

Government Orders

The regulations contain another flaw: How can we approve regulations that authorize the transportation of unloaded unrestricted weapons on the back seat of a vehicle, as long as they are under the supervision of an adult?

According to Anne-Marie David, such leniency is an incentive to steal and contravenes in some cases the provisions of the Act Respecting the Conservation and Development of Wildlife.

The government must therefore launch an extensive information campaign to clearly explain the amendments to the regulations. It is aimed at the public at large, but should target certain groups in particular, such as hunters, collectors and sharpshooters.

According to coroner David, it is imperative that this publicity campaign be conducted under the aegis of a provincial committee and, sadly, that the federal government contribute the financial resources necessary to the success of such endeavour.

As we can see, this bill has no teeth, but its flaws have to be remedied, if the federal government really wants this legislation to have not just teeth, but good sharp ones.

The official opposition remains committed to producing legislation that will ensure tighter gun control. Support expressed by individuals, organizations and community social action groups fighting against violence, is extensive.

A large coalition originating from Quebec has taken a stand for closer monitoring of the sale, possession and use of firearms. Both public and parapublic organizations have come forward; the vast majority of police forces and police associations are in favour of increased gun control.

As the member for Laval Centre, I am particularly proud of the level of awareness displayed by the residents of my riding and my city, as evidenced by the resolution passed by the Laval town council on November 9, 1994, in support—unequivocal support—of stricter gun control measures.

[English]

Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to stand and make my contribution to the debate on the question of the adoption of the new legislation on gun control in this country. I say to anyone in this House who is in question as to where I stand on this issue, I stand most strongly and most passionately in favour of the adoption of this bill. I do so for a whole variety of reasons. Many of them are emotional because it is an emotional debate.

I think that all of us, wherever we stand on the gun control debate, were horrified just before Christmas when a young girl in the United States went for a sleepover with her friends because her parents were going to be away overnight. At some point in the evening she found out that her parents were going to

be able to come home. She and her friend went back to the house. When she heard her parents coming in she hid in the closet. When her father came in the front door she jumped out of the closet and yelled “boo” and her father shot her to death. What a terrible tragedy. It would not have taken place if there had not been a gun in that house.

• (1630)

I think many of us remember the case in Michigan several years ago of a 9-year old paperboy who went to collect paper money, something he did every week. Most of us pay our paperboys or girls every week. The owner of the house, not realizing who it was, thinking it was an intruder, shot him to death.

We remember the Japanese exchange student in the United States who was out with some friends on Halloween, experiencing a long and treasured tradition in the culture of the United States and Canada, going door to door, trick or treating. He too was shot and killed by a homeowner who thought he was an intruder.

All of these examples take place tragically in the United States. I believe most passionately they take place there because there is a gun culture in that country that does not exist in this one. I intend to fight most passionately to see that kind of culture never takes hold in this country. That is not the culture that belongs to bona fide hunters, farmers or sport shooters.

I am going to quote someone I saw on CTV not too long ago. The man's name is Dan Matheson. Any who watch Canada AM will have seen him. He does sports, the weather and shares the anchor desk. One day not too long ago he said he had taken his little boy fishing. I cannot remember if I have the exact cost, but it somewhere between \$30 and \$50 to get a fishing licence to go fishing with his son. He said: “I just do not get it. I pay this to go fishing with my son. What is the complaint to register a gun? That is a whole lot more dangerous than a fishing rod”.

The whole question of gun mentality in this country is misunderstood. There are members in this House who have misused the statement that there is a right to bear arms. There is not now any right in any Canadian constitution to bear arms. Not in this country. Not now and please, God, not ever. We have already seen the results of violence.

The hon. member opposite spoke most eloquently of some of the examples in Montreal; the example that haunts all Canadians over the age of reason on that December night, the École Polytechnique.

Violent actions are not only occurring in the streets at the hands of criminals, they are occurring in the homes of our neighbours. Death and injury by guns in the home are now a greater problem than the criminal misuse of firearms on the street. This relates directly to the questions of violence against women.