



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 067**

Thursday, May 11, 2023

---

Chair: Mr. Ron McKinnon





## Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

Thursday, May 11, 2023

• (1635)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Ron McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.)):** I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number 67 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security.

We will start by acknowledging that we are meeting on the traditional unceded territory of the Algonquin people.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format pursuant to the House order of June 23, 2022; therefore, members are attending in person in the room and remotely using the Zoom application.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, May 9, 2023, the committee resumes consideration of Bill C-21, an act to amend certain acts and to make certain consequential amendments (firearms).

I would like to remind all members regarding some specific sections of the motion adopted on Tuesday that have an impact on clause-by-clause consideration.

Amendments filed by independent members shall be deemed to have been proposed during the clause-by-clause consideration of the bill.

No more than 20 minutes can be allotted for debate on any clause or any amendment moved. These 20 minutes are to be divided to a maximum of five minutes per party, unless unanimous consent is granted to extend debate on a specific amendment. At the expiry of the time provided for debate on an amendment, the chair shall put every question to dispose of the amendment forthwith and successively without further debate.

If the committee has not completed the clause-by-clause consideration of the bill by 11:59 p.m. on Thursday, all remaining amendments submitted to the committee shall be deemed moved. The chair shall put the question forthwith and successively without further debate on all remaining clauses and amendments submitted to the committee, as well as each and every question necessary to dispose of the clause-by-clause consideration of the bill. The committee shall not adjourn the meeting until it has disposed of the bill.

Before we proceed, I would now welcome the officials who are once again with us. From the Department of Justice, we have Sandro Giammaria, counsel; and Phaedra Glushek, counsel, criminal law policy section. From the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, we have Rachel Mainville-Dale, acting director general, firearms policy. From the Royal Canadian Mount-

ed Police, we have Rob Daly, director, strategic policy, Canadian firearms program; Kellie Paquette, director general, Canadian firearms program; and Rob Mackinnon, director, Canadian firearms program.

Also, I would like to welcome the officials from the Canada Border Services Agency, CBSA, and the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, who are not at the table at this moment. From the Canada Border Services Agency, we have Jeff Robertson, manager, inadmissibility policy unit, strategic policy branch. From the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, we have Pascale Bourassa, acting director general, directorate of security and safeguards; and Pierre-Daniel Bourgeau, counsel, legal services. These officials will join us at the table and be available to answer questions when we study the relevant clauses. CNSC is relevant to clauses 49 to 51. CBSA is relevant to clauses 52 to 63 and 67 to 69.

Thank you, all, for joining us once again. Your participation is critically important to us.

I note that Mr. Calkins followed by Mr. Julian are on the speaking list. Before we go into that, we have a couple of housekeeping items.

(On clause 15)

**The Chair:** The first one is on NDP-1. The amendment of Ms. Damoff has a couple of grammatical concerns. I will ask the clerk to mention them. Perhaps we can change them on a unanimous consent basis.

Go ahead, Mr. Clerk, please.

• (1640)

**Mr. Philippe Méla (Legislative Clerk):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As you will recall, yesterday the committee adopted a subamendment to NDP-1, the protection order. There was a new definition.

[Translation]

In French, in the definition of protection order, "*S'entend une ordonnance rendue*" should read "*S'entend d'une ordonnance rendue*."

[English]

At the end of the sentence, the accord is not done properly with the feminine gender. It should say,

[Translation]

"*limitée*."

[English]

We just need to add a “d” and an apostrophe at the start and an “e” at the end. That’s all that would be required.

**The Chair:** Do we have unanimous consent to effect those changes?

[Translation]

Agreed?

[English]

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** It’s done. Thank you.

**Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.):** Can I ask a question on the clause, Mr. Chair?

• (1645)

**The Chair:** Please be very, very quick.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I would need unanimous consent to do this. Folks weren’t here last night—or maybe you were, Blaine—when Glen Motz was talking about courts not being the only ones who issue protection orders. Because of time limits, we didn’t have a chance to amend that. I think we’re actually not accomplishing what we wanted to accomplish because of the amendment I put forward. Because I used the word “court”, we’re actually limiting what we can do. In addition, officials pointed out to me that we have not given them regulating powers.

I’m just wondering if there’s unanimous consent for me to provide some wording to change that and fix it.

**Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP):** Sure.

**The Chair:** Do we have unanimous consent on this matter?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** I believe we do. Go ahead, please.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Is that okay?

**Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC):** I just want the same courtesy when I want unanimous consent.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Let’s start out on the right foot here.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** All right.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I don’t have it in front of me right now.

Is there wording we could add to it that would allow officials to still regulate? I think I came up with wording yesterday, actually, and then we were ending.

**The Chair:** I’ll give you some time to find that and sort that out. We will consider that the matter will be addressed on a unanimous consent basis.

(Clause 15 allowed to stand)

**The Chair:** There is another matter regarding another error we made. This was brought up by Mr. Paul-Hus yesterday. It’s on G-21.

There is a discrepancy between the English and the French in new clause 11.1 on page 52 of the package. New proposed para-

graph 117.05(4)(b) begins with the word “if” on the English side and...where in the French?

Why is the French side in English?

Go ahead, Mr. Clerk.

**Mr. Philippe Méla:** Mr. Chair, the change is only in the English version. Of course, on the French side you’ll have the new English version.

It says both “if the justice is satisfied” and “where the justice is satisfied”, so at reprint there will be a problem. We won’t know which one to put there.

I asked Ms. Mainville-Dale what wording would be preferable. She indicated to me that “where” would be the appropriate word on both sides.

**The Chair:** All right.

The request is to change that one word, “if”, to “where” in the English version.

Do we have unanimous consent to do so?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

(On clause 15)

**The Chair:** Ms. Damoff, are you ready to go?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Yes.

**The Chair:** This is on the amendment you made previously. We have unanimous consent for you to propose some changes.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Currently, it says “a court”—

**Mr. Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC):** What clause is it?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** It’s clause 15, Alex. NDP-1 is amending clause 15.

After “a court”, we would be adding the words “or another competent authority”.

Then, at the very end, we took out too much. I take complete blame for this. It should still include “orders that prohibit a person from”. That got deleted when we did the clause, I believe, so it doesn’t really make sense.

Is “orders that prohibit a person from” still there?

**Mr. Philippe Méla:** No, it’s not.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Okay.

So it would be, “this includes but is not limited to orders that prohibit a person from”.

The way it reads right now, according to what I submitted, it includes but isn’t limited to “being in physical proximity” to a person. It just doesn’t make sense.

Again, this would be adding “or another competent authority”, and then, at the end, “orders that prohibit a person from”.

As well, at the end, is there standard wording available that regulations would be made based on this? We don't want to take away officials' ability to make regulations, which I understand we've done in this clause.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale (Acting Director General, Firearms Policy, Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness):** Perhaps I can make a suggestion.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Absolutely.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** The original clause was worded this way: "protection order has the meaning assigned by the regulations". Then I would add the language that you're comfortable with, such as "which can include" or that kind of general intent, saying that this is what it's intended to capture but it has the meaning assigned by the regulations.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I'm good with that.

**The Chair:** Mr. Calkins, do you wish to respond to this?

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** Sure, Chair, if it's okay.

This seems to be a more substantive change than what we had originally expected. Could we get this in written format and distributed to the committee so that we can actually see it? I'm going back into this binder and I can't even find NDP-1.

I'd like to actually see what's going on, if you don't mind.

**The Chair:** Ms. Damoff, can we do that and come back to this once that's available?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Yes. That's fine.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ):** Can we make sure that it is in both official languages, please?

[English]

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. I didn't understand any of that....

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Can we make sure that the document we receive from Ms. Damoff is in both official languages, please?

[English]

**The Chair:** We'll do our best.

[Translation]

**Mr. Peter Julian:** I has to be done.

[English]

**The Chair:** Yes.

We will come back to that when everything is good.

(Clause 15 allowed to stand)

**The Chair:** Monsieur Godin, go ahead on the same matter.

• (1650)

[Translation]

**Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC):** Like my colleague, I am having a bit of trouble following. I am new to the committee.

I just want to draw your attention to something. I don't know how the situation can be corrected. Maybe the legislative clerk can help us.

If I am not mistaken, we talked about the "if" or the "where" in proposed paragraph 11.1(2)(b) in amendment G-21, which is on page 52 of the amendments package.

Also in that amendment, subclause 11.1(1) proposes to replace subsection 117.05(4) of the Criminal Code.

So I'm talking about proposed subclause 11.1(4).

[English]

It says, "If, following the hearing of an application".

[Translation]

In the French version, it says: "*Le juge qui, au terme de l'audition de la demande, conclut.*"

The conditional is used in the English version but not in the French version. Can the legislative clerk confirm that everything is correct in the interpretation?

[English]

**Mr. Philippe Méla:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[Translation]

Yes, I can try to do that.

We have to remember that when amendments are drafted by the Department of Justice it is done independently by anglophone and francophone drafters. It isn't a matter of translating from one language to the other; it is parallel drafting.

In this case, the wording means the same thing in both languages. In English, it says:

[English]

"If, following the hearing of an application made under".

[Translation]

In French, it says: "*Le juge qui, au terme de l'audition.*" So something is going to happen after the application. In practice, it says the same thing.

**Mr. Joël Godin:** Thank you for your answer.

However, we saw something relatively unique in the House of Commons today.

We amended some commas and words in Bill C-13. Ten motions were introduced by the government after the same work was done as we are doing here for Bill C-21.

I draw your attention to this because I want to make sure the same mistake isn't made. I would like us to make sure that the meaning is the same. This is a law, and there has to be as little as possible that needs to be interpreted and argued in court. I think it is important to point this out, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Godin.

[*English*]

As we wait for the hard copy that Madam Damoff is undertaking, Mr. Calkins I believe wants to move an amendment to clause 30.

(On clause 30)

**The Chair:** Is this what you wish to speak to, Mr. Julian?

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Yes, Mr. Chair. We could be looking at the same amendment.

**The Chair:** I have Mr. Calkins on the list first. We'll let him go ahead.

After we're done clause 30, I propose that we will go to Mr. Ruff, who will ask for unanimous consent to go back to clause 18 to do his amendment.

Mr. Calkins, go ahead, please.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** Thank you, Chair.

Just to let you know, I have two amendments to this clause. I have to do them separately because they are separate issues.

The first one I have to move simply because I did not have time in the five minutes to ask the question that I wanted to ask in regard to subsection 63(3), "Authorizations to carry".

What I propose is to remove the word "not" between the words "are" and "valid". It would read, in English, "Authorizations to carry are valid outside the province where the holder of the authorization resides."

My reason for moving that amendment is I would like to ask the department officials a question regarding what this clause intends to do. My colleague, Mr. Genuis, talked about people who lived in proximity to borders. I just want to understand it clearly.

Is this authorization to carry that's being discussed here for personal protection or is it for things like trappers, for protection from animals? Would it be for all of those or is it for those very rare instances where an individual is carrying a firearm for personal protection from another person or where law enforcement can't readily respond? Is it both or is it just the singular instance?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** It would cover all of the authorizations to carry for reasons under paragraphs 20(a) or 20(b).

As it normally works currently, the vast majority of them are for reasons of employment. For example, it's a security guard who carries a handgun for a bank cash transfer company. They have one in Ontario. There's an agreement that happens also, for example, with the Quebec CFOs, so that they can cross over to Gatineau and do their route across there.

There's an agreement. It's still an authorization in the province in which it was issued, currently.

That's what the intent was. It was to capture those situations. However, the way it's worded would limit it in terms of where that person resides. I think the intent would be to maintain the current regime so there is a geographical reality to the authorization to carry.

• (1655)

**The Chair:** I just want to point out, sir, that the clock is running.

Can you move the amendment?

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** I did. I believe I said I want to withdraw the word "not" from the clause.

**The Chair:** I missed that. I apologize.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** I'm sorry, Chair, if I wasn't clear.

I have a purpose for removing the word "not".

I appreciate your answer, but I want to speak specifically to those cases where it's not for the purpose of employment or the purpose of the course of somebody's job, like a trapper or an armoured car guard. I'm talking about those rare instances where an individual has been given an ATC for personal protection for whatever reason.

If I read this correctly, this clause, if it's not amended, would limit the person's ability to travel in their country with their protective device that they've been authorized to carry to the area of jurisdiction of that chief firearms officer only. They would essentially be—because I can't come up with the right words right now—imprisoned in their own area of jurisdiction.

I'm asking you this from a charter perspective. Under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, section 6, mobility rights, every Canadian citizen is granted the ability to travel freely in this country, and under legal rights under section 7, everyone is entitled to the right to life, liberty and security of the person. These people would be issued this authorization to carry for that life, liberty and security of the person premise. That security of the person premise only applies, then, to the jurisdiction of the chief firearms officer. It doesn't apply to the entirety of Canada.

Is this clause charter compliant?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** As I said, the intent was to sort of mirror the language that was originally there and adapted because of the change of the authorization to carry for protection of life. We recognized yesterday that this did not capture the government's intent when drafting the motion.

With regard to the charter, I will turn to my colleagues in terms of the implications.

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria (Counsel, Department of Justice):** Unfortunately, I don't think I can give charter advice, but just as a point of clarification, section 6 of the charter is not a freedom of movement guarantee. It provides a right to enter a province and take up residence in that province, so it's narrower than I think maybe you characterized it as. It's kind of a bare right of freedom of movement. I just wanted to provide that correction.

**The Chair:** Mr. Calkins, I'm going to have to cut you off there.

Go ahead, Mr. Julian, please.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I understand what Mr. Calkins is trying to get at.

I would not be voting in favour of his amendment, but I would like to offer a possibility, once we've considered his amendment, which is to add to the amendment "and/or works", so clause 30 would read, "authorized to carry are not valid outside the province where a holder of the authorization resides and/or works".

We can double-check with the officials, but I believe that would cover border areas such as Mr. Genuis raised yesterday.

That would be what I would offer if Mr. Calkins' amendment is defeated.

• (1700)

**The Chair:** We can't go back to Mr. Calkins at this point.

Is there any further discussion on Mr. Calkins' amendment?

Seeing none, I will ask for a vote on Mr. Calkins' amendment.

**An hon. member:** A recorded vote.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** I know Mr. Calkins has one more amendment, but I think Mr. Julian had his hand up right after, so we'll take them in order.

Mr. Julian, please move your amendment, and then we can come back.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Mr. Chair, I would move that we add "and/or works" at the end of the phrase.... However, I do want to check with the officials to make sure that's appropriate wording to resolve the issue that Mr. Genuis brought up.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** You could also consider mirroring the language that's in paragraph 20(b) of the Firearms Act "for use in connection with his or her lawful profession or occupation". "Works" is a little simpler, but you could consider mirroring the language that is already in the Firearms Act.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Which would be?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** It would be "for use in connection with his or her lawful profession or occupation".

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Okay. For use....

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** You could also consider, "for the questions for protection of life of that individual or other individuals".

If we could, I think I might want to take a few minutes with my colleagues—if that would be all right—just so that we could consider....

**The Chair:** Does your amendment interfere with this amendment, do you think?

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** No.

**The Chair:** How about we go with Mr. Calkins' amendment while you guys sort that out and we'll be efficient with our time.

Madam Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I don't have a problem with that, but it probably involves asking officials questions and they can't answer Mr. Calkins' questions and ours if they're thinking about something, so I think maybe we should let them put their heads together, Chair.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** They have to sort it out.

**The Chair:** We'll suspend for a couple of minutes to get this sorted out.

• (1700)

(Pause)

• (1735)

**The Chair:** I'll resume the meeting.

Mr. Julian has the floor.

Mr. Julian, would you like to reread your amendment?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

That will be very different from what I just proposed.

I want to thank the officials for producing the bilingual versions so fast; they are very high quality.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Shipley, do you have an issue with translation?

**Mr. Doug Shipley (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC):** No, but I have a point of order.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** I hear Taleeb's concern about my attendance at the committee. I've been here virtually the whole time.

**The Chair:** That's not a point of order. We need to keep that off-line.

We're under way with Mr. Julian's amendment, and we need to carry on with it.

Mr. Julian, please carry on.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I have a point of order, Chair.

Mr. Shipley needs headphones if he's going to speak.

**The Chair:** Absolutely.

Mr. Shipley, you need your headphones.

Mr. Julian, please continue.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm pleased to see you, Mr. Shipley.

My amendment deals with subclause 30(3) of Bill C-21. It reads as follows:

Authorizations to carry referred to in paragraph 20(a) are not valid outside the geographic area set in the authorization by Commissioner. Authorizations to carry referred to in paragraph 20(b) are not valid outside the province in which they are issued.

