

FULL COMMENT

Gary Mauser: Why the long-gun registry doesn't work — and never did



GARY MAUSER, SPECIAL TO NATIONAL POST | Dec 11, 2012 12:01 AM ET

[More from Special to National Post](#)



Ethan Miller/Getty Images

In March, Stephen Harper's government reversed decades of increasing restrictions on civilian firearms, scrapping the controversial long-gun registry on grounds that it was wasteful and ineffective. Gun laws, the prime minister correctly said, should focus on criminals rather than law-abiding citizens such as farmers and hunters.

Some claim that this Conservative policy flies in the face of a mountain of evidence, and even represents an assault against reason. Canadian voters seem divided on this issue, as well as some basic related questions: Are firearms in the hands of ordinary citizens a serious threat to public safety? Is registration an effective approach to controlling misuse? How useful was the long-gun registry to police? This article will answer some of those questions.

Gun laws generally tend to be passed during periods of fear or instability, and only occasionally reversed afterwards. In 1913, for instance, a fear of immigrants prompted Ottawa's first serious handgun legislation, requiring civilians to obtain a police-issued permit to acquire or carry handguns. Non-British immigrants found it difficult to get a permit.

Fearing labour unrest as well as American rum-runners, Ottawa mandated handgun registration in 1934. In 1941, concerned about possible Japanese sabotage, the government prohibited all “Orientals” (including Chinese) from owning firearms. (After the war, these restrictions were rescinded.) Terrorism in Quebec swayed opinion in the 1960s and ’70s, spurring Ottawa to limit handgun permits for “protection” to a handful of people, such as retired police and prospectors. In 1977, a Firearms Acquisition Certificate (FAC) was required to obtain ordinary rifles and shotguns. (The police decided to refuse an FAC to anyone who indicated a desire for self-

protection. This is shocking given that in a typical year, tens of thousands of Canadians use firearms to protect themselves or their families, mostly from wildlife.)

The 1989 École Polytechnique massacre in Montreal prompted the Mulroney government to introduce Bill C-17 in 1991, prohibiting a large number of military-style rifles and shotguns. FAC applicants were now required to provide a photograph and references, and to submit to police screening. (Typically, vetting involves telephone checks with neighbours and spouses or ex-spouses.)

In 1993, the Liberals brought in additional changes to gun laws, passing Bill C-68 in 1995 (the Firearms Act). Over half of all registered handguns in Canada were prohibited. No evidence was provided that these handguns had been misused.

The heart of the Firearms Act to this day is licensing: Owning a firearm, an ordinary rifle or shotgun became a criminal offence for those who do not hold a valid licence. In addition, the 1995 law broadened police powers of search and seizure, and expanded the types of officials who could make use of such powers, and weakened constitutionally-protected rights against self-incrimination. To coincide with the “National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence against Women,” the Firearms Act became law on Dec. 5, 1995. However, it took until 1998 to issue licences and require buyers to register long guns. In 2001, all gun owners were required to have a licence and, by 2003, to register all of their rifles and shotguns.

Not everyone complied. An estimated 65% of firearms owners registered at least one rifle or shotgun, and no more than half of all long guns ended up in the registry. Opposition was intense and has never abated. Grassroots anger helped to fuel the rise of the Reform Party, and contributed to the elimination of the Liberals as a political force in the West. Despite their mutual antagonism, three opposition parties (Reform, Progressive Conservative and New Democrat) united against the legislation. Only the Bloc Québécois voted with the Liberals.

In 2002, the auditor-general revealed that the Firearms Centre had grown out of control. Despite political promises that the program would not cost over \$2-million, costs were expected to exceed \$1-billion by 2005. By 2012, this had ballooned to \$2.7-billion. The auditor-general uncovered irregularities including mismanagement and corruption. Her findings stimulated a parliamentary revolt. In 2003, Parliament imposed an annual spending cap. The auditors’ reports led to RCMP investigations of Liberal insiders and contributed to the fall of the Liberal government in 2006.

To this day, it has been claimed that the registry is important in protecting women. But in fact, there is no convincing evidence that registering firearms has been effective in reducing either homicide rates overall, or spousal murders in particular. Even though homicide rates have been gradually falling since the 1970s, a wide variety of researchers have been unable to find solid evidence linking gun laws to this decline. Changing demographics, not firearms laws, better explain the decline in homicides involving long guns over the past 20 years. It is difficult to argue that Canadian gun laws are effective when homicide rates have dropped faster in the United States than in Canada since 1991.

