

*Government Orders*

dealer's company name or registered trademark and a consecutive manufacturer's serial number".

The legislation also provided for confiscations without legal action and without compensation, for the prohibition of certain types of weapons, and for arbitrary changes in regulations and fees.

In fact, the justice minister could have saved a lot of money by dismissing his high-priced legal help, getting a copy of the Reichstag legislation and running it through a photocopier, except that this document contains no search and seizure provision. Of course, outside of the English-speaking world search warrants are of as little consequence as they are to our Minister of Justice. And the penalties for non-compliance were much lighter than those proposed in Bill C-68. O Canada.

• (1335)

Some friends have suggested to me that I should not talk about these matters because by drawing attention to the recent past I am going to somehow destroy my credibility as an opponent of gun control by being too strident, too extreme. I disagree. After all, I am only the messenger drawing attention to irrefutable historical fact. Anti-gun people, above all others, should not shoot the messenger.

The laws are essentially the same. What I want people here to understand is that governments often chip away at civil liberty little by little by little. A common destination can be reached by many different roads. I am certainly not suggesting that the self-righteous authoritarianism of this government places it on the same level as the Third Reich. In fact I am satisfied that everything the Liberals and Conservatives have done and propose to do regarding guns reflects a sincere belief that gun control will somehow reduce violent crime.

The fact that this is not logical and has not worked anywhere else where it has been tried does not deter them, because they are driven not by logic but by their elitist prejudices. And prejudice is a very weak foundation on which to build the laws of a nation.

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the debate now for the last couple of hours and I find it very, very interesting to listen to the doublespeak and the doubletalk and all the rhetoric that has been going on.

I listened to the first speech given by the justice minister, and he made a statement that I think all of Canada ought to know. It is one of the most ridiculous statements I have ever heard. He said that criminals will identify themselves because they will not register their guns. Criminals will identify themselves. I am not taking that statement out of context. If that is not doublespeak, if that is not one of the most ridiculous things I have ever heard! By targeting law-abiding citizens, he said we will somehow flush out the criminal element.

The people of Canada ought to know what debate is taking place here today. He says the cost will be minimal. He says that we have too many guns in society and this will simply be a minor inconvenience. The contradictions are there. We have too many guns in society. We have to get rid of them, but this will only be a minor inconvenience. It will not really restrict law-abiding gun owners. Right there are the contradictions. They are talking out of both sides of their mouths. I have a difficult time sitting here calmly listening to this debate.

One of the things they say is that it will make society safer, and then they go on to explain how they are going to tie up the police and all of our resources. How does that make society safer when you are dealing with 99.99 per cent of the people who are not a problem and you are going to tie up your police behind their desks dealing with these law-abiding citizens rather than being out on the street dealing with the criminal element? That defies logic. That is speaking out of both sides of your mouth. That will never work.

They are going to increase our taxes. They are saying it will not cost very much, \$10 for 10 guns, et cetera. Who is going to pay for it? The finance minister has admitted that the increase in taxes is destroying jobs. If they destroy jobs in this country, the first people who are going to suffer are the young men of this country. Do not tell me that is not a risk or will not increase crime in this country. They cannot have it both ways. They are actually doing the opposite of what they are leading us to believe in their speeches. This is really a problem.

• (1340)

We have repeatedly stated that the registration system will provide information to the wrong people. It will fall into the wrong hands. A senior RCMP officer admitted that. He said there is no way we can prevent criminals from obtaining the information. We have a problem.

They talk about Great Britain and how much safer it is there. In Great Britain 59 per cent of the attempted burglaries are committed while someone is at home and the lights are on. In the U.S.A., less than 9 per cent of burglaries are committed when people are at home and the lights are on. Why? Because a criminal will not put himself at risk. I do not have time to go through the whole argument, but research shows that victims of attempted robbery and assault are less likely to be injured if they can defend themselves.

There are so many statements that contradict themselves. For example, the government proposes to ban .25 and .32 calibre handguns and handguns with barrel lengths of less than 4.14 inches, implying that will make society safer. What does that do? Does that restrict the criminal element? No. They will simply go to the guns that are larger and more effective.

**Mr. Stinson:** More killing power.