That creates two different ways of dealing with authorizations to carry, for paragraphs 20(a) and 20(b).

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Julian, do you have that in hard copy, so we can distribute it to the committee?

Is it already distributed? Okay.

Madam Michaud.

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you for moving this amendment, Mr. Julian.

Ms. Mainville-Dale, you have answered my question, but I just want to make sure I have understood correctly.

This means that the provincial commissioner has the power to decide the outcome for the individual.

Is that correct?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Yes, that's correct.

When an individual needs an authorization to carry to protect their life, and let us agree that these are a few rare special cases, the commissioner will be able to establish a geographic range that is suited to their needs.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Perfect.

So it falls within the commissioner's prerogative.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Yes, that's right.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** That's great.

In the written version of Mr. Julian's amendment, there is an "à" missing in the last sentence, after "*prévues*" and before "*l'alinéa*".

Thank you.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Can we consider that corrected?

There's an accent missing in Mr. Julian's French version.

Madam Michaud, could you say that again, please?

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** In the last sentence of the French version, there is an "à" missing between the word "*prévues*" and "*l'alinéa*" in the segment that reads "*l'autorisation de port prévues l'alinéa*."

We could correct that before voting on the amendment.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Julian, is that how you moved this?

[Translation]

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Yes, Mr. Chair.

[English]

**The Chair:** We have more.

Carry on, Mr. Clerk.

**Mr. Philippe Méla:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[Translation]

There are other corrections that need to be made to the French version of Mr. Julian's amendment.

In the segment that reads "*L'autorisation de port prévues*," there should not be an "s" on the word "*prévues*". In the word "*établit*," the "t" should be replaced by an "e". And again, in the segment that reads "*L'autorisation de port prévues*," there should not be an "s" on the word "*prévues*."

• (1740)

[English]

**The Chair:** Can we consider that those changes have been made and have been unanimously adopted?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

The debate on Mr. Julian's amendment continues.

Is there any further discussion on Mr. Julian's motion?

Mr. Calkins.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** I just have a question for the officials on how this is interpreted. I believe I'm working from a current copy of the proposed amendment by Mr. Julian. The correction that was just made, because I just got this now, was in the French language version, so there have been no changes in the English language version that would have been sent. Is that correct?

**The Chair:** I believe that's correct.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** It's changing now to read,

Authorizations to carry referred to in subsection 20(a) are not valid outside the geographic area set in the authorization by Commissioner.

Can you explain this to me, because I thought in the discussion that we had about these authorizations to carry that the authorization was granted by the chief firearms officer, not the commissioner.

Why are referring to the commissioner here, instead of the chief firearms officer? I'm just looking for some clarification.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** There's an amendment in the bill to centralize the authorizations to carry for personal protection, to centralize those with the commissioner. That was a clause, I believe, that was passed last evening.

Therefore, that one is to give discretion to the commissioner to set the geographic area according to the needs of that individual person. For people who will have an authorization to carry for reasons of their employment, the current process would exist where the chief firearms officer would be the one who would issue the authorization to carry.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** I'm sorry. Could you just repeat that last bit, please?



**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** For people who have an authorization to carry for reasons of their employment, the current process would continue. That would be the CFO, the chief firearms officer of the province, who would issue it, and if they need to cross provinces, there's an agreement between the CFOs.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** Thank you.

In the second part of the amendment, it says:

the geographic area set in the authorization by Commissioner.

The amendment that I was going to move, had I not been bumped by Mr. Julian, would have been to add “province or territory”, because not everybody lives in a province. In one part of the amendment here, we're talking about “the geographic area set in the authorization by Commissioner”, and then in the second part of the amendment, it says:

Authorizations to carry referred to in subsection 20(b) are not valid outside the province in which they are issued.

Not everybody lives in a province.

Even though the chief firearms officers have certain authorities that the commissioner doesn't have, the Northwest Territories is no longer part of the joint Alberta area. Do we need to have an amendment in order to make this valid and legitimate, one where we say the “province or territory” in which you reside?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I would refer and rely on the Interpretation Act, in which “province” includes the territories.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** We don't need to have that amendment made for clarification.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** No.

**The Chair:** Are there any further discussions on Mr. Julian's amendment.

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Mr. Calkins, did you have another amendment to make?

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** No. My questions have been answered.

**The Chair:** We'll go back to Ms. Damoff.

Are we ready with Ms. Damoff's amendment?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** We are, but do you want to carry clause 30, and then we'll go to mine?

**The Chair:** That's a very good idea.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** We're doing a recorded vote.

(Clause 30 as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(On clause 15)

● (1745)

**The Chair:** We have Ms. Damoff's amendment, and then we'll get back to Mr. Ruff.

Ms. Damoff, your amendment is on your previous amendment to NDP-1. Are you ready to proceed?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I am.

**The Chair:** Has that been distributed to the committee?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Okay. Carry on, please.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** It would amend the first paragraph that we adopted yesterday. It will clean it up. It will allow officials to make regulations, but it will also expand who is issuing a protection order.

For the new one, I'll just read the first paragraph, Chair, if that's okay. Everyone has it. It would be that “protection order has the meaning assigned by the regulations (*ordonnance de protection*); but is intended to include any binding order made by a court or other authorizing entities in the interest of the safety or security of a person; this includes but is not limited to orders that prohibit a person from”.

I'm sorry. I think I might have an old one. Do I? I do.

Could you correct the words? I'm sorry. I took the one that the clerk sent me, but I believe that's not the most recent one.

It's “by a court or other competent authority in the interest of the safety or security of a person”.

I hope colleagues will support that. We've already passed the clause. This is just cleaning it up and making it more effective.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. You're amending your previous amendment, the text of the previous amendment. Is that what you're doing?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** It's the text of what we passed in NDP-1, yes.

**The Chair:** Okay. All right.

Mr. Clerk, are you clear on this amendment?

**Mr. Philippe Méla:** Did you remove the term “court”?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** No, it says, “by a court or other competent authority”.

**Mr. Philippe Méla:** I don't have that.

**Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC):** Thanks, Mr. Chair, just—

**The Chair:** Just hang on a minute.

I'm hoping we get back to—

**Mr. John Barlow:** This is on Ms. Damoff's subamendment.

**The Chair:** Okay. Carry on. We'll get this sorted out in the interim.

**Mr. John Barlow:** In the email that's been sent I have two different versions here, and nothing that I can see shows the changes. I know this was approved, but nothing shows the changes. Gauging from my colleagues, I'm having a bit of a difficult time.

I know that for us I want to thank our colleagues who are permanent members of this committee to allow us.... This is very important to our constituents. I appreciate the time they have given us to be a part of this. I apologize if I'm going back a little bit. Again, this is pretty critical to my constituents and I know for many of us, so I want to make sure that I'm following this properly.

In the email that I've been given, I have two different versions of new amendments, but nothing really highlights what the changes are.

Ms. Damoff, of the two you've sent us, can you tell us which one we're dealing with specifically on the change?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Sure.

Do you have NDP-1 in front of you, John?

**Mr. John Barlow:** I do.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** If you look at NDP-1 and the paragraph that begins with "protection order", delete that whole paragraph.

Replace that paragraph with, "protection order has the meaning assigned by regulations (*ordonnance de protection*); but is intended to include any binding order made by a court or other competent authority in the interest of the safety or security of a person; this includes but is not limited to orders that prohibit a person from".

Then the remainder of NDP-1 does not change.

• (1750)

**The Chair:** Are you next, Mr. Calkins?

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** Sure. I'll ask some questions on this.

Thank you for the clarification on what exactly the change is.

Could the officials tell us this? With the proposed change that's happening right now, everybody understands what a court is. What would be on the list, other than a court, of the other competent authorities?

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** Thank you for the question.

Unfortunately, I can't provide a comprehensive list, but I can indicate that there are various forms of provincial legislation that include protection orders of various sorts. Those can include conditions that one not possess a firearm or any of, let's say, the conditions that are listed here. Those particular provincial statutes will set out who the issuing body is, so—

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** Could you give me an example of something other than a court that could do this?

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** I can give you that. It's a pretty obscure example, but it's from New Brunswick. It's called the Intimate Partner Violence Intervention Act. It's referred to as an emergency protection order. The issuing body is a member of the provincial civil service. It's an administrative decision-maker.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** Are there any examples where this competent authority could be in place without a statute, either federally or provincially?

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** That's difficult to answer. In terms of the words competent authority, I can indicate that those terms are used several times throughout the Criminal Code in reference to bodies that issue orders that are not specifically courts. Those are common terms. They're terms that have been used—

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** I'm not worried if it's a court or not. I'm just worried that.... I don't know the answer to the question I'm asking.

Would anyone who is deemed a competent authority be a competent authority under a provincial or federal statute? How could a

competent authority exist without a statute? Is it possible? Does it exist in common law? Does it exist in religious types of laws, or does a competent authority actually have to be in a statute?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I would point to the first sentence where we say that it has the meaning assigned in the regulations. That would give the government time to develop and propose the regulations, consult and define exactly the types of competent authorities and types of orders.

That second clause would sort of signify the intent of the legislature to say what kinds of orders and protection orders are captured by the regulations. The intent, when this was proposed, was not to capture every single type of protection order, but those that were for the protection of victims of intimate partner violence and gender-based violence. By relying on that, and defining it in the regulations, the fact is that it's going to have the meaning set in the regulations.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** Yes, but a regulation can't exist without a statute.

I guess the answer to my question is that there shouldn't be a competent authority anywhere that doesn't have the authority by regulation, be it a statute or be it the statute itself.

Without getting into detail, there are other types of ways we deal with justice, and other types of issues in Canada. I'm wondering if those would not be considered competent authorities. It would have to be by statute. I'm getting the sense that, yes, it would have to be by statute and, thereby, regulation.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Again, that's outside of my personal scope of expertise, but I would rely on the fact that, if the government were to develop regulations, those questions would be answered and the meaning of competent authority would be sorted out.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Calkins.

[Translation]

Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In the French version of clause 15 of the bill, it reads "*ou une autre autorité compétente*." I wonder whether we shouldn't write "*ou toute autre autorité compétente*."

Would that change something in terms of interpretation?

• (1755)

**Ms. Phaedra Glushek (Counsel, Criminal Law Policy Section, Department of Justice):** Are you asking me whether we can add "*ou toute*?"

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Instead of writing "*ou une autre autorité compétente*," should we write "*ou toute autre autorité compétente*?"

**Ms. Phaedra Glushek:** Yes, we could do that. If it is explained in the regulations, it is correct to write "*toute autre autorité compétente*."

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** If I understand correctly, that does not really change anything.

At the very end of the subsection, it reads "*à une personne de*," but I think the "*de*" is too much, since all the paragraphs start with "*de*" in the French version.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Did you wish to make an amendment? You're good. Okay.

Is there any other discussion on this amendment?

Seeing none, the clerk would like to read it back for the committee before we vote on it. Please go ahead, sir.

**Mr. Philippe Méla:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just made a few changes that Ms. Damoff is aware of. The amendment would read, in English:

protection order has the meaning assigned by the regulations

—I removed the semicolon and “*ordonnance de protection*” because it's already at the end—

but is intended to include any binding order made by the courts or other competent authority in the interest of the safety or security of a person;

The rest stays the same. I changed the “of” for “or”, because it was misspelled there, and then I just removed the reference to *ordonnance de protection*, because it's already at the end in the reference to the French version.

I did the same in French. It would read as follows:

[*Translation*]

Concerning "*ordonnance de protection*:"

*S'entend au sens des règlements*

I removed the words "*ordonnance de protection*."

*mais vise à inclure toute ordonnance contraignante rendue par un tribunal ou une autre autorité compétente dans l'intérêt de la sécurité d'une personne; cela inclut, sans s'y limiter, les ordonnances qui interdisent à une personne:*

I have removed the preposition "*de*."

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you. I think we can take that as the definitive version.

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, we'll call the vote.

(Subamendment agreed to)

**The Chair:** Okay. That wraps up NDP-1 and its amendments.

Let us redo the vote on NDP-1 as amended by Ms. Damoff.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** I'd like a recorded vote.

**The Chair:** Absolutely.

(Amendment as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 15 as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I'll give the floor now to Mr. Ruff, who I believe will be asking for unanimous consent to take a look at his amendment, which pertains to clause 18, I believe.

Mr. Ruff.

● (1800)

**Mr. Alex Ruff:** Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Before I do that, though, I maybe I should have done this as a point of order. I just think, in recognition of the tragedy that happened this morning, and especially considering this committee, we should just take a moment to recognize Sergeant Eric Mueller and his family and the whole law enforcement community for what they do on a daily basis to keep our communities safe. My personal thanks to Mr. Chiang for his many years of service as a law enforcement officer.

It's terrible news when somebody makes the supreme sacrifice for their country and their community, so I would ask the indulgence of the committee just to take a quick moment of silence, Chair.

**The Chair:** Absolutely. Is that the will of the committee?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*A moment of silence observed*]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Ruff, for bringing that forward.

**Mr. Alex Ruff:** Thank you, Chair.

I'd like to seek the committee's unanimous consent for me to go back and move an amendment tied to clause 18, which we discussed at length last night. I think we were in agreement that it wasn't in the appropriate spot.

**The Chair:** Do we have the unanimous consent of the committee?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(On clause 18)

**Mr. Alex Ruff:** Thanks so much, Chair, and thanks so much to the committee members.

Everybody should have a hard copy. Basically the change now is going to happen in subclause 18(0.1).

I move that Bill C-21 in Clause 18, be amended by replacing line 1 on page 17 with the following:

Paragraph 19(1)(b) of the Act is amended by adding the following after subparagraph (iii):

(iii.1) wishes to transport the firearm to another individual or business who holds a licence authorizing that individual or business to possess prohibited firearms or restricted firearms for purposes of storage for the time necessary for the individual to address a mental illness or similar problem, or

Then it says at the bottom of that:

(1) Subsection 19(2.1) of the Act is replaced by

As I discussed last night with those committee members who were here, the purpose of this is to provide that clarity to the firearms community, so that they understand that if they're dealing with a mental health challenge, especially for veterans dealing with PTSD and others, they have an ability to have their firearm temporarily stored with another appropriately licensed individual. It's important they know that this is an option that's available to them and that it's quite clear to them. Then they can seek the help they need and not turn away from it.

As well, it provides initial clarity to our chief firearms officers across the country to know that this is an avenue, and from my discussions with the officials, especially within the firearms program, it would likely help them from a prioritization standpoint to address these types of requests when they come in.

I'll leave my comments at that for now, Chair.

• (1805)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Ruff.

Now we go to Ms. Damoff, followed by Mr. Julian and then Madam Michaud.

Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you, Chair.

I have to say, it's a pleasure having you here at the committee, Mr. Ruff, and I want to thank you for bringing this forward.

I do have some questions for officials. I wonder if they could clarify for me, from a practical perspective, how this will work and how that person gets their firearm back because there's no requirement for... If they have a mental illness, I'm assuming that the individual would determine on their own when they're competent to retrieve their firearm, but could you just go through the process of how this would work?

**Mr. Rob Mackinnon (Director, Canadian Firearms Program, Royal Canadian Mounted Police):** The individual would apply to the chief firearms officer for the authorization to transport for the purposes of temporary storage, as Mr. Ruff denoted, and the CFO would provide the time period that this firearm would not be in the possession of the individual who was originally in possession of it.

The CFO would determine when the firearm would need to be removed from the temporary storage through the issuance of another ATT to move it from temporary storage back to the individual who had the firearm registered—the handgun registered. At that point, the CFO would make a determination regarding that individual around whether they still have the eligibility to hold that type of firearm.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** The amendment says that it would be stored for the time necessary for the individual to address a mental illness or similar problem.

The individual's not disclosing that to the chief firearms officer. Is that correct? They're just saying that they want to store the firearm, and then.... I guess the worry I've always had with this—and it's not that I'm not going to support it—is that you have someone making a self-determinations on when they should have a firearm in their possession. One of the things we talked about at

length is the risk for someone who has depression or PTSD. The whole reason Mr. Ruff has brought this forward is so that they will seek help.

My concern around this is that you're self-determining when you have a mental illness and when you are healthy enough to get that firearm back. Am I correct in interpreting that?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette (Director General, Canadian Firearms Program, Royal Canadian Mounted Police):** My understanding of this amendment is that they would self-declare, so that would trigger an eligibility process for sure. A CFO would review the situation when the individual requested the firearm back.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** In this amendment they don't have to self-declare. Is that right, or they do?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** Yes, we would actually add it to one of the forms.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Okay.