Another argument is that strict laws are required to monitor potentially dangerous gun owners. However, in my Senate testimony, I presented Statistics Canada data to show that anyone who has legally obtained a gun is less likely to be murderous than other Canadians. This should not surprise anyone: Firearms owners have been screened for criminal acts since 1979; and since 1992, they have been stripped of their firearms in cases where they commit a violent crime. (Ironically, Canada does not currently have in place a coherent system that tracks violent criminals on probation or parole — instead choosing to track law-abiding, licensed duck hunters, farmers and recreational sport shooters.)

A third claim is that long guns are the weapon of choice in domestic homicides, and that registration can help to identify the perpetrator. (This is related to the aforementioned claim that guns promote violence against women.) In fact, the long-gun registry and licensing are rarely needed by police to solve spousal homicides for three reasons: (1) in almost all cases, spousal murderers are immediately identified; (2) firearms are not often used to kill female spouses; and (3) the firearms used by abusive spouses to kill

their wives are almost all possessed illegally. Statistics Canada data show that just 4% of long guns involved in homicides were registered.

In a typical year, there are almost 600 homicides and 60 female spousal murders in Canada. On average, long guns are involved in the deaths of just 11 female spouses. It is knives, not long guns, that are the weapons used most often to kill women. Statistics Canada found that most spouses (65%) accused of homicide had a history of violence involving the victim. None of these spouses could legally own a firearm.

Every home has a variety of objects, such as hammers or kitchen knives, that can be used for assault or murder. Creating expensive bureaucracies to register one or more of these items does nothing to protect vulnerable women.

A fourth assertion is that the long-gun registry is an important tool for the police because they use it 14,000 to 17,000 times daily. Besides mistaking frequency of use with usefulness, this claim is disingenuous because it confuses the long-gun registry with the Canadian Firearms Registry Online (CFRO). Almost 98% of the queries to the CFRO concern licensing, not the long-gun registry. The firearms registry contains only gun-specific data, such as the make or model.

The statistics show that police recover registered long guns in just 1% of homicides. During the eight years from 2003 to 2010, there were 4,811 homicides; 1,485 of those involved firearms; only 45 featured long guns registered to the accused. In none of these few cases have the police been able to say that the long-gun registry provided the identity of the murderer.

A fifth contention is that the registry tells the police who has firearms. This is false. Neither licensing nor the long-gun registry contains information about unregistered firearms. The most dangerous criminals have not registered their firearms. Trusting the registry can get police officers killed. When police approach a dangerous person or situation, they must assume there could be an illegal weapon. For this reason, experienced police officers have testified that they do not find the registry helpful.

A sixth claim is that the data in the long-gun registry are too valuable to be destroyed. Unfortunately, the many errors and omissions in the registry vitiate its utility. The RCMP testified to the auditor-general that they could not rely on it in court. Recent information shows that many errors remain despite the best efforts of the Canadian Firearms Program. Immense problems similarly have been reported concerning the accuracy of the South African firearms registry and the now-abandoned New Zealand long-gun registry.

The RCMP has reported error rates between 43% and 90% in firearms applications and registry information. An Access to Information request discovered that 4,438 stolen firearms had been successfully reregistered without alerting authorities. Apparently, the thieves had resold the firearms to new owners who (unsuspectingly) had subsequently registered them. This is a classic database problem: garbage in, gospel out. The irregularities stem from multiple causes inherent in any registration system.

The evidence shows that the long-gun registry has not been effective in reducing criminal violence. Nor is the Canadian experience unique. No international study of firearm laws by criminologists or economists has found support for the claim that restricting access to firearms by civilians reduces criminal violence. And so ending the long gun registry is consistent with the basic principles of good fiscal management. Arguably any government program that fails to achieve its objectives should be shut down.

In abolishing the long-gun registry, the Harper government was acting in accordance with the available evidence. It is the government's opponents, whose ideological belief in the unproven efficacy of gun control blinds them to fact, who are out of step with the available evidence.

National Post

Gary A. Mauser is a professor emeritus at the Beedie School of Business and the Institute for Canadian Urban Research Studies at Simon Fraser University in Burnaby,, B.C. A longer version of this article appears in the current issue of The Dorchester Review magazine.



Find National Post on Facebook



Jonathan Kay: The tragic death of Jacintha Saldanha,...



