

Hon. Raymond J. Perrault: That is totally inaccurate. I confirmed it today; completely inaccurate.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: The regulations would allow the minister to ban the guns used in international competition.

Senator Perrault: Absolutely incorrect. You are spreading another falsehood. May I read the section to you?

Senator Lynch-Staunton: No.

Senator Perrault: It is in the bill, if you would read it instead of reading propaganda.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: I am not reading propaganda; I am reading the testimony of the Canadian Olympic shooting team.

Senator Perrault: It is incorrect. I will send you the citation. It may help you.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Please do. Thank you.

What you cannot deny is that a gun which is purchased legally and then put on the restricted list, which means it has to be registered and then put on the prohibited list, which means it has to be confiscated, can be expropriated without compensation. That has already been done, and it will continue with this bill. Senator Stratton gave us examples yesterday.

The most troubling feature of this bill is that it raises expectations which will not be met. Although this too may be challenged, let me read you an analysis of the bill by Dr. Taylor Buckner of Concordia University, an associate professor of Sociology:

Bill C-68, presently before the Senate, will have little or no effect on homicides, suicides or accidents. Its proponents have not offered a single piece of evidence or research that it will reduce homicides, suicides or accidents, because there is no such evidence or research. It may well allow for an increase in violent crime as police efforts and funds are diverted into bureaucracy. It will certainly increase the overall crime rate, as almost every gun owner in Canada will inadvertently be in violation of one or another of its confusing provisions.

Honourable senators, the Minister of Justice is falsely claiming that if this bill goes to him tonight with amendments, there is a strong possibility that the House of Commons cannot deal with it. Is he so ignorant of the procedure over there that he does not know that the rules of the house favour the majority, and that any bill can get through in the time that the majority wishes, with or without the cooperation of the opposition?

Is the legislative agenda there so heavy that time cannot be made for this bill? Do I hear them discussing a bill which will

abolish the GST? There is nothing of immediate importance going on over there. Is this government in a minority position? There is nothing to stop them from getting this bill tomorrow, amending it, and returning it to us next week, in plenty of time for the Christmas recess.

The minister is really saying that he does not want to see this bill back in the House of Commons. He fears another debate. He fears revealing again the deep splits in his own caucus, the deep opposition which will be expressed to him publicly and privately that Canadians by the hundreds of thousands object to being treated as suspected criminals by the policies underlying this bill.

The minister will not be able to show that he has properly consulted aboriginals as required by the Constitution and by treaties and agreements. Consultation does not mean sending 600 letters. The minister will not be able to show that he has consulted adequately with four provinces and two territories.

Speak to the ministers and attorneys general out there and ask them about the consultation. It was information. It was a monologue. These are the provinces which are responsible for the application of the Criminal Code. Provincial-federal relations at all times are tense, difficult, awkward and frustrating, and never more so than since the referendum. Yet, this government does not seem to accept that the days of "Daddy knows best" are over.

We are in a period where we should have been long ago, a period of consultation, of open discussion, even if it takes longer than one might want to come to agreements. We need an end to destructive letters from the Minister of Health demanding that the provinces follow the rules or be cut from the payroll; or destructive edicts back and forth from the Minister of Human Resources saying, "Do it my way, or no way."

The provinces have requested that only the registration of long arms be delayed so the system can be assessed, and then the provinces could do a better job in applying it. The rest of the bill would apply to all of the provinces.

The aboriginal people are asking only for consultation. They are saying, "We have a way of life here which is different from yours in Ottawa, Toronto and Montreal. We have a way of life which is essential to us. To us, a rifle is a tool. It is an essential, defensive weapon. We are law-abiding citizens. We cannot join your culture, but we do not want to be outside the mainstream. You have pushed us out over the years. You have taken our lands. You have put us on reservations. You have ignored our education. You have tried to abolish our culture. Now you are trying to make some reparations; that goes nowhere without respect. That is what consultation is — respect."

Yet, the Minister of Justice says to aboriginals, to provinces and to every Canadian citizen, "I do not care what you say; you will do it my way."