On the form you were talking about yesterday where it's not listed, it would now be one of the options they would choose, so they would tick that off. The chief firearms officer would be looking for some kind of competence to return that firearm to the person and take it out of storage.

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** Of course, we haven't operationalized it yet, but I'm envisioning that is probably what would happen, because it would be part of that form. It would trigger that eligibility process and a review. The CFO could request that the individual seek a medical form to obtain the ATT to bring it back—the authorization to transport it back to their residence. It's a little different from the ones right now, because it's usually a set time. I'm assuming, given that they check off that it's for an illness, the end date would not be determined up front.

• (1810)

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Damoff.

We go to Mr. Julian, followed by Madam Michaud. Mr. Noormohamed will have maybe 25 seconds left at the end.

Mr. Julian, go ahead.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Damoff asked a number of my questions.

It is possible, following this, that there could be a requirement to have a note from a medical doctor. That's something that would be contemplated.

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** Currently, through a CFO, they do eligibility processes all the time, and I think given the circumstances of this it would trigger an eligibility review. Depending on the circumstances, they would most certainly, I would think in most cases, request or seek some input from their physician.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** “They” being the authority...?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** Yes.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Okay.

That would be something that would be part of the regs later on or part of the application process.

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** It's part of our eligibility process now. It's a continuous eligibility process. If something comes up throughout a licence-holder's five years, it always triggers an eligibility process. A chief firearms officer will evaluate the information that's coming in. Sometimes it could be an interview with the person, or it could be going back to the individual and asking the physician to answer some questions. It could be a number of things.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Thanks for answering those questions. I'll be supporting this amendment.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Julian.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Several of my questions have already been answered.

A lot has been said about self-declaring. When I spoke with Mr. Ruff behind the scenes, he told me that some people are reluctant to get help because they are afraid of being reported. If they talk to a physician or a psychologist about a personal problem, that person might alert the authorities, who might remove the firearms.

Can it also be understood that way?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** In fact, if the individual has self-declared and surrendered their firearms, they can tell their attending physician. If the physician then checks with the authorities, they will be able to see that the firearms have been proactively surrendered.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you.

I would also like to know what is understood by "similar problem." We are talking about mental illness here. I imagine that this means a post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, or this kind of thing.

Is it too vague or is it obvious from the way it is worded?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I think we are talking here about someone whose underlying reason for self-declaring is perhaps not common. We are talking about mental health, but there may be other situations where self-declaring might be justified. It might be someone who themselves declares proactively that they should not have firearms at home, for their safety and the safety of their family and friends, and decides to remove them temporarily.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you.

I also want to thank Mr. Ruff for making me aware of this issue.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Noormohamed, you have 25 seconds.

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed (Vancouver Granville, Lib.):** I'll speak quickly.

I am really pleased that Mr. Ruff brought this forward. I've talked to him before, and I know he was very keen to make this happen. My only question, really, to officials is whether there are any concerns about an uneven application across the country by the CFOs with respect to the return of prospective firearms. How would we mitigate any risks there?

Other than that, this is a really excellent amendment, and I look forward to supporting it.

• (1815)

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** Consistent application is always a concern, but we would clearly define standard operating procedures for everyone on how we envision it to operate.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Noormohamed.

We have Mr. Ruff, again, for two minutes and 52 seconds.

**Mr. Alex Ruff:** I'll be a lot shorter than that, Chair.

I want to thank everybody for what I anticipate is unanimous support. This is important. I can talk some more off-line, really, about the rationale of why I wanted to do this. This is all about keeping Canada safer and, at the same time, reassuring our firearms community.

In my final comments, I'd like to personally thank the permanent members of my party on this committee for allowing me the opportunity to partake. Firearms and this bill mean a lot to rural Canadians and all Canadians. My point is that they wanted to be here. It has allowed us to be here to speak up for our constituents. It means so much, and it means so much to my constituents.

I don't think there's a single issue, in my three years of being elected, that I've gotten more correspondence or feedback on, so the opportunity to participate in this debate has been greatly appreciated. I wish to personally thank the permanent members of this committee who have allowed me to be here tonight.

Thanks, Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Ruff.

Is there any further discussion on this amendment? I am seeing none.

(Amendment agreed to)

(Clause 18 as amended agreed to)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Ruff, and congratulations.

At long last, we can proceed forward.

Next, we have new clause 30.1. BQ-10 is the next amendment.

Hopefully, we'll get through this, and then we can break for lunch.

Madam Michaud, please go ahead.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It will be relatively simple. For my colleagues who have just joined us, yesterday we unanimously adopted a number of amendments to require a valid licence for acquiring a cartridge magazine as is required for ammunition. There are still a few amendments to coordinate with that objective.

I am therefore proposing that Bill C-21 be amended by adding after line 16 on page 21 the following new clause:

30.1 Subsection 64(1.2) of the Act is replaced by the following:

(1.2) The holder of a licence that is extended under subsection (1.1) must not, until the renewal of their licence, use their firearms or acquire any firearms, ammunition or cartridge magazines.

Everyone should support this amendment, which coordinates with the previous ones.

Thank you.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Is there any discussion?

Mr. Calkins.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** Thank you, Chair.

I find this addition, this amendment, absolutely frustrating and infuriating. As a hunter, I sometimes wait eight to 10 years for the privilege of being able to pursue a hunt in my home province. I would be outraged if, through no fault of my own, the Government of Canada did not renew my possession and acquisition licence on time, and I drove 200 or 300 miles to a hunt that I paid \$5,000, \$10,000, \$15,000 or \$20,000 for, just to find out that my magazine is faulty and I cannot go to the store and purchase a replacement one because of a clause like this.

The governing body that determines when an applicant gets their licence renewed is the one that bears the responsibility. The reason the extension of six months was added on was that governments typically can't meet the obligation of getting a firearms licence renewal processed in a timely fashion, even according to what the firearms centre says it does on its website.

I deal with this in my office constantly. The number of people in this country who follow the guidelines on the website, do a renewal, and do not get their licences returned in time, who are now going to be.... It's punitive, absolutely punitive, to somebody who acts in good faith, not only in the acquisition of their licence but in the acquisition of their hunting permit and the purchase of a hunt.

I'm asking the officials. If this clause becomes law, what we are saying, in essence, is that unless your.... You have to wait. It doesn't matter; the hunt will not wait for you. The season in the province or territory in which you are hunting will not wait for you. You might even only have a season of a week. As a matter of fact, in January of this year, I had a three-day elk hunt that I waited 10 years for. Ten years I waited for that opportunity, and if I would have lost the magazine for my Savage rifle, if this clause had been law and I had been by myself. Because my PAL was in the six-month grace period, I would not have been allowed to go to the store and get a replacement magazine.

Is that correct?

• (1820)

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** In the circumstances you have just described, yes. You wouldn't be able to purchase a magazine. I would just like to point out that you wouldn't be able to use the firearm either, and that is already in the Firearms Act.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** This is the point.

I understand the notion, and I understand that she is making it consistent. But I want to make it clear to every hunter who is being told right now by members of other political parties that these laws are not going after you as a hunter, make it explicitly clear to you, as a hunter, that you will potentially be denied your hunt because you cannot use your gun, you cannot buy replacement ammunition and you cannot buy a replacement cartridge or any part of a firearm, even though through no fault of the hunter—

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Calkins said “will” and he said “potentially”. Could he, in his statement, just clarify what he means? Is it that it “will” or that it “potentially will”—because there is a difference there.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I think that is debate, but if Mr. Calkins wants to clarify....

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** I just want to put it on the record, and I am being crystal clear. If I am not allowed, because I have applied for a renewal of my PAL and it doesn't get processed in a timely fashion, I will be denied a hunting season, even if I have paid upwards of thousands of dollars for a hunt, which I cannot get refunded.

I think it is incumbent on the MPs who are here at this table to understand the consequences of not only this decision, but the decisions that have already been made earlier on. By denying somebody who, through no fault of their own is now going to be denied, perhaps, a once in a lifetime opportunity.... In some parts of this country, people wait their entire lives to get an opportunity for one specific hunt. As a matter of fact, in B.C., in terms of your opportunity to get a Roosevelt elk draw, you may never get one in your entire lifetime, and if you were to get one.... This particular clause is punitive, absolutely punitive, to the hunting community.

I'll cede my time, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** We'll go now to Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you, Chair.

Could the officials just clarify this? We made an amendment last night to add the requirement to have a licence for a magazine. This is just updating a coordinating amendment to ensure that it's in compliance with the decision we made last night. Is that correct?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Yes.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I just want to remind the Conservative members, and in particular Mr. Calkins, that the vote in requiring a licence for a magazine was passed unanimously last night, including by Conservative members.

I would like Mr. Calkins to go and look Reese Fallon's family in the face and tell them that the elk hunt is more important than her life, because the shooter on the Danforth did not require a licence to go and buy a magazine before he went and tried to slaughter people on the Danforth.

I'm sorry that Mr. Calkins doesn't like this amendment, but Conservatives voted—

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** Was that person a PAL holder waiting for a renewal of their licence?

**The Chair:** No cross-talk, please.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I have the floor, Mr. Calkins.

You're complaining about not being able to do something and waiting for 10 years. Reese Fallon will never be able to get married. She'll never be able to have children, and you're complaining about not killing an elk.

I'm sorry, Mr. Calkins, but I find that so offensive.

I was very proud of members last night on this committee that we unanimously passed the amendment that Ms. Michaud brought forward to require a licence for magazines. All this is doing is changing something that's already in the law, to add magazines to it, and I would hope that members would support that.

• (1825)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would point out that the Conservative members who were present last night voted unanimously for the first amendment regarding cartridge magazines and the subsequent amendments.

There is no need to scare hunters. As Mr. Giammaria said, they would not be able to go hunting or use their firearms in any event. It is not our fault if the government is slow to renew licences or if the person applies or does things at the last minute.

I find it a little offensive that Mr. Calkins is not even listening to the answers that are given to his questions. I invite him to vote in favour of this amendment. It is a coordinating amendment. There is nothing more to be said.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** We have Mr. Steinley, followed by Mr. Julian.

**Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC):** We'll turn down the political rhetoric a little bit here.

I just have a couple of anecdotes from over the last couple of years.

I wasn't here last night, obviously, so my question would be if the grace period has been shortened up for...?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** No.

**Mr. Warren Steinley:** How long is that grace period still?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** It's still six months.

**Mr. Warren Steinley:** I have a couple of anecdotes from the last couple of years.

It happened to my neighbour, who is a very avid hunter and very law-abiding. He's had his guns and magazines and shells in his gun safe for the last three years, because throughout COVID-19 he had not been able to get the renewal of his RPAL or his PAL, through no fault of his own. Actually, at one point in time they said, because people weren't getting their mail through Canada Post.... He has had to send his application in twice now, and obviously that grace period was gone so he missed two years of hunting, through no fault of his own. Sometimes there are extenuating circumstances where law-abiding—

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, Mr. Steinley, but your time is up.

Are there any further comments?

Mr. Julian, go ahead.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** I'm a little confused by the Conservatives on this. They voted for similar amendments yesterday, so I'm confused that, while they understood the sense of the amendments yesterday, today those same amendments provoke a completely different reaction.

I've been somewhat dismayed by the intent of some Conservative members in the House to try to present the bill as still having the amendments that we forced the withdrawal of months ago. Conservatives tried to take credit for it, but now they seem to be, at least in the House, indicating that the amendments are still there. I think that misinformation is not helpful at all.

In this sense, I don't understand why they would vote for similar amendments yesterday and now say today that these are problems. It doesn't seem to be consistent at all.

I do recognize that this government is slow in a whole range of areas, including on renewal of licences. That is true, and we've seen it in a number of different areas. I had similar concerns with the Harper government that was so slow in a whole range of other areas. That is an administrative issue that I think does need to be followed up on, but it's different from considering the bill and considering the amendments that are before us now.

• (1830)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Julian.

We'll go now to Mr. Noormohamed.

You have three minutes and 19 seconds this time.

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I won't need all that time.

Like Mr. Julian, I'm a bit perplexed. We sat through a unanimous vote on effectively the very same amendment yesterday. I would love to understand why, all of a sudden, there seems to be opposition to voting for something that everyone on this committee unanimously approved yesterday. This seems to be a fairly straightforward process. I would love to actually understand, sincerely. This is not a question asked out of malice. I would love to understand this from my Conservative friends.

Why were they so willing to unanimously support something yesterday, but today are prepared to speak with such force and energy against the very same thing?

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Noormohamed.

Is there any further discussion on this amendment?

Seeing no further discussion, I would call the vote.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Could we get a recorded vote on this?

**The Chair:** Absolutely.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

**The Chair:** Congratulations. That is new clause 30.1

I suggest we break at this point for dinner.

Before we do so, I note that we stood clause 26 yesterday. I believe it was because of translation concerns. I'm not quite sure why. I'm going to ask, during the break, if we can figure out whether we can go ahead with that at this point?

Let's take a break for 15 minutes for dinner.

• (1830) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1855)

**The Chair:** I call this meeting back to order.

Last night, we stood clause 26, because Madam Michaud needed some....

Mr. Shipley, do you have a point of order?

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you, Chair.

I just got here, so I'm not trying to jump in. I made an intervention earlier tonight, and I wanted to apologize to my colleagues, the officials, but especially to the interpreters, because I know they have a very tough job. I didn't wear my headset. It was kind of a rush. I had a couple of people who texted me quickly and called me that Mr. Noormohamed was concerned about my whereabouts. I didn't take the time to put on my headset, so I apologize for that, but I'm here now.

I would have apologized to him, but he's not here in person. That's unfortunate, but I wanted to especially apologize to the interpreters.

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** I'm here.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Madam Michaud, if you're ready, we can go back to clause 26 and clear that up.

(On clause 26)

**The Chair:** We will start with BQ-8.1.

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I first want to thank my colleagues for standing this clause yesterday. We had had some discussions behind the scenes and we

were not sure whether the amendment was admissible, properly speaking.

I am going to explain the intent behind this amendment. We had this discussion several times when the officials appeared at the committee and we discussed what happened when a firearm enters the Canadian market. Is it checked by the RCMP first? Is it checked once the RCMP realizes the firearm is already on the market and has to be classified differently? Ms. Paquette told me this was in fact the case for non-restricted firearms when they entered the market.

There isn't really a process that requires them to go through the RCMP first. We decided that in order to avoid the definition we adopted a little earlier being circumvented with new firearms, a process for pre-authorization by the RCMP would be useful. It would be an additional safeguard before firearms enter the market.

Our intent and the discussions we have had with legislative counsel led us to word the amendment this way. I know it does not entirely cover the initial intent. That is why I want to get the officials' opinion about it.

I am going to read the amendment. We propose that Bill C-21, in Clause 26, be amended by adding after line 26 on page 19 the following:

A person may transfer or import a firearm only if it bears a Royal Canadian Mounted Police identification number.

I would like the officials to tell us how they interpret this amendment, what effects it would have, and whether it really expresses the intent I had at the outset.

Thank you.

• (1900)

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Thank you for the question.

It needs to specify what identification number it is referring to. The amendment doesn't define what a Royal Canadian Mounted Police identification number is.

If I understand correctly, it means the identification number for the make and model corresponding to the one in the Firearms Reference Table.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** If we adopted the amendment in its present form, would that create a problem for enforcing the law?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** What identification number it means could not be clearly determined, so it would lack clarity.

I would also like to point out that the government announced last week that it intends to make regulatory amendments to require that there be a Firearms Reference Table reference number.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you.



We also tried to see whether it was possible to amend another clause in the bill by way of this amendment. However, the effect would be to amend the coordinating amendments concerning cartridge magazines, that I am going to propose later. Because there was excellent unanimity yesterday about adopting the provision about cartridge magazines, I didn't want to risk these amendments being negated if I included that intent.

I don't know whether I need unanimous consent, Mr. Chair, but I would like to withdraw this amendment, while pointing out that the Minister has actually committed to making regulations under the Firearms Act to ensure that the firearms are classified correctly before they enter the Canadian market, by requiring a valid Firearms Reference Table number. That would ensure that the firearms are classified correctly and that the government is aware that there are new makes and new models of firearms before they enter the Canadian market.

To do that, my intent was really to use the legislative route. However, I understand that it might be easier to do it by the regulatory route. So I really am counting on the Minister to fulfil this promise.

If it is agreeable, I am going to withdraw this amendment, Mr. Chair.

[English]

**The Chair:** Madam Michaud, I don't think you moved it, so I think you could withdraw it.

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Then I withdraw it.

Thank you.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Julian would like to speak.

