



Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police *Leading Progressive change in policing*
Association canadienne des chefs de police *À l'avant-garde du progrès policier*

Presentation to the Senate – a

STANDING COMMITTEE ON LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

(CU)

**Proposed Firearms Information Regulations (Non-Restricted
Firearms) changes to subsection 118(3) of the *Firearms Act*
(S.C. 1995, c. 39)**

Remarks By:

Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police

Chief Mario Harel – Vice-President, CACP

June 20, 2012

(Final)

300 Terry Fox Drive, Suite 100/ 300, promenade Terry Fox, suite 100, Kanata, Ontario K2K 0E3
Tel: (613) 595-1101 • Fax/Télécopieur: (613) 383-0372 • E-mail/Courriel: cacp@cacp.ca

David H. Hill, C.M./Q.C., Lynda A. Bordeleau General Counsel/Conseillers juridiques
Perley-Robertson, Hill and McDougall LLP Barristers & Solicitors/Avocats et Procureurs

Caring • Courage • Equity • Integrity • Openness • Respect • Transparency • Trustworthiness
Compassion • Courage • Équité • Intégrité • Ouverture • Respect • Transparence • Fiabilité



Once again, thank-you for having the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police present to you today. My name is Directeur Mario Harel of the Gatineau Police Service and I am a Vice-President of the CACP.

We respectfully regret that once again, we are being asked to appear before you to discuss legislation around the issue of firearms. Despite the fact that we have supported the introduction of a number of positive legislative measures to improve the safety of our streets and communities, this particular item runs counter to that goal.

On March 28, I appeared before this committee and stated: “The CACP acknowledges on the issue of repealing the LGR, the government has been transparent with the Canadian people of their intent to pass this legislation. In our Parliamentary system, we must respect the desires of Canadians who elected this government with the ability to do so. Nothing now is gained by providing further opposition to this Bill.”

The governments reasoning for removing the LGR was based on spent costs and the philosophy that “it criminalizes hard-working and law-abiding citizens.”

We were prepared to leave it at that.

During House and Senate Committees relating to C-19, and through a letter to the Minister, the CACP urged the

government to ensure that records of sales by firearms vendors be maintained as has been the case since 1977.

Why? Very simply, firearm vendor ledgers provide at least one method to which law enforcement can investigate a long-gun used in a criminal act. I repeat, in a criminal act.

It is not a searchable, centralized database. It has no cost to Canadians. It does not criminalize law-abiding citizens and it places no burden upon them. Why would we remove such a practice and how can we justify it from a public safety perspective?

During the Long-Gun Registry debate, I feel it necessary to quote some of the testimony given by witnesses who supported the governments C-19:

Tony Bernardo from the Canadian Sport Shooting Association held up the pre-registry 'green book' in front of the House Committee on November 17, 2011 – He described the process of a gun coming into Canada:

“That firearm then goes to a dealer's inventory; they are obligated to keep an inventory book. It's colloquially known as “the green book”. Every single merchant in firearms has to have that green book, and every firearm coming in or going out has to be recorded in that green book....That green book has been the status quo for at

least 30 years.” He was asked “... store owners can now just sell guns to anyone and there will be no record; they can sell a gun to anyone?” and he responded “No, that’s absolutely false....he has to have where it went in his inventory control.”

Sgt Grismer in front of this very committee stated:

“I am very familiar with the ledgers that were kept then. That kind of a system was not onerous then and I do not think the dealers of today would consider it onerous now.

Calgary Chief Rick Hanson, again, who supported C-19, recommended in front of this very committee:

“We must reinstate point of sale recording. This existed prior to the gun registry and was useful for two reasons. The first is that it allowed for proper auditing of gun stores to ensure that they are complying with the law requiring them to sell only to those with proper licences. That is a starting point should that gun be identified as being used in a criminal offence.

Law enforcement has attempted to enter into respectful dialogue with the government on this issue but not once have we been consulted. Opponents of the LGR, the hard-working, law abiding citizens, to our knowledge, have never requested this action. Other than the pro-gun lobby, who state that ‘the

so called gun control laws simply make the bad guys laugh all the way to the next crime scene', who is really making this an issue?

It is not a searchable, centralized database. It has no cost to Canadians. It does not criminalize law-abiding citizens and it places no burden upon them.

So we have to ask the question, how does this regulation possibly serve the interests of Public Safety? And since we are not part of the consultation process, we have to ask, what can we expect next?

Thank-you.