

Good Morning,

I would like to write to express my concern over Bill C-71. I would like to ask to have my letter added to the record of the committee in regards to C-71 and also would ask that I be considered to be called as a witness for the committee as a law abiding firearms owner. If this is not available then I ask the committee to have CCFR president Rod Giltaca speak as my representative. Bill C-71 was presented as taking action to make our streets safer. Sadly this seems to be marketing and not based on evidence and statistics.

The first issue that is being largely ignored is the mysterious 12(9) section of the bill. This government was committed to openness and transparency and this section of the bill needs to be addressed. 12(9) by all accounts appears to allows or individual to be grandfathered to "possess prohibited firearms of a prescribed class". What firearms are destined for this class? What classifications will be used to determine 12(9) firearms? How can decisions made to 12(9) be appealed and if the firearms are added to the class how will the government inform owners? I urge you to clarify this area. If more classes are being added to Prohibited Firearms, we the law abiding citizens deserve to know what they are and there justification and impact so that we are not made criminals by paperwork changes.

The RCMP has historically made improper classifications of firearms. The Mossberg Blaze for example. How will mistakes like this one be corrected with bill C-71. Classifications should always be made on technical specifications based on the firearms act. When these are not followed there should be oversight of elected officials to verify the RCMP is doing their job correctly. When I review it looks like the government can increase a firearms classification but cannot lower it. This seems to be a very biased part of the bill. If the government believes the RCMP are the "experts" why did they retain the ability to increase the classification? When mistakes are made how are they corrected?

This bill is being justified as a solution to gun crime in Canada. Part of being a safe firearms owner is making sure your firearms are in proper working order and that they are safe to use. Firearms, like any mechanical device do wear and break over time. It is in the public's best interest to allow citizens to take firearms to a gunsmith for repairs. If ATTs are required for maintenance and repairs it encourages owners to try and fix problems themselves often without knowledge and training. I have witnessed safety issues with malfunctioning firearms first hand. The firearm should be taken to a gunsmith immediately to be inspected. Hindering this process decreases public safety as it becomes harder to prevent firearms from being kept in working order. Can the committee please explain how removing ATTs to Gunsmiths, Peace Officers, Gun-shows and Borders are increasing public safety? What evidence is there to support this?

Thank you for your consideration.

Kevin King

Good Afternoon,

One additional note. As I have been researching bill C-71, Primarily on how the bill was drafted and who was consulted in its creation, I came across some information that I think you should be made aware of. It appears that bill C-71 was largely written based of of a letter sent Dec 12, 2017 by Nathalie Prevost to all MPs.

Mrs. Prevost serves as the vice chair of the firearms advisory committee. As a committee member she is not allowed to engage in lobbying activities on issues relating to the mandate of that committee. I have attached her signed letter agreeing to not lobby acquired from the access to information act. It was signed by Mrs. Prevost on Jan 26, 2017. As of Today she is still serving on the committee.

I have also attached the letter sent by Mrs. Prevost to members of parliament on Dec 21 2017.

I would like to ask to have this information aslo added to the record of the committee in regards to C-71

Kevin King