Donald Trump annoys Scots over golf and Scotch. Is there...



John Ivison: Harper beats back criticism on Nexen, but falters...



Jesse Kline on Hassan Rasouli: Making decisions about death



Andrew Coyne: Stephen Harper compromises on...



Kelly McParland: Liberals show signs of shaking the rust...

Topics: [Full Comment](#), [Gun Control](#), [Gun Laws](#), [Long Gun Registry](#), [Poli](#)

72 comments


★ 0



Leave a message...

Discussion | Community | My Disqus

Share ⌵ ⚙


- 

WilcoxPass · 10 hours ago

With the LGR gone, does Canada now have the optimum level of gun laws, or is there a desire on the part of gun owners to modify and/or eliminate other pieces of legislation?


Also, Mauser did mention that the 1989 Ecole Polytechnique shootings did lead to some changes by the Mulroney government of the day and (I believe) were a major incentive for C-68. Given that the LGR failed to provide any additional public safety, what are the legislative changes that should have been enacted instead to prevent those shootings? Is there nothing that could have been done?

To be clear, I don't know...I'm asking.

7 ⌵ ⌵ · Reply · Share
- 

margeryk → WilcoxPass · 5 hours ago

Sometimes you just can't do anything to prevent tragedies.


10 ⌵ ⌵ · Reply · Share
- 

WilcoxPass → margeryk · 3 hours ago

Not sure that I would completely agree with that - for any tragedy we can almost certainly come up with some actions that could have prevented or minimized it.


The more relevant question is whether the cost of those actions outweighs the gains, and not just financial costs.

So let me rephrase my question for you: In the particular case of Marc Lepine and Ecole Polytechnique, is it correct that there is not even a single low cost action that would have prevented that tragedy?

0 ⌵ ⌵ 1 ⌵ · Reply · Share
- 

robins111 → WilcoxPass · 3 hours ago

No, there was and is, a reasonably low cost, effective solution. Spend funds on mental health (He was diagnosed and was being treated prior to the incident) Spend money on keeping violent offenders off the streets, rather than the catch & release criminal justice system. Make real consequences for real criminals, don't create criminals for paperwork reasons. I would suggest you review the firearms act, you'll find that permit holders have less rights than crack dealers. For example, did you know that not being sufficiently helpful to the police, if they raid your house (no warrant needed) can result in a criminal charge?

5 ⌵ ⌵ · Reply · Share
- 

Always Ask → margeryk · 4 hours ago

Sometimes. Not all the time.

0 ⌵ ⌵ 1 ⌵ · Reply · Share



robins111 → WilcoxPass · 5 hours ago

There are other sections of the Firearms Act which need to go, for instance, the criminalization of an owner, the instant a license (PAL) expires. In many cases, the expiration is due to bureaucratic mistakes, but the owner is the one charged. Other things need to be reviewed such as the arbitrary classification, the seizure of personally owned guns (without compensation). The classification is often done on what the firearm looks like (its scary looking). Simply put, there needs to be a comprehensive review of the legislation, based on, A) Fair and ethical treatment for firearms owners (there are over 30 charter violations in the act) B) A system of classification of firearms which is consistently applied, based on function, not what they look like, C) Research and eliminate sections of the legislation that essentially make no logical sense, other than being a soother to the un-educated on the issue. In conclusion, the best solution is to repeal the FA, of which the registry is a small part, and write new ones, based on actual facts, not reactionary emotional angst.

9 ^ | 1 v · Reply · Share ›



WilcoxPass → robins111 · 3 hours ago

Thanks for that response. Jumping to your last statement first, I am 100% on board with implementing public policy based on actual facts, not reactionary emotional angst.

Two follow-ups:

- are there some firearms that would be banned outright? If so, in general what types of firearms would you include in that group.
- are there some citizens who would not be allowed to own firearms? If so, in general, what types of criteria would you use to decide?

2 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → WilcoxPass · 2 hours ago

There are many firearms banned today, most fall into the machine gun category. There are hundreds banned on what they look like. My suggestion is to review the list, using real tangible operational criteria and go from there. Modifying a firearm into full automatic function can be the benchmark, but also understanding that building a submachine gun, is often easier than modifying an existing one. There are websites giving plans on building fully automatic submachine guns available on the net. The fact that although, freely available, there's been no reported case of Canadian gun owners doing so. This is indicative of a stable law abiding community. A significant number of firearms made the list, because they use black plastic in their construction, or how they were ergonomically laid out. this is ludicrous.