[Translation]

**Mr. Peter Julian:** I wanted to say the same thing. The Minister does have to commit to eliminating these loopholes. I think everyone agrees that they should not exist in a normal system...

[English]

**The Chair:** The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. Shipley, go ahead on a point of order.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you, sir.

There was just, I think, an issue in the translation. When Ms. Michaud was talking, the translation came through that we had unanimous consent on "chargers" yesterday. I'm not sure exactly what that means, so can we get some clarification if there was an error?

• (1905)

[Translation]

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** The French term is "*chargeur*."

[English]

In English, it's a cartridge magazine.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you.

It was coming through as a charger, not a cartridge. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Julian, go ahead on the same point of order.

[Translation]

**Mr. Peter Julian:** I just want to point out that the Minister has assured us that it would be done by regulation. That is extremely important. I think the committee's message on this is very clear.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you. We can't commit the minister in such a way, but we can certainly carry the message back. I'm sure Ms. Damoff will—

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Can I respond to that?

**The Chair:** Sure. Go ahead on a point of order.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Just very briefly, Chair, Madam Michaud very kindly read what was said, and I certainly will give a commitment. I can't speak on behalf of the minister, but I will certainly speak on behalf of our side of the table and reiterate what the minister said.

Absolutely, we will be doing regulations on the exact issue that Madam Michaud has put forward. It's in the record, and it is absolutely something we're committed to doing.

**The Chair:** Okay. This is a fairly loose process here. It'll get tighter later.

[Translation]

We will now move on to amendment BQ-9.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Unsurprisingly, amendment BQ-9 is a coordinating amendment concerning cartridge magazines.

I won't repeat what I said before, although I would sort of like to do it anyway. I was surprised that a Conservative member was offended just now about a coordinating amendment concerning cartridge magazines, when the Conservatives voted for all the amendments concerning cartridge magazines and the coordinating amendments yesterday. I hope that this time my colleagues will be consistent with their vote yesterday.

This amendment amends clause 26 so that the act will state consistently that a valid licence is needed for acquiring cartridge magazines, just as is the case for acquiring ammunition and possessing firearms.

I hope my colleagues will vote in favour of the amendment.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Michaud.

[English]

Is there any discussion on BQ-9? I am seeing none.

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** That takes us to amendment G-43 now in the name of Mr. Noormohamed.

Mr. Noormohamed, would you like to carry on? You're on mute. Try unplugging your headset and plugging it back in. It's IT-101: reboot, unplug it and plug it back in.

Mr. Noormohamed, if you don't mind, I'll get Ms. Damoff to move it for you.

Go ahead.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thanks, Chair. Let me just check my handy list.

Indeed it is another “firearm part” coordinating amendment to continue the good work that we were doing last night to make sure that all parts of what we're doing in Bill C-21 are complying with other acts. This is to do with ghost guns, and let's vote yes.

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion on this amendment?

Mr. Shipley, go ahead.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you.

We have talked about ghost guns a lot, and I'm just getting back up to speed tonight, Ms. Damoff.

Maybe the officials could tell me what this amendment would do in real life. How would this assist, going forward?

• (1910)

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Thank you very much for the question.

This motion would impose a requirement on individuals to have a valid firearms licence to import a firearm part. It specifies that an individual must, at the time of importation, have a valid firearms licence. It must be presented to a customs officer in order to import the firearm part, and the licence must be shown to a customs officer.

It would create a limited exemption to proposed subsection 38(1) for non-residents of at least 18 years of age if they declare the firearm part to a customs officer in the prescribed manner—and that's through a form and information—and a confirmed declaration would have the same effect as a valid licence for the purpose of importing a firearm part.

I will remind you that “firearm part” was defined in an earlier motion as a barrel or a handgun slide.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Therefore, this amendment only pertains to bringing it across the border then. Is that correct?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Yes.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Would you be able to give me an example of how this amendment would function in real life?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Sure. For example, somebody is going to the United States, and when they are there they go and buy a handgun barrel as a part. For example, they have maybe a specialized firearm, and they need a barrel. As they come across the border they would declare, “I am bringing in a handgun barrel”, in the same way that if you bring firearms into Canada you must declare them upon entry into Canada. You would show that you have a valid PAL, your licence. The customs officer would note it, and you would enter.

**The Chair:** Are you finished?

Mr. Perkins, go ahead.

**Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC):** Going further on Mr. Shipley's question, is it only when you physically go across the border? What if you're ordering online or by mail? Could you describe how that works?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** The same would apply if you apply by mail. When you go to pick it up, anything that you require a permit for.... Let's say you were ordering a firearm online. When you were to go and pick it up, you would have to show your firearms licence. You would have to confirm that you have a valid firearms licence in order to pick up your firearm. It's in the same way.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Are the courier companies where you would pick this up trained to ask that? Do you do any spot audits of compliance? I was in the retail business for many years. We'd do what's called mystery shopping against standards. Do you do that in this case in order to ensure compliance?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** This would be up to our colleagues at the Canada Border Services Agency to apply, and they would apply the same process as they do for the importation of firearms in terms of verifying that people have a valid licence. It would extend to firearms parts that are defined as barrels and handgun slides.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** You haven't seen any reports in the past to show the effectiveness of this type of thing, or that they are or aren't complying when they come in now.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I can't comment on the questions of compliance or non-compliance with the CBSA. I can tell you how it would be applied generally, and it would be the same process as for firearms.

**The Chair:** Mr. Tochor, you have one minute.

**Mr. Corey Tochor (Saskatoon—University, CPC):** Thank you very much.

Thank you to our fellow members here. I've been watching online, and this is my first availability to make it down to the committee.

This amendment talks about the border, and that's seemingly a big focus of trying to stop illegal firearms and parts. Would this stop any illegal activity at the border?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** With regard to the trafficking of firearms and measures that are included in the bill, I will refer to materials that are available online with regard to measures that are going to strengthen with regard to trafficking.

However, this specific motion has to do with addressing certain firearm parts that go into the manufacturing of illegal firearms or ghost guns—these are the parts that people don't necessarily make with a 3-D printer; they will go and buy these parts—and trying to prevent their entry into Canada.

• (1915)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Tochor.

Is there any further discussion on this amendment? Seeing none, I will call the vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 26 as amended agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

(On clause 31)

**The Chair:** We are now back to clause 31. We have clause 31, clause 32 and clause 33. We don't have amendments for any these, I believe.

Is it the will of the committee to adopt all three clauses at one time? No. Okay.

Shall clause 31 carry?

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Are we going to have a chance to talk about this one?

**The Chair:** Yes, if you need to talk about it. I'm sorry. I was getting in a hurry.

Mr. Shipley, go ahead.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Again, I just have to read some notes here.

We're talking about clause 31. Is that correct?

It's just because we went back and now we're going forward again.

**The Chair:** We're talking about clause 31, yes.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** This is where we're making registration certificates expire when their owners cease to own the firearm when the classification of that firearm is changed by an act of Parliament.

Perhaps the officials could just explain what this clause does in real life.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** This creates a new paragraph, 66(c), a third instance in which a registration certificate of a prohibited or restricted firearm becomes expired when the classification of a restricted or prohibited firearm changes as a result of, for example, an act of Parliament or a regulation that is made under such an act of Parliament.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** You say "expired". Is that the registration that is expired? Is that what you mean?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I mean the registration certificate, yes.

• (1920)

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** How long does the original registration last before it expires?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I will ask my colleagues at the RCMP.

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** It depends, but this change is specifically to do with, if something happens through Parliament that changes the classification of a firearm—for example, makes it a prohibited firearm—then the registration certificate would automatically expire.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Okay.

You mentioned that "if something happens through Parliament". Can you explain what you mean by that and give me an example of that?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** For example, if Parliament changes classifications of firearms that are, for example, restricted and makes them prohibited—if there were a change to the Criminal Code in terms of how it defines prohibited firearms—then when that provision comes into effect, the classification changes and the certificate would automatically expire.

The second instance is when there is a regulation that changes the classification of a firearm. In that case, the registration certificate would also automatically expire.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you.

I think my colleagues have something.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Thank you.

I just spent a modest amount of time on the finance committee talking about ministerial accountability. I'm sure everybody in Canada was watching my discourse and I'm sure every firearm owner watches intently every comma that happens in a parliamentary change.

When Parliament changes the classification of a previously legal firearm, how would a legal firearm owner be notified that they now own a firearm that is no longer lawful? Secondly, what would then happen to that firearm?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** When it's a registered firearm, the registrar will notify the licensee of the change of classification of their firearm.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** By mail...?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** Yes, and by email if we have the email. We do that.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** For the second part of my question, what would happen to the firearm then?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** That depends on what was put in the change of that prohibition. For example, if Parliament or the regulation prohibited the firearm, it depends on whether an amnesty period is given. The firearm owner would then have to comply with whatever conditions had been made either by regulations or by Parliament in the act of Parliament.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Tochor, you have 35 seconds.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** How does this make Canadians safer?

**The Chair:** I believe that's not a question they can answer. Our witnesses are here to give us interpretation of technical—

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** I'll rephrase it.

We have an individual who has unfortunately fallen on hard times and has turned to crime. They're out on the land and they have their firearms. This bill goes through. How does it stop that individual at all, or doesn't it?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Pardon me. Your question is that somebody.... I'm sorry. I missed the first part.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** In a hypothetical situation where an individual has a firearm and it expires but they are already down the path of criminal life, how would this actually stop them from carrying on with their firearm?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** If the firearm was one that was already legally registered—if it was, for example, a restricted firearm—and the Parliament or a regulation under an act of Parliament changed the classification to prohibit it and they were....

I'm sorry. I don't understand.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** It expires, but what do they do?

**The Chair:** Mr. Tochor, I think we have to draw a line there.

**Ms. Phaedra Glushek:** We can add to our colleague's comments, if you like.

**The Chair:** Could you do it quickly?

**Ms. Phaedra Glushek:** If a person is in possession of a firearm and it is prohibited, then the possession and the use of that firearm would be prohibited, unless there was an amnesty or another way that the government would allow the individual to keep it.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** It doesn't keep them safer.

• (1925)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Tochor.

Is there any further discussion on this clause?

Seeing none, I will ask for the vote.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** I'd like a recorded vote.

(Clause 31 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

(On clause 32)

**The Chair:** We go now to clause 32.

Is there any discussion on clause 32?

Go ahead, Mr. Shipley.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's so nice to be back in here again tonight, isn't it? I missed you guys.

On clause 32, just to recap this, this allows the commissioner of firearms to renew an authorization to carry a prohibited firearm and outline exemptions to handguns grandfathered in December 1998.

My first question, because some people may not know this, is this: What is a commissioner of firearms?

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** The commissioner of firearms is a statutory office that's created under the Firearms Act. That term is defined in the act. I'd refer the committee to section 2 of the Firearms Act, where there's a definition of what the commissioner is.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Is there one in each province, or is there a national one?

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** There's one commissioner of firearms, and there are potentially many chief firearms officers of jurisdiction.

**The Chair:** Mr. Shipley has the floor.

Go ahead.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you.

I applaud the keenness of my colleagues tonight. I just had another question, because in Ontario—and I think you caught that at the very end—I'm familiar with the chief firearms officer. In this clause we're talking about the firearms commissioner or the commissioner of firearms.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Madame Michaud, on a point of order, please.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** One of our Conservative colleagues asked the officials exactly the same question a few minutes ago. Asking redundant questions slows the committee's proceedings down. I want the Conservatives to switch out every 15 minutes or so, but we are here and we would like things to move forward.

I am therefore asking my colleagues to keep this in mind.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I quite understand. I think that is a fair point of order.

The Standing Orders certainly do discourage repetitive sorts of things.

We have Mr. Julian on a point of order, and then Mr. Perkins on the same point of order.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Just following on Madame Michaud's comments, the reality is that there has been a tremendous amount of repetition from the Conservatives, who are asking the same questions over and over. Now it's true that people change, but it's up to Conservatives to brief their incoming people to make sure that the work of this committee isn't sabotaged.

We had to start late because Conservatives insisted on having four identical votes in the House that took an hour of House time to delay this committee. I just find it disquieting that, on an issue that is so important, there seem to be so many delaying tactics.

As you'll recall, Mr. Chair, I asked numerous times for us to meet more often as a committee. The Conservatives always refused that permission. They really need to be working hard on behalf of their constituents. That means not being repetitive, coming well briefed and having read the legislation as well. We've had indications that there are Conservatives who haven't even read the bill when they come forward to this committee.

I hope that will stop and that they will work co-operatively with everybody so we have the best possible legislation moving forward.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Julian.

I would point out that, the longer this kind of stuff takes, the longer we're here in the morning.

Mr. Perkins, go ahead on the same point of order.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd say to Mr. Julian, the deputy Liberal House leader, that it is not anti-parliamentary to hold votes in the House of Commons.

• (1930)

**The Chair:** Mr. Perkins, we're not allowed to disparage people, and calling Mr. Julian the deputy Liberal House leader is—

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Well, he did sign the supply—

**The Chair:** Excuse me, the chair has the floor.

I urge you to maintain your discourse in a respectful manner. Carry on.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I'm sorry; I thought that was his official title.

I think, when you go through clause-by-clause, to Madame Michaud's point, members of Parliament have a right to ask questions about particular elements. It's not repetitive when you're asking about different clauses. You may not like the fact that parliamentarians—

**The Chair:** I think we're going into debate now, Mr. Perkins. The point of order is closed.

Mr. Tochor, do you have a new point of order or is it the same point of order?

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Mr. Chair, it's relevant to it.

The officials had to pause and talk among themselves to figure out the proper answer to the question, so it can't be repetitive if the witnesses don't even know. It refers to the act, and their answer was that it refers to the act, but in that clause, there's no reference to the act. We've highlighted—

**The Chair:** I think we have information. I think we're getting into an argument. No more. This point of order is over.

We have a new point of order from Mr. Shipley.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have a couple of quick things. First of all, many times in this committee, Chair, you have mentioned that you don't want us to go back and discuss things in the past, that we need to keep working forward. You've said that to us many times.

My friend down the end here just mentioned votes that took place earlier, and he was allowed to mention things that happened in the past. I believe that Standing Order 18 prohibits reflecting on the decisions of the House.

**The Chair:** That's correct. It's a valid point. I encourage us all to maintain a forward perspective on this. Thank you.

That being the case, we are on clause 32.

I believe Mr. Shipley was speaking to clause 32.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** I hate to do this to Ms. Michaud, but I wasn't here earlier. I agree that there was some delay. I need to know. I want to know what the difference is between the commissioner of firearms and the chief firearms officers for a province. How do they differ? That is where we left off last time.

Officials, could you give me those details?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** If we refer to section 2 of the Firearms Act, a chief firearms officer is defined, and the commissioner means the commissioner of firearms appointed under section 81.1. Currently the commissioner of firearms is the commissioner of the RCMP.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** That's the commissioner of firearms. How are the provincial chief firearms officers appointed? Who appoints them? Are they appointed?

**Mr. Rob Mackinnon:** In accordance with section 2 of the Firearms Act, a chief firearms officer is designated by a provincial minister. If the provincial minister chooses not to designate, the federal minister will designate a chief firearms officer.

**The Chair:** Mr. Tochor, do you have your hand up?

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Yes, I'd like a clarification on the commissioner and the order of appointments.

Does the federal government fund all the offices in the same way, then, each commissioner? How is that funding determined? It's the minister who appoints the provincial one, but who funds it? Is it both, or just the federal?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** There's only one commissioner of firearms, but if you're referring to the chief firearms officers of each province, it depends on whether they're provincially or federally appointed, designated. If they are provincially designated, there are contribution agreements that are drafted and signed off on by the minister of the province and the federal minister. They come to an agreement on funding to administer the Firearms Act.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** “Refers to the December 1998 handgun” is cut off my version. This is when they transferred to restricted firearms and guns.

• (1935)

**Ms. Phaedra Glushek:** That's correct. That was through Bill C-68.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** That was to address rising crime rates with handguns, I believe. This was before I got here.

**Ms. Phaedra Glushek:** It was to create a licensing regime in the Firearms Act and do some transfers of responsibility between the firearms program and the criminal law policy sector.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Was that the creation of the RPAL?

**Ms. Phaedra Glushek:** Bill C-68, I believe, was when the categories changed. There was grandfathering at the time—in subclause 12(6), I believe.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Since 1998, they—

**The Chair:** Mr. Tochor, your time is up.

Ms. Damoff, please.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** No, I didn't have anything further.

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion on clause 32?

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I want to ask one question.

