age that that gun is hanging over the door, loaded, should we encounter a brown bear or another animal — and a tent is no problem for them to destroy — and should we need to protect ourselves. We saw on the news what can happen in the national park west of Calgary just this summer.

Is our legislation practical? I am talking about some of the legislation that was brought in by our own government but has never been enacted or tried on farmers. It is the same thing.

• (1510)

By way of a personal example of that, about three weeks ago, I was cultivating one of my son's fields. From across the field came a coyote that looked bigger than a wolf. A cattle herd was grazing nearby, which included small calves. The coyote watched the herd while the cows formed a circle. Had I run home to get the gun out of the cabinet and the ammunition from another place, the coyote would have been long gone before I returned.

I cite those examples pertaining to the native community and the ranching community only to say that we must be practical. Let us try to understand the different regions of this country.

We heard from native people, including at least three chiefs who represented largely populated areas. One represented 24 bands from the Prince Albert area, and another represented a number of bands from The Pas. We also heard from Sol Sanderson from Regina. They all basically said that native people would not abide by this legislation.