As far as the mental health issues, I suspect that a Medical Doctor's recommendation, or admission to a mental health facility would be the base criteria. Interestingly many police officers suffer from depression, and serious mental health problems due to PTSD, but we give them guns, wonder what would happen if we applied this criteria to them..

3 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



bchunter · 4 hours ago

An excellent article that deals with facts, not emotions.

9 ^ | 1 v · Reply · Share ›



Dewey Riesterer · 11 hours ago

Excellent article, Gary, certainly enjoyed your presentation at our Mission Gun Club last spring and hope to see more of your outstanding work to bring forth the TRUTH about gun ownership in Canada.

I believe that ownership is my birthright and given the centuries that my family has been in Canada, serving in time of war, paying taxes and contributing to the society which has evolved here, I will NEVER give up this right!

16 ^ | 4 v · Reply · Share ›



mel now from surrey → Dewey Riesterer · 11 hours ago

The registry didn't stop you from owning guns . The anti-registry people over-reacted.

5 ^ | 5 v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → mel now from surrey · 4 hours ago

Hey Mel, using your logic, the criminal code didn't stop Gamil Gharbi (Marc LePine) you leftards over-reacted.

7 ^ | 2 v · Reply · Share ›



Always Ask → Dewey Riesterer · 4 hours ago

And if you are a law-abiding responsible gun owner, I would support you in that fully

And if you are a law abiding, responsible gun owner, I would support you in that rally.

If you are a criminal, or mentally ill, I'd take your guns away.

3 ^ | 2 v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → Always Ask · 4 hours ago

Great idea.. did you know that under the existing legislation, you can become a criminal, simply because the mail is slow, or a federal bureaucrat lost your application for renewal?

6 ^ | 1 v · Reply · Share ›



Always Ask → robins111 · 4 hours ago

So then the problem is the bureaucracy, not the gun control laws.

I'd rather a law abiding gun owner lose their guns due to a bureaucratic mix-up, then a psychopath get their hands on a gun due to one.

1 ^ | 5 v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → Always Ask · 4 hours ago

I love your proclamation that its better for someone to lose their guns etc.. How about you offer to lose something of yours, for imaginary public safety reasons.. like your car, or house.. after all, most domestic violence takes place in homes.

9 ^ | 1 v · Reply · Share ›



Always Ask → robins111 · 3 hours ago

To pretend that guns are no different from houses or cars is either supremely ignorant, or supremely dishonest.

Guns are tools for killing. That is their express purpose. it's why we give them to police officers and to soldiers. It's why we don't give them to eight year olds and criminals.

This means they are highly effective tools for self defence. I have NO problem with law abiding citizens owning guns. I've said before that I feel more comfortable with a neighbor who owns a gun and is responsible with it than I did with neighbors who didn't own guns.

However ignoring what they are is highly naive.

2 ^ | 4 v · Reply · Share ›



Chris O'Malley → Always Ask · an hour ago

What is the purpose of a corvette other than to speed? Way more people are killed by cars than guns. Shall we confiscate all sports cars?

2 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → Always Ask · 2 hours ago

I wonder who my police friends are supposed to kill.. Most of them feel their handguns are for self defence?

2 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → Always Ask · 4 hours ago

The laws are the enabler, the foundation for these incidents, the easy solution would be removal of the ownership, paperwork violations from the criminal code, it was suggested, and mocked by the libs & dippers last week if you recall.

5 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



Always Ask → robins111 · 3 hours ago

Without paperwork, how would we be able to ensure that violent gang members aren't stockpiling guns?

0 ^ | 6 v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → Always Ask · 3 hours ago

Don't know if you figured out yet, but gang members generally don't do the paperwork. If you can show me how many galloway boys, have registered guns I'll be very surprized. Whats the heck is a stockpile?

6 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



Always Ask → robins111 · 3 hours ago

stock-pile

Noun

A large accumulated stock of goods or materials, esp. one held in reserve for use at a time of shortage or other emergency.

And that is exactly the point. BECAUSE the Galloway Boys are not able to legally acquire guns, it provides law enforcement with a vast number of tools to arrest them. Anytime they arrest a gang member and find a gun in their possession, they can charge them.

Take that away, and now you have to wait until AFTER they kill somebody before they can be charged.