**The Chair:** Your time's up. In that case, we'll call a vote on that. I assume we want a recorded division.

(Clause 32 agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

(On clause 33)

**The Chair:** Is there discussion?

I have Mr. Perkins, followed by Mr. Shipley.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

On the previous clause, it was mentioned that the commissioner of firearms is the commissioner of the RCMP. Is that correct?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Yes.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** In the testimony of the recently retired commissioner of the RCMP before the Mass Casualty Commission in Nova Scotia, when asked about her knowledge as the chief commissioner for firearms, she said she didn't know the difference between prohibited and restricted firearms and that she hated to admit that.

Is the current commissioner—I believe it's an acting commissioner—of the RCMP familiar with the difference between prohibited and restricted?

If you don't know the difference between prohibited and restricted as commissioner of the RCMP, how do you carry out your duties?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Chair, this has nothing to do with clause 33. Officials are not here to talk about the commissioner of the RCMP. We're talking about a bill that's before us.

**The Chair:** I take your point. I believe it's a valid point on relevance. I would urge the member to—

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** The relevance is that this is giving specific powers to the commission—

**The Chair:** Please don't interrupt the chair.

I would urge the member to stick to the thing. I assume you are going to get to it at some early point.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I did. I finished it. The commissioner of the RCMP is given specific, additional powers under this clause. I want to understand if the commissioner, in exercising those powers, is required to know the difference between prohibited and restricted, since the previous one admitted she didn't.

Read the testimony.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Clause 33 proposes a few changes. It proposes to replace the heading to add the words “and Suspension”, as well as require a CFO to refuse a licence to individuals who are not eligible. It allows the CFOs—the chief firearms officers—to refuse an authorization to carry or an authorization to transport for sufficient reason.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Mr. Shipley.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you, Chair. I was waiting for my light there.

This clause states, “for any good and sufficient reason”. Could the officials give some concrete examples of what a “good” or “sufficient” reason is? Can you clarify that, please?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** There are many examples, but the one that comes to mind is if there's a suspicion of...I'm sorry...if something is flagged to the CFO because there might be straw purchasing involved, like multiple purchases of firearms. To allow the time necessary to do an investigation, this is something that would be used to make sure they have the time to stop any further purchases and allow for an investigation to be done.

• (1940)

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you for taking your time on that, because these answers are important. We want to get it right the first time.

You mentioned when “something is flagged”. The word “something” is a little vague. I'm sorry. Can you explain to me what you mean by “something is flagged”?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** Yes. That's okay.

There are various forms of flags that come in. Someone could call. A business could call in this situation. It could be a flag from police. Maybe they got stopped. Maybe there was something in the description of that incident—the flag that they had multiple firearms. It could come in various forms.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you.

The other thing you mentioned in that answer was “multiple purchases”. I wasn't clear on that. Someone can't purchase multiple...at the same time, or over a length of time. When does that start to get flagged, or nullified, if that's the right term?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** I'm just using it as an example. There's not a maximum today.

If I'm going into the business, and I've gone there, I don't know, every week for a month and I'm buying a couple of firearms each time, then that business may flag that. They may call the chief firearms officer and say, this person seems to be coming in a lot and buying more than I've seen, or it could be an association of businesses and they've seen Kellie Paquette go to all these various stores. That kind of information will drive something like this, to trigger an investigation.

**The Chair:** I think I'm going to have to cut you off there, Mr. Shipley.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** I was just going to say thanks, because that was good information.

**The Chair:** Okay, that's good.

Is there any further discussion on clause 33?

(Clause 33 agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

(On clause 34)

**The Chair:** We will start with CPC-19. I would note that if CPC-19 is adopted, NDP-4 cannot be moved, due to a line conflict.

Mr. Julian.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'll be voting against CPC-19. I do agree with the spirit of the motion that the CPC has offered. I think NDP-4 goes in the same direction, so in spirit we're aligned. I just feel—

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, Mr. Julian, but I'm ahead of myself. I didn't give a chance for the motion to be moved.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Absolutely.

**The Chair:** Mr. Shipley or Mr. Perkins. Would somebody like to move this motion?

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** I'll move the motion.

**The Chair:** Do you wish to speak to the motion as you move it?

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** No, but I'd like to read it out, if I could, please.

**The Chair:** Go ahead.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** It's that Bill C-21, in clause 34, be amended by replacing line 30 on page 22 with the following:

have collected or received from a member of the immediate family of the holder of a licence or a person who resides with the holder, or an organization authorized to submit an application on their behalf, a peace officer or a medical professional, that the hold-

That's it.

• (1945)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Is there anything further?

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Yes, just briefly, we would like to narrow the use of “any person” to immediate family and medical professionals in this amendment.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Julian, we'll start you over.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** I'll just say that I agree with the intent of CPC-19. I believe that NDP-4 is better. I'll be voting against CPC-19, not because I have anything against my Conservative colleagues but because I feel that NDP-4 is stronger and more effective in this clause.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Ms. Damoff, please.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I agree with my NDP colleague.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** I think some of my colleagues are proposing to strengthen these tools in other amendments that will follow. Unfortunately, it seems to me that this amendment weakens the measure. I will therefore be voting against it.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

[*English*]

Is there any further discussion on this amendment?

Mr. Shipley.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** I have one quick question. Maybe the officials could tell me what the definition of “any person” would encompass.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I think I would use the ordinary dictionary sense of “any person”.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Seeing no further discussion, I shall call the vote on CPC-19.

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4)

**The Chair:** Thank you. The amendment is defeated.

I will now go to NDP-4.

Mr. Julian, if you please.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

On NDP-4, you'll recall that this is recommended by both Doctors for Protection from Guns and the Canadian Association of Emergency Physicians. Both believe this measure would be appropriate. They feel they need to have protection under the law not to be found in violation of doctor-patient confidentiality, so this particular amendment would ensure that doctors can report when a person may be a danger to themselves or others.

It is in the same framing as Mr. Ruff's amendment that we adopted earlier, which was an excellent amendment. What we're doing is just providing additional supports and protection. I think that is something we can all get behind.

What it would do is replace line 30 on page 22 in the clause with the following statement:

have collected or received from any person, including a psychologist, a psychiatrist, a nurse, a nurse practitioner or a medical practitioner, that the hold-

Then it continues as listed in the clause.

Hopefully, we'll have a consensus around this, as we have through most of this exercise. This is an important additional level of protection for people, and it goes in the same sense as Mr. Ruff's amendment.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Julian.

We'll go to Mr. Shipley and then to Madame Michaud.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you, chair.

While I appreciate what took place earlier with Mr. Ruff's amendment, and I think that was a good amendment, I'm feeling that in this NDP-4, the term “any person” is a little vague, so I won't be able to support this amendment.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Shipley.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I am genuinely wondering about the need for the proposed addition. To my mind, "a psychologist, a psychiatrist, a nurse, a nurse practitioner or a medical practitioner" are persons, so this addition is already included when it talks about any person. It does not give them more power.

I see the intent behind this amendment, but does it give these people more authority? Not really, as I understand it.

● (1950)

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** No, that's right.

Concerning immunity, I don't really want to speak to what might violate their code of ethics. I think that is under provincial jurisdiction. I am not in a position to answer that question.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** I would like to add one last thing on this point.

In the testimony we heard, this was discussed mainly for outside Quebec. I think the code of ethics in Quebec is already covered.

Both medical practitioners and emergency physicians have said that this was an important aspect. I think that underlines the importance of this measure.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Julian.

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, I'll ask for the recorded vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

**The Chair:** That brings us to BQ-11. If BQ-11 is adopted, NDP-5 becomes moot, as they are identical as far as the effect is concerned. Also, if PV-2 is defeated, so is NDP-3 for the same reason.

We go now to BQ-11.

[Translation]

Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The intent of this amendment is to strengthen the section that instructs the chief firearms officer to refuse or revoke a licence where they have reasonable grounds to suspect that a person has been involved in acts of domestic violence.

The underlying intent of clause 36 of Bill C-21 represents a crucial improvement for women's safety, since its purpose is to create a provision that asks the chief firearms officer to refuse or revoke a licence for a person who engages in domestic violence. We understand that the chief firearms officer is being given discretion to determine, subjectively, whether there has been domestic violence or criminal harassment. However, I believe it should be circumscribed, in this case. The goal of this amendment is therefore to remove the chief firearms officer's discretion and require them to suspend the licence, rather than making it an option.

So it simply replaces "may suspend" with "shall suspend". This is how subsection 69.1(1) would then read:

69.1(1) If a chief firearms officer has reasonable grounds to suspect, on the basis of information that they have collected or received from any person, that the holder of a licence is no longer eligible to hold the licence, they shall suspend, in respect of that licence, the holder's authorization to use, acquire and import firearms for a period of up to 30 days.

As I said, it simply removes the chief firearms officer's discretion. What we have heard from women's shelters and groups representing women is that it would protect women's safety better. I think it could have a positive effect.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment. It is identical to amendment NDP-5, in fact, so I imagine that my NDP colleague thinks somewhat the same thing as I do.

Thank you.

● (1955)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

[English]

Ms. Damoff, followed by Mr. Shipley, followed by Mr. Perkins.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you, Chair.

I'd like to first say that we support the intent of the change and think it's important to change the word to "shall".

I would like to offer a subamendment to the amendment, Chair, to change the word "suspect" to "believe". It's a small change. I'm not a lawyer, but my understanding is that it's a slightly higher burden of proof, but not a significantly higher burden of proof. If we are requiring that the licence shall be suspended, I think we should be using just a slightly higher burden of proof in the law. It would still mean that if there were reasonable grounds to believe, a number of people would have their licences suspended.

I hope colleagues will support that small change, maintaining the change that Ms. Michaud has put forward, which would change it to "shall". As I said, in the law this is just a slightly higher burden of proof. It's not significant, though.

**The Chair:** I'm not on the same page here. You said "suspect" and there's no "suspect" in this amendment.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** There is "reasonable grounds to suspect", is there not?

**The Chair:** BQ-11 proposes that Bill C-21, in clause 34, be amended by replacing line 32 on page 22 with the following:

they shall suspend, in respect of that licence, the holder's

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I have the wrong one. I'm sorry, Chair.

**The Chair:** Maybe I have the wrong one.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** No, I think it's me. You're right.

**The Chair:** Okay, so we'll withdraw your suggestion.



**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Okay, we go now to Mr. Shipley, followed by Mr. Perkins.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you.

My first question was going to be what's the difference between "suspect" and "believe", but we don't have to...maybe later, when we get into that.

Maybe the officials could tell me what this amendment does.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** This is with regard to the yellow flags. It's not labelled like that in the bill, but these are the yellow flag provisions, whereby, if there are, as my colleague, Madame Paquette, was mentioning, concerns with regard to any number of questions of eligibility of the individual, then somebody could flag to the CFO, use the yellow flag, and say, I don't really think this person should have a...and detail the reasons, so these steps are not necessarily taken frivolously. Somebody, such as a business or a health practitioner, would call in and say, this person, for these reasons, perhaps should not be acquiring firearms, and the CFO would be able to suspend their licence after taking down the reasons.

That 30-day period that's proposed in the bill gives time for the CFO to do the investigation to see what further actions are necessary.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you. I'm sorry; I have one more.

I have a question as to why the French version is a lot longer than the English version. Is that just a straight translation, or is there something different?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** In terms of the use of words in French, the way we formulate ideas in French versus in English is different. We use different words, sometimes multiple words, to say what one word in English will do. It's not unusual. You'll see that throughout the text. There are a different number of words that are used to convey the same idea.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you for that. I just noticed this one was more so than others, so thank you for that answer. I'll pass the time to my colleague.

**The Chair:** We have Mr. Perkins followed by Mr. Julian.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just so that I'm clear, the way this works is that an individual can lodge a complaint to the chief firearms officer, and that is enough to suspend. Is there no court involvement?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** There is a task that is included in the measure that talks about "has reasonable grounds to suspect", and I believe the motion that is on the floor is to change that to "has reasonable grounds to believe". It's not just an automatic call that would suspend the licence. It's that there is a call; there is information that's given, and the CFO has reasonable grounds to believe that the holder of a licence is no longer eligible. In terms of looking at licence eligibility and saying that you're convinced—

• (2000)

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** All right. I'm satisfied with that. Thank you.

**The Chair:** We have Mr. Julian, followed by Mr. Tochor.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** I will be supporting this amendment, BQ-11.

To my Conservative colleagues, I'd just like to remind them of the famous quip from Steve Martin, that people who speak French have a different word for everything.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We go to Mr. Tochor.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** I'm going to give my time to Doug.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Shipley.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you.

I'm definitely not an expert in the French language. Everybody knows that. I mentioned the differences, but there is a significant difference, and even I can tell with my very limited French that the English one does not mention anything about 30 days, and the French one says 30 days, so there is a difference here in these two.

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[English]

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Madame Michaud, on a point of order.

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** I don't know whether I can answer my colleague's question, but there is an introduction just before what we want to amend.

In the English version, it says "replacing line 32," so that means that it is only that line that we want to change. The reference to "30 days" appears later in the subsection. As the officials said, we have a different way of writing in French. That is why it is longer in the French version, but it is exactly the same thing.

[English]

**The Chair:** I'm going to ask our clerk to advise us.

You're saying essentially they're the same thing; they're just changing different lines of code. Is that correct? Would you agree?

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Well, I'm sorry. I know we're running out of time. I don't understand that, because one mentions 30 days and one doesn't. Can someone explain that to me?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Can I read the clause in full? Proposed section 69.1(1) says:

If a chief firearms officer has reasonable grounds to suspect, on the basis of information that they have collected or received from any person, that the holder of a licence is no longer eligible to hold the licence, they may suspend, in respect of that licence, the holder's authorization to use, acquire and import firearms for a period of up to 30 days.

The proposal is to change "may" to "shall".

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** On that, I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** It's just that the particular line that's being amended in the English doesn't affect the 30-day part, whereas the line that is being amended in French has to deal with that.

Who else is speaking on this point of order?

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Can she read that in French, though? I want to hear the French read out.

**The Chair:** Sure.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:**

*S'il a des motifs raisonnables de soupçonner, sur la base de renseignements qu'il a reçus d'une personne ou qu'il recueille, que le titulaire d'un permis n'y est plus admissible, le contrôleur des armes à feu peut, pour une période d'au plus trente jours, suspendre, relativement à ce permis...*

[*English*]

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** On a point of order, the translation isn't working.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry; you wanted to hear it in French.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** I do want to hear it in French, but I would like the translation into English—

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** —so it is a point of order that translation services were not working during that.

**The Chair:** Okay. Please read it in French, and...

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I thought the purpose of the request was that it would be heard in French.

**The Chair:** That's what I understood as well. I think we're going into the deep end here with this point of order. I'm going to bring it to an end.

You have a minute to carry on with your intervention, Mr. Tochor. You can use it how you like.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Going back to the actual clause, what would it change from how the act reads now? What is the main difference for functionality? What would this actually change?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Currently, the government is seeking to, when it talks about adding a new.... It would amend the act to add a new section after section 69, and a yellow flag. Currently, in terms of registration certificates, it talks about refusing to issue registration certifications.

In this case, it would allow a CFO to suspend somebody's licence if they have reasonable grounds, and there is debate as to what those words will be. The bill states, if they "suspect, on the basis of information that they have collected...that the holder of a licence is no longer eligible to hold the licence".

• (2005)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Are there any further interventions on this amendment?

Let us conduct a vote on BQ-11. Do we have it on division?

I'm not sure what takes priority.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** No, it's not about priorities.

**The Chair:** We have a request on division and generally accepting....

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** No, that's not how the Standing Orders work. We should be on—

**The Chair:** That was my question.

We'll have a recorded division, please.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

**The Chair:** BQ-11 carries. NDP-5, therefore, cannot be moved.

I spoke earlier of PV-2 and NDP-3 and so on. That was totally erroneous. It was text that was copied from somewhere else.

We will carry on now to NDP-6.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I am going to move NDP-6.

What it basically does is amend the part in clause 34 that allows the suspension of holders' authorization for a period of up to 30 days. This would allow that suspension to be beyond 30 days if that is what is required.

It's a relatively simple protection. It's an additional ability to ensure in this case that there is an ability of the system and the chief firearms officer to respond. In the case where there are reasonable grounds to suspect, the chief firearms officer could suspend beyond that 30-day period.

I raise this. We're getting into some very important pieces over the next hour or two, and I wanted to ask my Conservative colleagues.... I don't think the idea of slowing things down is appropriate for these sections. We need to have appropriate conversation, and certainly by UC we can extend time, but the normal path that we take is to move forward. If the parties have clearly indicated it, we allow it on division and we pass to the next amendment. I would suggest that we really need to focus to get through these crucial amendments over the course of the next hour or two.

