

to deal with that is to tighten up the bill and perhaps consider an amendment so that in a renewal there is not a cooling off period by the same person. They could renew it instantly, for example, at the same time that it expires. We could look at better regulations, a better way of dealing with people in rural areas. That is one complaint and one possible amendment or areas of amendment.

Second, they are worried that, under the bill, you have to have guarantors. What is the liability of these guarantors who sign the application form? Well, we could consider that. We could consider some sort of limitation of liability or a better setting of the liability of the guarantors. That could be done by amendment.

Third, people say that five and ten shots in a magazine really limits what they can do. It will lead to people mutilating their guns. I think we can have a look at that, and if necessary, the government could come up with a program to buy out certain guns. It would cost money, but it could do it if it is really serious about having a workable gun control system.

The fourth area of concern that I have picked out of this is that they are worried about having to get a picture on ID. It is like getting a passport. They have to get people to sign for them and so on. I think we might be able to deal with that in terms of less bureaucratic regulations, less red tape. Maybe there could be different regulations for rural areas as opposed to cities. That would be an intelligent way of dealing with it.

They are worried about the grandfather clause in the bill, that it would not allow the inheritance of some part of a gun collection. Maybe you are to inherit a gun collection, some of which may be semi-automatics and so on. You cannot in fact inherit that. You would have to give that back. There might be ways of dealing with that in the bill.

You will notice that all the legitimate gun clubs and gun people support mandatory firearms training. The Mission people I referred to before clearly set out in their letter to me that they favour a mandatory system and firearms training so that people learn how to use guns.

Government Orders

These are difficulties, but they are not fatal difficulties. A government which really knows how to govern and a minister who really has the political will could have faced this and brought in the bill.

My friend for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce has also met with the people in Montreal. I hope and trust that he will be speaking about that later as well as about this notion of political will. I recall a speech he gave in the House some time ago under his private members' bill in which he dealt with some of the arguments. For example, only criminals have guns.

We should be going after criminals, not people who get guns. In fact, two-thirds of homicides in this country are not committed by professional killers. They are committed in families. They are committed by people who in a rage or who are temporarily or permanently insane—not insane in law—but who are deeply uncontrolled and upset; disturbed like Marc Lépine was and others have been. They grab a gun and they use it.

The intent of Bill C-80, as I see from a realistic reading of it, and which everybody agrees with, is that we need a bill that will make people pause before they buy a gun; that the people who get a gun know how to use a gun and are sane. That is what everyone wants.

I do not want to go into the terms of the bill. I have suggested some amendments. Let me conclude by saying that this is a dishonest, disreputable move by the government. This committee is going to be a farce.

One will have to consider whether one should even sit on the committee. Why did the government not have the political will to proceed with the bill, to listen to people in rural and other areas who have legitimate concerns, and amend the bill properly in committee? That would be the best way to do it and that is how we would get the end that we want. We want a system of gun control, but one that is realistic for everyone in the country.

The government and the minister really copped out on this one. I think this represents a substantial defeat in cabinet for the new Minister of Justice.

Mrs. Pauline Browes (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State of Canada and Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Citizenship)): Madam Speaker, I have had an opportunity to listen to some of the comments by the hon. member. I am most concerned about some of them which has really moved me to stand today to ask a few questions and to put a few things on the record.