0 ^ | 4 v · Reply · Share ›



Feldgrau → Always Ask · 2 hours ago

You need a licence to possess any firearm. No licence + firearm already equals jail. And, since we are talking gang members, we are also discussing handguns. There are already a slew of charges that can be brought forth without the paperwork you are trying to cling to.

4 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → Always Ask · 2 hours ago

Funny, the term stockpile could be applied to a collection of swords from the middle ages, or I have a friend who has a stockpile of glass javex bottles etc.

2 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



Bill Grigg → Always Ask · 2 hours ago

Please provide links to news stories showing that cops are charging, and convicting, criminals for illegal guns. Go on! Try to find ONE.

2 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



Feldgrau → Always Ask · 2 hours ago

"Without Paperwork, how would we be able to ensure that violent gang members aren't stockpiling guns?"

A non sequitur.

4 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



Feldgrau → Always Ask · 2 hours ago

And therein lies a central problem with the whole gun control apparatus in Canada--punish the innocent; and still the pro registry crowd refuses to get it and wonders why the innocent rejected their pet project.

4 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



Gigolo4life → Dewey Riesterer · 3 hours ago

I'm curious if Mauser is his actual name. If so, that's an excellent name for a long gun advocate.

0 ^ | 2 v · Reply · Share ›



crumb · an hour ago

What a great piece of reporting - an extended explanation including factual supporting data. Too bad this has been classed as an 'idea' while editorial spin dressed up as journalism fills most of the newsprint in this country and is called 'news'. "Always asks" pretends '...not to know, I'm asking', but it is clear that she does know and is baiting, not asking. I look forward to an essay of the caliber of Dr Mauser's that can justify making anyone who actually abides by the law requiring firearms permits a second-class citizen subject to arbitrary search and seizure (without compensation) and opens the door to the officious intimation that has become the standard tool of administering this regime. One of the biggest canards is the assertion that the registry gave police a vital edge in knowing if a firearm was present when they were called to a particular address. But there was never a requirement for long guns to be kept at any particular address - only that they be registered by their owner. The possession permit, on the other hand, did (and still does) tell police if there is an individual who is licensed to possess firearms associated with a residence. And so what, one might ask? It should be no surprise that in the vast majority of calls, the police either have a good indication of what the problem is (particularly if violence is a factor), in which case the urgency leaves doing a records check in the dusts and conditions their response accordingly without it; or they are going to an address where their local knowledge allows them to surmise, without recourse to a records check, what to expect. When they do check the firearms records (I have been told by my police friends), the most important thing they learn if a firearms permit pops up is that someone at that address is at least cognizant of the

law and inclined to abide by it; a potential useful tidbit, but not something that changes much. I might add that restricted and prohibited weapons (in the hands of law-abiding owners who have paid good money for them, and are keenly interested in keeping them) still need to be registered and kept under lock and key at a designated location known to the authorities - as they always have been. But then these weapons (and their legal owners) are an even more law-abiding group than the regular run of firearms permit holders and far, far less likely to ever be the subject of police calls.

2 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → crumb · an hour ago

Very well said, its almost hysterical when AA, gets into an ideological bind, he/she generally resorts to inconsequential questions like 'is a pumpkin orange or hollow', it idicates the mindset. I fully agree, there should be more articles like this, if for no other reason, than to educate the citizens

0 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



lescaine · 4 hours ago

Canada should be more like United States and Toronto more like Chicago?

<http://www.thedaily.com/page/2...>

<http://www.torontopolice.on.ca...>

2 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



Always Ask · 4 hours ago

A system that keeps guns out of the hands of those we consider potentially dangerous is what is needed. The long gun registry was useless in this regard, but that doesn't mean that gun control laws should not be tightened.

Anyone convicted of any criminal offence should permanently lose the right to own a gun. No non-citizens should be able to own a gun.

Anyone with a history of mental illness should not be allowed to own a gun.

Anyone found selling or providing access to a gun to someone not allowed to own a gun should be prosecuted with significant jail time.

I would also suggest that anyone seeking a licence to own a gun should have to prove their knowledge and proficiency first, just as a driver must to obtain their drivers licence.

2 ^ | 1 v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → Always Ask · 4 hours ago

All your suggestions are whats pretty much the laws since the 1960's, so why do the think the legislation needs to be stronger.

In addition to your points, there's also a thing called continuous eligibility, where firearms owners are checked every day, for possible criminal charges, if so, their license is suspended. Incidentally, prior to those charges being found guilty in court.