I wanted to flag that with you, Mr. Chair.

I move my amendment.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Julian.

We'll go to Ms. Damoff, please.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you, Chair.

While I think my honourable colleague's amendment is.... I know his intentions are good with this amendment. However removing the period of 30 days leaves it open-ended.

The next clause to discuss deals with licence revocation.

The 30 days is appropriate for this section of the act in order to just.... We feel that the amendment to this goes a bit too far, so we won't be able to support it, while I understand the intent.

I will say that I agree with my honourable colleague that the next section.... We have about 20 amendments here that are dealing with intimate partner violence, and I hope that we will keep our comments focused on the important amendments that we have before us.

Thank you, Chair.

● (2010)

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** I have a point of order on that.

The change—

**The Chair:** Please wait until you are recognized.

We have Mr. Tochor on a point of order.

What is it?

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** The programming motion said that we had five minutes per clause, so any deviation from that is not....

The Conservatives have five minutes on each clause, regardless of the other members wanting to group them together. We will have five minutes per clause, as prescribed in the programming motion.

**The Chair:** You have up to five minutes per clause—yes, that's true—and up to five minutes per amendment. That is also true. It doesn't mean you have to use them and, of course, the more time we spend doing this, the less time we have to debate other items that we will meet going forward.

After midnight, there's no more debate, and things just get voted on.

If there are things that you want to have serious debate on between now and midnight, we need to be able to get to them, so I would advise all members to use the time that is allotted to them very judiciously.

Mr. Perkins, go ahead.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

For the officials, just so I'm clear, I share the concern that Ms. Damoff had about the unlimited nature of this.

If this were to pass, do you think it could withstand a legal challenge, such that you could have a suspension of a licence indefinitely with no actual—

**The Chair:** I would suggest that this calls for some conclusions, some speculation, and that's not what our officials are here for.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I would think that the officials are experts on...because I get this on other bills from departmental officials, whether something actually is legal or not—

**The Chair:** They may answer. I'm just cautioning you that they might not.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I appreciate that, thank you.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I am not a lawyer, and we cannot provide advice on whether something is meant to withstand a legal challenge.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Maybe I could take it another way.

Why did the government choose 30 days?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** The 30-day period was meant to.... The government intended to have a defined suspension period in which an investigation or a determination would be made by a chief firearms officer in terms of whether further action was necessary, so as to provide some certainty and not have it last indefinitely.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I appreciate that. Thank you.

That's adequate time for you to do the investigation into the complaint, if I'm hearing you correctly. Is that based on any sense of the volume of complaints that you might get through this process? Obviously, everything has a limit on resources.

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** Right now we have an administrative tool at our disposal. It's not a legal one, but we can put a licence under review currently to investigate an incident or a complaint. We used the timeline that generally we take for these types of reviews and applied it to this.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** It's based on your existing experience.

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** That's correct. Thirty days is reasonable.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** There is not a calculation in here that with this new power there may be more cases or complaints that come up and what the resource limits of that might be on you.

It is possible that if the complaints do increase because of the ease of getting this into the system, you may not have the resources to go through them in 30 days? Is there any cushion, in other words?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** I don't have any statistics on that. The 30-day period is reasonable, based on the processes we have to date.

● (2015)

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Is there any further discussion on this amendment?

Seeing none, I shall call the vote.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** I'd like a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 9; yeas 2 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** That is all about clause 34, so shall clause 34 as amended carry?

I'm sorry, did you want to speak to the clause?

Okay, go ahead.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you, Chair.

I have just a quick question. Well, it may not be that quick, because I'd like a fulsome answer on this.

Could the officials explain in its entirety what this clause 34 has achieved in its new, amended form?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Clause 34 establishes the “yellow flag” licence suspension regime. There is a test in terms of when a licence may be suspended by a CFO, providing for a notice that the chief firearms officer would give in writing of the suspension to the holder of the licence, with regard to creating an exception for non-disclosure of information, as well as for the termination of the suspension and a prohibition on the use, acquisition and importation during time the licence is suspended.

**The Chair:** Okay, thank you.

Shall we conduct the vote?

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Let's do a recorded vote.

(Clause 34 as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(On clause 35)

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion on clause 35?

Mr. Shipley.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you, Chair.

I have a question for our officials tonight.

We've talked a lot about the words “to carry”. Can we get exactly what the “authorization to carry” entails?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** An authorization to carry is an authorization to carry a restricted or prohibited firearm, either in the course of reasons of employment or for reasons of protection of life. It is defined and described under section 20 of the Firearms Act.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you for that. I'm sure there are some people watching this who aren't really up to speed. To clarify, isn't it fairly limited in terms of the individuals who have permission to carry?

• (2020)

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Yes.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Could I get a couple of specific examples?

You said it was for work. I think you said that. Is that correct?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** For employment, a reason for carrying a firearm and having an authorization to carry is, for example, being a security guard with the armoured car carriers. They are often authorized to carry, because they are private businesses.

Another one is with regard to, for example, trappers. They will often carry a side arm as well as their long gun when they're hunting. They would have an authorization to carry.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you.

You made a very interesting comment. I asked this back in our witness days, a long time ago—too long ago.

We heard from some trappers that they use them quite often to carry. I wish I could remember. There was a second individual who said he had never seen that. You just mentioned that trappers have the right to carry.

Do many trappers carry?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I don't have the statistics to be able to share.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** This gentleman does.

**Mr. Rob Mackinnon:** Yes. Between working in a remote wilderness area and/or trapping, I think the number is currently at about 400 ATCs that have been issued for those purposes. It's not a high number.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** I guess that's a matter of opinion. To me, 400 seems like a lot. I didn't think it was going to be that high, quite frankly.

I don't know if you're going to know the answer to this. I'm just trying to get a relation....

Do you know how many trappers there are? Would any of the officials know? I obviously don't know. I'm not a big trapper myself.

No. Okay. I think I'll leave some time for my colleagues.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** It's Mr. Perkins and then Mr. Tochor.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, officials.

This clause refers to the commissioner of firearms being able to revoke that. Is the commissioner of firearms the only person who can revoke that?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** This is a coordinating amendment with an earlier amendment for reasons of protection of life under paragraph 20(a). The authority to issue authorization to carry for the reason in 20(a) is going to reside with the commissioner of firearms. Therefore, it's the commissioner of firearms who would revoke it.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** What's the process that happens for that? What would cause somebody to need to have it revoked? How does that process work?

Does it go up the chain to what I believe you referred to earlier, which is that the commissioner of the RCMP is also the commissioner of firearms? They would be the ultimate person who would have to sign off on revoking it.

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** They would no longer need protection of life, so they would no longer meet that threshold.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Where would that request be made, and how would it make its way up to the commissioner of the RCMP?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** There would be a full process.

Do you want to explain?

**Mr. Rob Mackinnon:** There would be a process that would provide the commissioner of firearms the information that the individual does not require the authorization to carry for the purposes of personal protection of life. They may have been issued that authorization to carry because they were not provided safety by a local enforcement agency, which is one of the reasons one of those things could be issued.

Maybe the circumstances changed and, therefore, were provided to the commissioner. The commissioner would therefore revoke the authorization to carry.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Does the commissioner not have that authority now, or does this modify it in some way?

**Mr. Rob Mackinnon:** Currently, the chief firearms officer has that authority, but this amendment provides for that specific purpose, so that the commissioner of firearms has responsibility for the approval and refusal of the authorization to carry. It's for that specific purpose.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** It's in addition to the—

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Perkins. We're done.

Is there any further discussion on this amendment?

Seeing none, I'll call for the vote.

We'll do a recorded vote.

(Clause 35 agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

(On clause 36)

**The Chair:** We have a number of amendments on clause 36, starting with BQ-12.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

• (2025)

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Amendment BQ-12 deals with clause 36 of the bill. It talks about revoking permits in cases of acts of domestic violence. I believe this amendment is better written than several amendments that are trying to do the same thing—for example, amendments NDP-7, NDP-8, NDP-9, LIB-1, LIB-2, PV-4, PV-5, and PV-6. Those amendments are trying to do the same thing in several parts, while amendment BQ-12 does everything in the same amendment. I think it might be useful to proceed with this one.

In fact, amendment BQ-12 strengthens the measures to protect victims of spousal or domestic violence, and stems from a request made by the National Association of Women and the Law.

In its present form, Bill C-21, and particularly clause 36, provides that the chief firearms officer must revoke an individual's licence if they are "*convaincu*" that the individual has engaged in an act of domestic violence or stalking. In English, the chief firearms officer must "determine" whether such an act has taken place, which seems somewhat vague.

What I am concerned about is that the chief firearms officer is being given broad discretion: to determine whether they are satisfied that there has been domestic violence, or not. Here again, I think we should err by an excess of caution when there is this kind of risk.

I like the way the National Association of Women and the Law addressed this question, by saying it is important to recognize that a false negative, that is, failing to identify a domestic violence situation and not removing the firearm, is often more probable and can

have more tragic consequences than a false positive. They said that the threshold is too vague and too high. It amounts simply to adding some items to section 70.1.

The bill as it now stands says: "If a chief firearms officer determines that an individual who holds a licence has engaged in an act of domestic violence or stalking, the chief firearms officer must revoke the licence."

I am therefore proposing that Bill C-21, in Clause 36, be amended by replacing lines 34 to 37 on page 23 with the following:

70.1 If a chief firearms officer has reasonable grounds to suspect that an individual who holds a licence may have engaged in an act of domestic violence or stalking, the chief firearms officer must revoke the licence within 24 hours.

That really does strengthen what the chief firearms officer may do in cases of spousal or domestic violence, where they have reasonable grounds to suspect such a case.

Because this came up several times during consideration of this bill, which was a good thing, we have all come up with somewhat the same idea. Given that the NDP, the Liberals and the Green Party have made the same proposals, I hope they will be able to support this amendment.

Thank you.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you for mentioning it. I should have mentioned that if BQ-12 is adopted, LIB-1, PV-3, PV-4, NDP-7, PV-5, NDP-8, CPC-20, LIB-2, PV-6 and NDP-9 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

The other way of looking at it is this. If we pass this one, we can save all those other ones.

We'll go first to Mr. Shipley, then Ms. Damoff, and then Mr. Perkins.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Well, as some good news tonight, Chair, I think we're going to be able to jump ahead, then, and save some time, which is nice for everyone.

This is obviously a very serious issue. Any time we're talking about domestic violence, we need to make sure we get this right. It's a serious issue that needs to be dealt with as quickly as we can.

My question is to the officers at the table.

The chief firearms officer is really not one person. It means the office of the chief firearms officer, I'm assuming. Let me get that part straight first.

• (2030)

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** There is one chief firearms officer in a province, who is either federally or provincially designated, but there are firearms officers as part of that office.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Right, that's what I mean.

Why I'm asking that is just so I'm clear and everybody else is clear. There's really not just one person who could revoke the licence within 24 hours. Not every one person is available at all times. There are obviously vacations, holidays, weekends away and statutory holidays. That wouldn't affect this. It would still be doable.

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** Yes.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Again, I'm not trying to split hairs here. I just want to be clear that, when we say that, it's not literal. I want to use the words "the office of the chief firearms officer", but it isn't one person. It is an office of, to make sure this gets handled properly and correctly. That's what I'm trying to ascertain here.

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** Yes. The Firearms Act refers to a chief firearms officer or a firearms officer. There are activities that a chief firearms officer can designate down to their staff.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Okay, that's great. That's all I wanted to clarify, to make sure that this can be done and is doable. We think this is a good amendment.

Thank you. That's all I have.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Go ahead, Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I'm definitely supportive of the "within 24 hours" part of this amendment, and thank you for bringing that forward.

My question to the officials is about the difference in the wording from the original clause, "determines" and "has reasonable grounds to suspect". My understanding is that there's a civil standard of proof around "determines". I'm wondering if you could just explain to us what the difference is with the change that Madame Michaud has proposed.

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** Thank you for the question. I think it's quite useful in terms of illustrating this difference.

You're quite right that, in the context of a revocation of a licence, if that were to be, let's say, contested and eventually determined in a courtroom, the standard that would apply would be on a balance of probabilities, which for the layperson is like "50% plus one" certainty, so more likely than not. I think that's a good way of understanding what a balance of probabilities means.

Reasonable suspicion is a standard that's used throughout the code. It's definitely lower. In fact, it's the lowest known to criminal law. It really just means... Well, first of all, we're talking about evidentiary standards, so with respect to the amount of evidence, obviously it's not just a question of quantity. The nature and quality of that evidence will matter. Effectively, it's a credible possibility that the thing suspected occurred or will occur, depending on how it's directed.

I should note here that it's modified by the subsequent language "may have engaged", so that's the thing to be proved, a mere possibility that a thing may have happened.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** What I'm hearing is that the way the bill was originally worded, with "determines" and "may have", it still offers a number of protections if someone were going to have this happen. Is that what you're saying?

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** I can say that it would be consistent with other kinds of revocations that occur, be they for public safety-related reasons, irrespective of the type of victim, I suppose, or potential victim. That would be more consistent with what you see elsewhere in the Firearms Act.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I'm going to propose a subamendment to this, Chair, that would remove "has reasonable grounds to suspect" and return it to "determines", and then change the words "may have" to "have".

• (2035)

**The Chair:** Okay.

Is everyone clear on this subamendment?

**Mr. Paul Chiang (Markham—Unionville, Lib.):** I didn't hear the subamendment.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Remove the words "has reasonable grounds to suspect" and change it to "determines". That was what I was just asking the official about. That returns it to the original language in the clause.

Then change "may have" to "has" engaged. I think we all want to make sure that we are keeping women safe in instances of domestic violence and stalking, but we also have to put reasonable grounds in this bill that align with other parts of the bill and ensure that there is a balance. The 24-hour period, I think, is critical, and I think we all agree on that, or at least I hope we do, that the 24 hours is a really valid addition and needs to be done immediately.

Certainly there are instances in which women have been killed when it hasn't happened quickly. I'm just asking if we can change those wordings to, as the officials talked about, the balance of probabilities and something that is in other parts of the Firearms Act.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

The discussion now goes to Ms. Damoff's subamendment.

Mr. Julian, go ahead.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Thanks, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank Madame Michaud for bringing forward this amendment, which is really a consolidation of a series of other amendments and puts them all in one place. That is very helpful.

The recommendation itself comes from the National Association of Women and the Law. You will recall, Mr. Chair, that when they came forward to this committee, they were very clear that we need to ensure that the chief firearms officer can intervene when he or she has reasonable grounds to suspect....

If we are talking about ensuring swift action in a dangerous situation, of which we have far too many examples, it seems to me that standing to the level of what the National Association of Women and the Law...would be really important. Though I completely understand Ms. Damoff's attempt and the spirit in which she offers the subamendment, I will be voting against the subamendment and voting for BQ-12. Certainly what we are seeing from organizations that are concerned about domestic violence is that we need to make sure the chief firearms officer can intervene when there are reasonable grounds, so I prefer to stay with the wording in BQ-12.

**The Chair:** Mr. Perkins.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I appreciate everything that our colleagues around the table said on this very important amendment, the offer, and we totally agree on the 24 hours.

I have a question, and I'm not really sure who is the best person to answer it. It's on the subamendment and the amendment, and the subsequent ones that the chair said we would not consider if any of this passes. I have two basic questions. Which offers the best protection and is most likely to stand up in any kind of challenge in court in terms of its ability to survive this? We don't want to have to come back and try to amend the act again.

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** On the second part of your question, I'm going to take direction from the chair. As I think the chair alluded to earlier, I can't really answer questions as to legal validity or viability in a challenge.

However, I'd like to try to answer the first part of your question, so could you give it to me again, please?

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I'm trying to figure out which one of these amendments provides greater certainty that any act of violence can be dealt with quickly in the wide variety of types of violence that could happen.... I want to know that one of these isn't narrowing, that it's broad enough to cover circumstances that we might see or not foresee that allow this to happen within 24 hours. Would that be the subamendment or the amendment?

• (2040)

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** I don't think I can speak to the circumstances in which it would come about, but I want to clarify that this is the administrative revocation of a licence. It's not a mechanism of emergency intervention.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** They have to have reasonable grounds or Ms. Damoff's suggestion of "determines". I am just trying to understand the difference.

I think you said it, but from the officials' perspective, which one is...?

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** I couldn't say which provides better protection. I can describe what they are in law, which is that they are evidentiary standards or standards of proof.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Are they different?

