

*Criminal Code*

minority of Canadians who organize themselves into the gun groups who are anti-gun legislation and they are able to hoodwink Canadians with phoney arguments. They hoodwink Members of Parliament with phoney arguments.

Those phoney arguments include the slogan: "Guns do not kill, people do". Of course, people do the killing but they require a means by which to do it. Guns are the most effective, in my view. A person who has the intention to kill and is emotionally upset in one way or another, but only has his hands, a stick or a stone, obviously cannot do the damage that is possible if a gun is readily available. A gun is an instrument that is designed and manufactured to kill, whether it is an animal or someone in war. We are not talking about pellet shooters, but guns. Their intent is to kill. In my view, that requires some control.

It is true that people can be killed with other instruments whose design and manufacture is not meant to kill. You can kill someone with a baseball bat if you can catch the victim. However, a baseball bat is meant for a game. It is possible to kill someone with scissors, a razor blade or chemicals, but those things are designed for other purposes. Even some chemicals are subject to restrictions and control. Of course, people do the killing but the gun is an essential instrument in killing.

Studies in the United States have shown that the capacity to kill with a gun is five times greater than any other weapon. That is obvious to any of us who know anything about guns. I do not think anyone would deny that a gun has that killing capacity.

Another argument we hear from the gun lobby is that if we ban guns, only criminals will have them. That dictum forgets that two-thirds of the murders in this country are committed in emotional circumstances between people who are usually members of a family, friends or acquaintances. A very small number of crimes are committed by the so-called professional gangster. Of course, gangsters will always know where to find guns.

We should concentrate on those people who would commit one crime in their life, to kill someone in an emotional argument, like the young person I referred to in Ottawa. I can give many cases of people who have never committed another crime until the day they have killed someone in an emotional disturbance or other dispute. Therefore, the argument that if guns are banned only criminals will have them is nonsense. Two-thirds of our murders are not committed by professional gangsters and criminals, but by those who do not usually have a history of crime.

Of course, we also hear that it is our constitutional right to bear arms. That particular argument is made because so many Canadians read American magazines and watch American television and movies. There is even doubt that it is a constitutional right in the United States, but it certainly is not a constitutional right in Canada.

We also hear that we must have guns in order to defend ourselves. I will talk later about the legitimate rights of

hunters and sportsmen with whom I have no objection. However, with respect to people who say that they must have guns in order to defend themselves in their homes in their cities, studies show that those who have acquired guns to defend themselves usually end up having those guns used against them. In Chicago, elderly women and young people were trained to use hand guns in order to defend themselves. Those people were being killed with the very guns they were given to protect themselves. Criminals would shoot them with their own guns.

In order to defend ourselves we should have an effective national, regional and city police force, rather than relying on defending ourselves as they did in the days of the American frontier when people carried guns and shot it out to defend themselves and their rights. That is not the Canadian way and never has been.

Some will say that the way to deal with the problem is by imposing stricter penalties for the misuse of guns. I am in favour of tougher penalties but that will not solve the problem. When we deal with other matters such as traffic offences, we do not allow people to drive without passing a test or having preventive measures, only to fine them when they break the laws. We use both precautions. Most provinces have strict licensing provisions for driving an automobile. We test the vehicles from time to time to make sure they are safe. There are standards for brakes, tires and other components in order to prevent accidents. We do not simply rely on tough penalties which will be applied against those who might kill, injure or maim if they drive negligently. They are all phoney arguments.

What is the present law? Presently, the gun control law is in the Criminal Code. There are three categories for guns: prohibited weapons, restricted weapons and non-restricted weapons. The prohibited weapons are machine guns, rapid-fire guns and sawed-off shotguns and rifles which can be easily hidden. They are prohibited to all individuals in Canada, without exception. They are allowed to the Armed Forces and the police.

Restricted weapons are hand guns which are allowed to certain people in certain circumstances with a registration certificate and a carrying permit. They are allowed to olympic or competitive shooters and private detectives and others.

With respect to the long guns, the rifles and shot guns, we now have a firearms acquisition certificate. In order to buy a long gun, unlike the young man to whom I referred earlier in my remarks, it is necessary to have a firearms acquisition certificate. However, that is not enough because it leaves out a whole gamut of people in this country who have obtained guns either as a hand down, through a will or by trade. They are not covered by the legislation. Nor does it cover the purchasing of ammunition.

My Bill does nothing more than simply change the firearms acquisition certificate to a firearms possession certificate so that it would apply to the possession of all firearms. Anyone who wanted to use and possess firearms must have one of these certificates, just like a driver's licence. That person must be tested for criminality, background, mental balance and history