5 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



Always Ask → robins111 · 4 hours ago

I would certainly hope they'd be constantly checked, and if they are found not guilty, their guns can be returned to them.

Better to err on the side of caution.

0 ^ | 2 v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → Always Ask · 4 hours ago

Why not go whole hog, and demand everyone in Canada give a DNA sample at birth, a finger print etc.. If they've committed no crime and the case gets tossed, you still have to fight in court to get your firearms, returned, which requires a lawyer, time in front of a judge. etc.

7 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



Always Ask → robins111 · 4 hours ago

Well that's silly. if the case gets tossed, you should get your guns back.

0 ^ | 2 v · Reply · Share ›



dpo2o → Always Ask · 3 hours ago

Yeah but you don't. The Crown will bleed you dry first in the hope you give up.

5 ^ | 1 v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → Always Ask · 3 hours ago

No you tell the system, it happens every day, or the firearms are chopped up, before the appeal is heard. What you don't understand is this legislation enabled abuses you can't imagine, and are still taking place.

5 ^ | 1 v · Reply · Share ›



Always Ask → robins111 · 3 hours ago

And again, I find those abuses small potatoes compared to the risk of people getting murdered.

Should those abuses be stopped? Absolutely. But that doesn't even compare in importance to keeping guns out of the hands of criminals and the mentally ill.

1 ^ | 4 v · Reply · Share ›



Chris O'Malley → Always Ask · an hour ago

Can't make an omelette without breaking some eggs, eh?

3 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → Always Ask · 3 hours ago

Then when is your suggestion for a knife registry going to be spouted off, they appear to be the weapon of choice in the last few years? Or how about we ban shopping malls and theaters, they seem to be the area of choice for shooters. Or forbid schools, to stop school shootings.. Do you see how absurd this can get? We should go after the root cause of these crimes, not the objects, or the people who lawfully use them.

5 ^ | 1 v · Reply · Share ›



Always Ask → robins111 · 3 hours ago

I replied to this issue above. It is extremely dishonest to pretend that firearms are the same as knives.

We don't send our soldiers into battle with knives.

1 ^ | 5 v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → Always Ask · 3 hours ago

I had one, and was a soldier, learned how to use it too. But don't try to isolate and demonize firearms, they are a tool, nothing more, and can be used for bad purposes. As can knives, which apparently is more common than guns.

6 ^ | 1 v · Reply · Share ›



Always Ask → robins111 · 3 hours ago

So again, why do we give our soldiers guns and not just knives?

Come on, it's not that hard.

1 ^ | 4 v · Reply · Share ›



Chris O'Malley → Always Ask · an hour ago

I was a soldier and I had a bayonette

3 ^ | v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → Always Ask · 3 hours ago

While I'm not sure what point you're trying to make, I'll respond by asking why they give soldiers 'armored personell carriers', rather than trucks.

1 ^ | 1 v · Reply · Share ›



Always Ask → robins111 · 3 hours ago

Your obvious attempts to avoid answering the simple question is telling.

If you have no interest in honest discussion, there's little point in continuing along this trail. I sincerely hope you lose your guns.

0 ^ | 3 v · Reply · Share ›



robins111 → Always Ask · 3 hours ago

I repeat, what was the question, as pertaining to the article?

1 ^ | ▾ · Reply · Share ›



bchunter → Always Ask · 4 hours ago

"Any" criminal offense? So the woman, who in her early 20s, marched on Parliament hill in support of Native rights but got carried away and was charged with mischief, can never buy a gun for self protection, never hunt nor ever join a target shooting club in her 50s?

And don't get me started about how successful the health system will be when you tell all gun owners that if they go to their doctor and complain about feeling depressed, all their guns will be confiscated and they will never enjoy their annual fall trip in the woods with their buddies.

5 ^ | 2 ▾ · Reply · Share ›

Load more comments

ALSO ON NATIONAL POST

[What's this?](#) ×

Vilifying Stephen Harper | Full Comment | National Post

2903 comments · 4 days ago



Dallas25305 — They seem to be able to fool you. Harper didn't pay the 14 1/2 billion for the Koyto scam that Chre...

Kelly McParland: Liberals show signs of shaking the rust from the party's brain

1 comment · an hour ago



Rick Bonsteel — I would never have even given thought to Liberals -- immigrant-pandering, smirking, big-shot glad-ha...



Comment feed



Subscribe via email

DISQUS