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** "Determines" is a bit higher—I would say a fair bit higher—than "reasonable suspicion".

In fact, if it's helpful, I'll just quickly plot them on a range. Reasonable suspicion is the lowest; reasonable and probable grounds is

slightly higher than that; and balance of probability is just slightly higher than that, if that helps.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** The balance of probability is the highest?

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** Yes, it has been interpreted by the courts as meaning a balance of probability.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, Mr. Perkins. That's it.

Is there any further discussion on the subamendment of Ms. Damoff?

Seeing none, let us have the vote.

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** On division.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Pardon me, Mr. Chair.

Are you saying that the subamendment would pass on division or be defeated on division?

**The Chair:** Well, that's a good point.

Mr. Shipley proposes that it passes on division.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Is this the subamendment?

**The Chair:** It's Ms. Damoff's subamendment.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Peter Julian:** I am going to leave that up to Ms. Michaud. There should be a recorded division.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I think we need to have a vote on this.

Madame Michaud.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Mr. Chair, I would like a recorded division, please.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I think we'd better.

Let's have a recorded division. Thank you.

(Subamendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** We go back now to the main amendment.

Is there any further discussion on the amendment?

Madame Michaud.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Can we have a recorded division, please?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Absolutely.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** If this is defeated, can we then move LIB-1?

**The Chair:** If it passes, that whole list is gone.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** All right.

**The Chair:** We will continue with the vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** The amendment passes.

That means that LIB-1 and LIB-2 cannot be moved; PV-3, PV-4, PV-5 and PV-6 cannot be moved; NDP-7, NDP-8 and NDP-9 cannot be moved; and CPC-20 cannot be moved.

That was a very efficient use of our time.

Do you wish to have a break? Absolutely.

It's been about two hours since we had a break. I'm proposing, at the suggestion of our esteemed colleagues on my left, not that you're left-leaning or anything, a 15-minute break.

We'll suspend for 15 minutes.

• (2045) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (2100)

**The Chair:** I call this meeting back to order.

We are, at this point, at CPC-21, carrying on with clause 36.

Who would like to move that?

Mr. Shipley.

• (2105)

**Mr. Doug Shipley:** Thank you.

I would like to move CPC-21.

This is a very important piece. This is what we feel would define domestic violence, so I would like to read this into the record, Chair. I almost called you “your worship”.

The amendment is that Bill C-21, in clause 36, be amended by adding after line 37 on page 23 the following:

(2) For the purpose of subsection (1), domestic violence means conduct, whether or not it constitutes a criminal offence, by a family member towards another family member, including conduct by or towards an intimate partner, that is violent or threatening or that is part of a pattern of coercive and controlling behaviour or that causes that other family member or intimate partner to fear for their safety or the safety of another person, and includes:

(a) physical abuse, including forced confinement, but excluding the use of reasonable force to protect themselves or another person;

(b) sexual abuse;

(c) psychological abuse;

(d) financial abuse;

(e) threats to kill or cause bodily harm to any person;

(f) threats to kill or harm an animal or damage property;

(g) harassment, including stalking;

(h) the failure to provide the necessities of life; and

(i) the killing or harming of an animal or the damaging of property.

I won't say any more about this. I think this is an important amendment, and we'll see what my colleagues and roommates in here feel about this themselves.

**The Chair:** Okay.

We'll go to Ms. Damoff and then Madame Michaud.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you for putting this forward. It's very similar to the amendment that we've put forward, and others. It's reflective of—

**The Chair:** I apologize, but I forgot to mention that there are conflicts if this passes. BQ-13, LIB-3, PV-7 and NDP-10 all deal with the same subject matter.

Anyway, I'm sorry. Please go ahead.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** That's fine, Chair, because I think it actually reflects.... I just want to note that Ms. May from the Green Party is here with us. I want to thank her for the work that she does, particularly when it comes to domestic violence and firearms. We've worked on this issue in the past.

The CPC have put forward this amendment, and so have the Bloc, the Liberals, the Green Party and the New Democratic Party, so we will be supporting this amendment. It's a good one. It's an important one, and it's nice to see all parties coming together when it comes to issues of domestic violence.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My comments are to the same effect. The intent of Amendment BQ-13 was exactly the same: to define domestic violence.

This was requested by a number of individuals and groups who testified before the committee, including Louise Riendeau, from the Regroupement des maisons pour femmes victimes de violence conjugale and PolyRemembers.

I, too, am very happy to see unanimity around the table. All parties seem to agree and want to propose the same amendment on this important issue.

The Bloc Québécois will therefore be supporting this amendment.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Is there any further discussion on this amendment?

Mr. Julian.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** I think this will be adopted unanimously, Mr. Chair, and I thank the Conservatives for bringing it forward.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Do we have unanimous support for this amendment?

(Amendment agreed to)



**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

**The Chair:** BQ-13 is not moved, okay?

LIB-3, I understand, is being withdrawn. Is that correct?

• (2110)

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Yes, and and PV-7, and NDP-10.

**The Chair:** That's right. Okay.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Now we're at BQ-14.

**The Chair:** We are indeed at BQ-14.

Madame Michaud, if you will, please.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Amendment BQ-14 again amends clause 36 of Bill C-21.

Its purpose is to offer no other choice other than to deliver the firearm to a peace officer, and it also establishes a 24-hour deadline for delivering a firearm, except in compelling circumstances.

However, I will not be moving it, because the intent of the next amendment, LIB-4, is somewhat the same, and it is less stringent. I therefore choose the Liberal Party's amendment.

I will not be moving amendment BQ-14.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Very well, thank you.

BQ-14 is withdrawn.

That takes us to LIB-4, and rather than do it after, I should be doing it first. If LIB-4 is adopted, NDP-11, BQ-15 and LIB-5 cannot be moved, due to a line conflict. Also, if LIB-4 is defeated, so is PV-8, as they are identical.

Madam Damoff, please.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you.

Again, we're talking about cases of domestic violence predominately, although that's not the only situation. This change that we're proposing is really important in terms of ensuring that things happen in a timely manner, ensuring that the 24 hours is included here unless it's impossible. The example that was given to me was that the 24 hours is not possible because the owner is in Italy, so the CFO could determine that 24 hours was impossible for them to meet.

I think it's an important amendment to ensure that these firearms are turned in in a very timely manner, because we know that the most dangerous time for a woman when she leaves a domestic violence situation is within that first very short time period. It's happened time and again that a woman is killed within that first time frame, so I'm hoping that colleagues...and I thank Madame Michaud for withdrawing hers to support LIB-4.

Thank you so much for this and all your work on this bill.

I'll leave it there, Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I'll not make the comment about speaking through the chair in that case.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Oh, yes.

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion on this amendment? I see no discussion.

(Amendment agreed to on division [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** That brings us to PV-9.

I'm going to ask.... I'm not quite sure what the rules are here. I'm going to ask for unanimous consent for Ms. May to speak to her—

• (2115)

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** I'm sorry. Mr. Chair, that's not necessary.

**The Chair:** It's not necessary.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** No, because this committee passed a motion that set out the terms that forced me to be here. My rights in report stage are removed and my rights to participate are not really....

It's a long story, but if you check the motion this committee passed, you'll find it sets out that I have a right to speak for a reasonable amount of time to any of my amendments, and that's the only time I'm allowed to speak. Generally, that's seen to be one minute.

**The Chair:** I was referring to the marching orders from the House from Tuesday night that—

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** I don't think that affects.... I'm sorry, Chair. Check your—

**The Chair:** Anyway, if we can get unanimous consent for Ms. May to speak to her motion, it would be good.

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** Mr. Chair, if it's helpful, I'm happy to cede my one minute of time to Ms. May.

**The Chair:** Absolutely.

Go ahead.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think it's important to emphasize that because these rules were in the motion that governs all of this committee's work at clause-by-clause, it wouldn't be changed by the motion that was passed in the House. However, I appreciate everyone's good will.

I just want to say that this motion is to ensure that if a licence is revoked, all firearms are delivered to a peace officer. It's virtually the same, except that it removes the "lawfully dispose of" language. I hope that this will be acceptable.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Is there any discussion on this?

Go ahead, Madame Michaud.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I may have missed part of the discussion. Did you say that BQ-15 could not be moved because we adopted LIB -4? BQ-15 proposes only to remove a word that the Liberals' amendment didn't affect.

Can I still move it? It's the same amendment as PV-9, in fact.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I think that's correct.

It conflicts.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Chair, how could that conflict and not PV-9?

**The Chair:** It could be I'm making a mistake. Let me just find out what's going on here.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** This is a really important amendment. Whether it's Ms. May, the Bloc or us....

**The Chair:** As noted for.... If LIB-4 passes, there's a line conflict with BQ-15.

I'm sorry. BQ-15 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

I apologize to Ms. May. PV-9 cannot be moved due to a line conflict, and NDP-12 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** On a point of order, Chair, it might have changed how we dealt with the previous amendment had we known that PV-9 could not be moved, because this is a really important change. Had we known that, we might have done something differently on the previous amendment.

**The Chair:** I mentioned it before we—

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** You didn't say PV-9, Chair.

When you went through the list, you stopped at LIB-4.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. Give me a minute.

When we talked about BQ-14, this whole long list, that same long list does not occur in my notes for LIB-4. However, I believe it is still affected by LIB-4.

Did you want to—

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** On a point of order, Chair, if you review, I believe you included PV-9 in your description.

If you ask the clerks to review the video, we could find out if you said it or not.

• (2120)

**The Chair:** I'm not inclined to do that. We just need to sort this out.

My understanding is that since we passed LIB-4, we cannot pass PV-9, and we cannot pass BQ-15.

If we want to do something else, we would have to have unanimous consent to do so.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** My point is that, had we known that PV-9 could not be moved, I suspect that Madame Michaud, Ms. May or someone would have amended LIB-4 to ensure that we did get “or otherwise lawfully disposed of”, because that is an extremely important part of what we are trying to change in this.

**The Chair:** I understand. I'm only going from my notes and trying to—

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I realize that, but—

**The Chair:** My point is that we have passed LIB-4. If we want to go back and revise it, we require unanimous consent to do so.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** I have a solution.

**The Chair:** Mr. Tochor.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Regardless of whether the video is showing that you did include PV-9 in it, I think it's just been a long day, and I would move adjournment of the committee.

**Voices:** Oh, oh!

**The Chair:** Thank you, but our instructions from the House don't allow us to adjourn at this time.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** With unanimous consent, we could adjourn.

**The Chair:** We're not going to get unanimous—

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Okay, all right.

**The Chair:** That wouldn't solve our problem either.

Let's suspend for a minute or two and get ourselves squared away here.

• (2120) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (2130)

**The Chair:** I call this meeting back to order.

The situation with LIB-4 cannot be resolved at this point. What is going to happen is the changes that need to be made in respect of these other amendments will be made at report stage in the House. We can't move them now, so that is something that will be taken up at....

Go ahead, Madame Michaud.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think it's unfortunate that we can't change the amendment, but I understand the reasons.

The present wording opens up the possibility of doing something with the firearm other than delivering it to a peace officer. We wanted to remove that ambiguity and specify that the firearm had to be delivered immediately to a peace officer.

The Bloc Québécois is therefore going to move an amendment at the report stage. I think it is possible to do that.

• (2135)

[English]

**The Chair:** That is my understanding of the best way to go forward on this. Thank you.

I believe we can now proceed with BQ-16. I will note that with respect to BQ-16, if it is adopted, LIB-6, PV-10 and NDP-13 become moot, as they are identical. Also, if BQ-16 is defeated, so are LIB-6, PV-10 and NDP-13, for the same reason.

I see Madame Michaud, on BQ-16.

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

At this point in the bill, it talks about justifications for exempting an individual from revocation of their licence in connection with a protection order.

The purpose of the amendment is simply to exclude employment from those justifications. This was requested by several groups, including Battered Women's Support Services and PolyRemembers. A number of women's groups expressed fears in this regard. For example, a violent spouse who is also a police officer could keep their firearm if they were subject to a protection order. We want to avoid creating more cases of violence.

Again, this is the same reasoning as for a number of other amendments: we want to sin by an excess of caution, rather than by too little. I know there are other similar or identical amendments, so there seems to be an intent around the table to remove employment as a justification.

I hope my colleagues will vote for this amendment.

Thank you.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Lloyd.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC):** I want to ask the officials about this, because I like the intent of it, and we had some witnesses who said that this was concerning to them. However, just because a CFO has the ability to use this as a reason to grant somebody a permit, it doesn't mean that the CFO is required to grant that person a permit for this reason.

Is that correct?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** That's correct.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Do the CFOs generally use a balance of probabilities to judge whether the person is a threat versus their need for a vocational livelihood? In those cases, if they are a threat, I would assume that the CFOs wouldn't give them a permit for this case.

Would that be correct?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** I would assume the same, yes. They have a variety of tools at their disposal.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Generally, I trust the CFOs, because I think they always err on the side of public safety. I have yet to see any evidence that CFOs have been granting licences for the purpose of vocations to people who have been a danger and committed terrible acts. It just seems to me that it's prudent to give the CFOs the discretion to decide whether or not somebody is a risk if it's something that's important for their job and their livelihood.

We're talking about people's livelihoods. I think somebody at the committee said that they can just get another job. I thought that was a bit flippant of someone to say, because it's a tough economy out there. Especially for older people, it's very difficult to retrain, and especially when you've been in a career your whole life. To just say that they can just find another job really ignores the reality of many people's lives.

Of course, if they are a genuine threat to public safety, as the officials have said, the CFOs will not be granting this permit to people who are a threat to public safety. Generally, I would trust our public safety officials to make the right calls on these matters, unless I see strong evidence to prove otherwise.

• (2140)

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** If I could, I'll add a point of clarification, because police officers were used as an example.

It is only with regard to authorizations under the Firearms Act that this would affect. Police officers hold their service arms not under the Firearms Act, but under their enabling legislation. If they hold firearms privately, they would be affected, but their service arms wouldn't.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Is there any further discussion on this amendment?

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Do I have more time?

**The Chair:** You have two minutes and 13 seconds.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Was that, indeed, one of the justifications made? This was a means to prevent somebody from being a police officer because they wouldn't be able to carry their firearm. That seemed to be what some of the testimony was saying.

What you've clarified here I knew, because military members and police members are not required to have authorization to carry. It's part of their job, so we're not talking about police officers and taking away police officers' handguns here. If they're a danger, there are other processes to remove them from the force.

I think I would trust the CFOs in this case to make the right decisions. I don't think taking away this tool is going to enhance public safety.

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion on this amendment?

Seeing none, let us conduct a vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

**The Chair:** BQ-16 carries, which means that LIB-6 cannot be moved; PV-10 cannot be moved and NDP-13 cannot be moved.

That brings us to whether clause 36 shall carry.

Is there any discussion on clause 36?

Go ahead, Mr. Lloyd.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Can the officials quickly explain for the folks listening at home what the impact is of this clause?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Clause 36 establishes a new licence revocation scheme related to domestic violence and protection orders, going from the revocation in situations of domestic violence, revocations in cases of protection orders, notices for the revocation of firearms and the conditional licences.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Is this not already in place? In cases where somebody has been convicted of domestic violence, does the CFO not have the authority to revoke their licence or their access?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** It expands on the current revocations that are in place for the revocation of licences.

(Clause 36 as amended agreed to on division [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(On clause 37)

**The Chair:** We have a new BQ-17. If BQ-17 is adopted, LIB-7, PV-11, NDP-14, BQ-18, LIB-8, PV-12 and NDP-15 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Madam Michaud.

• (2145)

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Amendment BQ-17 deals with delivering the firearm. It is very similar to LIB-7. In fact, the intent of both these amendments is exactly the same, but with different wording, so I prefer not to move BQ-17 and to vote for LIB-7.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Very well, BQ-17 is withdrawn.

That takes us to LIB-7. If LIB-7 is adopted, PV-11, NDP-14, BQ-18, LIB-8, PV-12 and NDP-15 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Madam Damoff, if you please.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thanks, Chair.

There was an error in the amendment that was distributed. In the French version, it says page 25, and it should say page 24, under (c). It's a typo that was done when it was distributed.

This, in essence, is ensuring that the 24 hours...or if that's not possible, that it's an extended period established by the chief firearms officer. We want it returned as quickly as possible. However, if the CFO determines that someone is out of the country, they can extend that time to within something that's reasonable.

I do have a question for our legislative clerks, though.

One of the amendments later on that will not be able to be moved is dealing with that same question of "otherwise lawfully dispose of", so BQ-18, LIB-8, PV-12 and PV-15 will not be able to be moved.

Can a colleague amend LIB-7 to include those words in this one? Can Madam Michaud amend LIB-7 to include the amendment that is in BQ-18?

**The Chair:** I'm not sure how the wording would work, but in theory, you can have a subamendment.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** The problem last time was that we were told there was a line conflict, so I don't want to ask for unanimous consent again, and I suspect that if you seek it, you would find that Madam Michaud would love to amend my amendment to remove the words "or otherwise lawfully dispose of".

**The Chair:** You wouldn't need unanimous consent for that. She would just have to move it, I believe.

Before we do that, you made a comment about some errors in the text around part (c) of the French that was distributed.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** That's correct.

**The Chair:** What should it be?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** The "253 should be "24".

**The Chair:** It's page 24.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** That's correct. Yes.

**The Chair:** Okay.

You moved LIB-7.

Is there any discussion on LIB-7?

I'm going to ask if Madam Michaud would like to speak and potentially move a subamendment.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Yes, I would like to move a subamendment.

Ms. Damoff, I would just like you to repeat exactly what you want me to take from BQ-18.

Thank you.

[*English*]

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Essentially, you would be putting the wording from BQ-18 into this, if it's allowed, so the words "or otherwise lawfully dispose of" would be removed from (a) and (b) unless the legislative clerk says that we can't do that.

• (2150)

**The Chair:** The clerk would need a bit of time to look at it, so how about we suspend for a few minutes.

• (2150) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (2200)

**The Chair:** The meeting is resumed.

There have been some discussions around the amendment.

Madam Michaud, do you want to move the amendment?

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We spoke with the legislative clerk and he has doubts about the English version as compared to the French version. It is the same thing as earlier. So we are instead going to move an amendment at report stage. It is simply a coordinating amendment with what we just dealt with. We will perhaps do it differently from what we had proposed here.

Ms. Damoff can therefore move her amendment as it stands and I will not propose to amend it for the moment.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

[*English*]

Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I moved LIB-7, and I spoke to it, Chair, so it's on the floor. We'll just leave it at that.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion on LIB-7?

I have Mr. Lloyd.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I noticed that Ms. Damoff was saying that a reason is that somebody was out of the country. Is that the only reason that a CFO might need more than 24 hours? What's the context of this change, and what is the current rule right now?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Maybe I can speak in terms of the first part of your question. Then I could hand it over to my colleague to answer the next part.

The question would be that especially in very remote and rural regions or up north, where they can't deliver to a peace officer or to a chief firearms officer within that 24-hour period, there could be an extension to give them sufficient time to be able to deliver it.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Is the amount of the extension prescribed in other parts of the legislation or is really up to the discretion of the CFO?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Right now, it would be at the discretion of the CFO.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** This amendment doesn't change that discretion.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** It would not change it.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion?

Is it the will of the committee to adopt this amendment?

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** On division.

(Amendment agreed to on division [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** That means PV-11 cannot be moved; NDP-14 cannot be moved; BQ-18 cannot be moved; LIB-8 cannot be moved; PV-12 cannot be moved; and NDP-15 cannot be moved.

Shall clause 37 carry?

**Mr. Peter Julian:** On division.

**The Chair:** Mr. Lloyd has requested a recorded vote.

(Clause 37 as amended agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

(On clause 38)

**The Chair:** Mr. Lloyd has a question.

• (2205)

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** For the people back home who are watching, can the officials tell us what is the effect of clause 38?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** These provisions establish the record-keeping requirements of the CFO with respect to licences that are suspended further to a yellow flag regime or revoked as a result of a protection order. These provisions have been amended to require the CFO to keep track of changes and variations to prohibition and protection orders. Previously, this provision obligated the CFO to keep records of only prohibition orders and their issuance, rather than the variants or revocations.

**The Chair:** Is that okay?

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** On division.

(Clause 38 agreed to on division)

(On clause 39)

**The Chair:** Mr. Lloyd has a question.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Can the officials give us an explanation on clause 39?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** This provision would authorize the commissioner, the registrar and the CFO to disclose specific personal information to law enforcement agencies if there are reasonable grounds to suspect that an individual is using or has used a past or current licence to purchase a firearm for illegal trafficking purposes. The provision, also in the spirit of transparency, outlines what specific information may be shared.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Is this the police going to the CFOs saying that they require this information, give it to them, or is this when the CFO suspects that something is happening and they're calling the police and giving this information?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** It's the latter.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** It's the CFOs.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** That's right.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** What are the investigatory powers of the CFOs to determine that this is happening? How does this get flagged to the CFO?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** In terms of general trafficking, my colleague Ms. Paquette earlier spoke to this. If they were seeing a large number of purchases, unusual purchase patterns or registration patterns, they could say, “Well, perhaps we’ll share this with local law enforcement for investigation purposes.”

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Thank you. I appreciate that.

As you know, it will be on division.

(Clause 39 agreed to on division)

(Clause 40 agreed to on division)

(On clause 41)

**The Chair:** That brings us to CPC-22.

I note that if CPC-22 is adopted, BQ-19, LIB-9, PV-13 and NDP-16 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Mr. Lloyd, will you move CPC-22?

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I’m happy to move CPC-22 forward on behalf of Ms. Dancho, who is not here at the moment.

It is to inform within 48 hours of a protection order.

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion on CPC-22?

Madam Michaud.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I thank my colleagues for moving this amendment, but I am going to propose an amendment that runs somewhat counter to it and is for a shorter time period. I will therefore be voting against CPC-22.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion on this amendment?

Seeing none, we’ll have a recorded division, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** This brings us to BQ-19 in the name of Madam Michaud.

I will note that if BQ-19 is adopted, LIB-9, PV-13 and NDP-16 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

• (2210)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** We want to change the words “without delay”. My colleagues are proposing a 48-hour time limit. I propose to make it 24 hours. This is the time limit for informing the chief firearms officer that a protection order has been made, varied or revoked.

When I put this question to Ms. Martin, the executive director of Hébergement femmes Canada, she told me that “without delay” was somewhat vague and it had to be more precise. She thought this was a reasonable amendment.

Ms. Riendeau from Regroupement des maisons pour femmes victimes de violence conjugale fully agreed about the 24-hour time limit. She said:

The information has to be provided quickly.

In fact, if a violent spouse who intends to harm his family is allowed too much time, he can become a time bomb and end up acting out.

The proposed amendment is again from the perspective of ensuring greater safety for women victims of violence. I therefore hope that my colleagues will vote for the amendment. As we said, it is the same as amendment LIB-9.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

[*English*]

I have Mr. Lloyd.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I’m not sure which official would have the best experience with this particular case, but what is the common practice right now for the amount of time it takes when a protection order is issued and the CFO being informed?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** I’ll start and then maybe hand it off to my colleague.

There are varying degrees of processes throughout the country. Some provinces actually receive these orders electronically and are able to process them very quickly. Others don’t receive all of them at all. Some of them actually have to go to...is it provincial court?

I think I’ll hand it off to Rob Mackinnon right now.

**Mr. Rob Mackinnon:** Just to follow up on Madam Paquette’s comments, there are variations across the country based on volume as well as the means in which they receive the orders. They are prioritized, obviously, within CFO offices now, so there would be an amendment to our current standard operating procedures in order to meet this requirement.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** There are different processes across different provinces. Is this currently a provincial responsibility? Is that why?

**Ms. Kellie Paquette:** Yes, and all provinces have different systems, so there is not a common system.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Is there a constitutional concern here? I agree with the sentiment behind this. We had our own amendment to say 48 hours, so obviously we’re not against it, but is there a constitutional provincial-federal...? Can the federal government dictate to provincial courts that they need to do something within a certain time period?

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** You’ll see timing standards throughout the Criminal Code. The Criminal Code is largely administered by provinces and applied by courts, so my answer is yes.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Lloyd.

Is there any further discussion on BQ-19?

**An hon. member:** On division.

(Amendment agreed to on division [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Therefore, LIB-9 cannot be moved; PV-13 cannot be moved and NDP-16 cannot be moved.

Shall clause 41 as amended carry on division?

• (2215)

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** No.

This is clause 41, correct?

**The Chair:** It's clause 41 as amended.

Mr. Lloyd has a question.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Can the officials explain for the folks at home what is the impact of clause 41?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** The amendment would amend section 89 of the Firearms Act from every court, judge or justice to every competent authority that makes, varies or revokes. It's just a changing of the labelling, and then there is a timing requirement that has been changed through an amendment with regard to CFOs informing without delay—or, in this case, 24 hours—of a protection order being issued, varied or revoked.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** What is the distinction being made between the courts and the competent authorities? What competent authorities are we talking about?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Earlier this evening, the committee talked about questions of prohibition and various prohibition orders and the definitions that they can be issued by entities other than courts. In terms of this, it is a broader language that would encompass courts as well as other competent authorities that are not courts.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Okay. Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Shall clause 41 as amended carry?

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** On division.

(Clause 41 as amended agreed to on division)

**The Chair:** Shall clause 42 carry?

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** On division.

(Clause 42 agreed to on division)

(On clause 43)

**The Chair:** That takes us to BQ-20.

If BQ-20 is adopted, BQ-21, NDP-17, CPC-23, NDP-18 and NDP-19 cannot be moved due to line conflicts.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Michaud, the floor is yours.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

If I may, I am going to move BQ-21 rather than BQ-20.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Very well, Madam Michaud, BQ-20 is withdrawn.

If BQ-21 is adopted, NDP-17 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Michaud, the floor is yours.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We are at clause 43, which contains the much-debated exception for handguns.

Amendment BQ-21 strengthens this measure, in a way, by instituting a requirement that already exists in Quebec. We are asking that the much-debated letter, which must be written by a national or provincial sport shooting governing body, be sent annually. So we are simply adding the word "annually". I believe this strengthens the bill. First, we ensure continuing eligibility, by requiring that an annual letter be sent to the chief firearms officer. Second, we also ensure eligibility to possess a restricted weapon by requiring the annual submission showing active membership in a shooting club.

At the federal level, the reason most often cited to justify the acquisition of a restricted firearm is target practice. That condition needs to be met only at the time the application is made, when it is assumed that the individual is an active member of a shooting club. Bizarrely, it is not necessary to maintain the membership once the restricted firearm is purchased. In my opinion, that makes no sense. In Quebec, the Act to protect persons with regard to activities involving firearms, or Anastasia's Law, requires that owners of restricted firearms actively practice target shooting—at least once a year—in order to continue to possess the firearms.

As a result, I think the bill should be amended to require an annual submission showing membership in a shooting club and an annual letter from a shooting federation attesting to the person's participation in Olympic disciplines. We might talk about that a little later.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment calling for a letter to be provided annually. I notice that similar things are being proposed a little later that may be more restrictive.

I believe this annual requirement would be a reasonable compromise.

• (2220)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

[*English*]

We will go to Ms. Damoff, then Mr. Julian and then Mr. Lloyd.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you, Madam Michaud. This is a strong addition to the bill, and we will be voting in favour.

**The Chair:** Next is Mr. Julian.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you for your amendment, Ms. Michaud.

I would like to propose a subamendment to it. We have the same beginning: "meets the regulatory criteria." I would just add this partial sentence, which comes from amendment NDP-17: "including respecting the minimum participation requirements."

Amendment BQ-21 as amended would therefore read:

meets the prescribed criteria, including respecting the minimum participation requirements, and provides every six months a letter

That means that the requirements that are applicable on an annual basis, as suggested by Ms. Michaud, will be higher. There will also be a stricter framework that still allows people the opportunity to participate in shooting sports.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Julian.

I will go to Mr. Lloyd.

We're speaking to the subamendment at this point.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** On a point of order, is that five minutes for the subamendment and five minutes for the amendment?

**The Chair:** It's five minutes for the whole—

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I just think that this seems like a ridiculous exercise.

We know that licensed, vetted handgun owners are not responsible for almost all violent handgun crimes that are committed in this country. These paperwork requirements that we're adding on are doing nothing to improve public safety.

We're talking about when somebody doesn't go to a range for over a period of a year, they will have their ability to own a handgun revoked if they can't provide this annual letter, and now, as a government, we're micromanaging what this letter has to say. We're putting in this huge paperwork requirement on all of these clubs and sporting associations across the country to deal with tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of members.

Who's receiving these letters? Is it the chief firearms officers who will be receiving these letters? We already have a huge backlog...or we have had backlogs in the past with getting people's possession and acquisition licence and other things. Now it's going to be the CFO's job to review hundreds of thousands of letters on an annual basis, all so that we can prove whether or not somebody has shown up at a club at any time in the past year and whether they've met these prescribed minimum requirements.

This seems like we're making rules for the sake of making rules and making it look like we're doing something, when there is absolutely no evidence to prove that providing this annual letter—and the NDP was originally proposing to provide this every six months—is actually going to improve public safety in any way.

The CFOs can maybe answer my question.

Presumably it would be your job to review these letters, would it not?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Before my colleagues answer, I just want to clarify that the requirements have to do with when you register a handgun or when you're asking for an authorization to transport, new sections 12.2 and 19.1 of the Firearms Act. In other words, it's at the moment that you would seek to....

It's an exception, in order to allow the registration of a handgun for those who participate.... There is not a question of continual eligibility; it's a question of when you are acquiring or transporting it.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** What is the point of an annual letter? It's an annual letter, in that terminology.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Right.

You were asking who is going to be reviewing an annual letter. The requirements with regard to the national handgun freeze that is proposed in the bill have to do with that moment of acquiring a handgun, people who are.... There is a class of individuals who are exempt. It has to do with the moment of transfer.

On a question of continual eligibility through a letter, unless there's a transfer happening...it's not that people, once they have the handgun, get to keep it.

• (2225)

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Okay. This is when they're getting into the sport shooting. I was confused. I thought we were talking about every single registered firearm owner across the country having to provide an annual letter, which would just be a huge paperwork exercise for everyone involved for very little. However, when we're talking about Olympians, we're talking about half a dozen or a dozen people who would require these letters.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** The class of individuals described in the measure are people who are "training, competing or coaching"... "in a discipline that is" at the discipline of the sanction, I believe. The language is "on the programme of the International Olympic Committee or the International Paralympic Committee". It does include people who are coaching and training in those disciplines, so it's more than just participating at the Olympics or at the Paralympics.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Lloyd.

Madam Michaud.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thanks to Mr. Julian for the addition he proposes, and I will support it.

To respond to Mr. Lloyd's comment, I don't believe it is so ridiculous to apply this kind of rule to all sports shooters. Quebec already applies it and the Quebecers affected are already used to it. Even though there is more bureaucracy or paperwork, it seems to work very well, and it should be possible to apply the rule fairly smoothly in the other provinces.



Thank you.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Next we have Mr. Kurek.

**Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC):** Thank you, Ms. Michaud, for that comment.

Is there any evidence from the exercise in Quebec that it has reduced crime, which it is purported to do? Certainly, as we look at many of the proposals, they're lacking the evidence to suggest that it will actually accomplish what it's purported to.

**The Chair:** I don't know if that was a question for the officials. You have 12 seconds left anyway.

Is there anyone who wants to answer that?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Unfortunately, I can't comment on any of the results of provincial legislation.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** On the subamendment, I believe Mr. Julian is adding, "meets the prescribed criteria"... "respecting the minimum participation requirements".

Could someone define for me what "participation requirements" are?

**The Chair:** Do the officials have an answer for this?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Just looking at that, it sounds to me like it would be something that would be defined in the regulations—the normal regulatory process in terms of engagement with appropriate stakeholders, and defining and proposing regulations—and then it would come back for finalization.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Then we don't really know what the criteria would be.

I have concerns, without knowing what the prescribed criteria are, with supporting this. I know Mr. Julian and I disagree on how much we should open up the handgun freeze, which is fine. This is a good thing when we have disagreements. We can't agree on everything. However, I do have concerns that this could open it up beyond just the Olympic stream, which is what we are proposing in the bill.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Julian, please.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Mr. Chair, there's a later amendment that would give the regulatory powers to the government. We're not talking about a huge open door but rather the possibility of some flexibility as this committee has heard from sport shooters.

I should say that we provided, in other areas like airsoft, some regulatory ability for the government. Therefore, I would suggest that is entirely appropriate and within the government's purview.

● (2230)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Julian.

Is there any further discussion on the subamendment?

Madam Michaud.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Could Mr. Julian clarify the intent behind the addition he is proposing? I am also afraid it would open the door too wide. That would help me understand the effect his subamendment would have.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Julian, if you wish.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Specifying regulatory criteria will give the government the power to put certain regulations in place for the requirements relating to minimum participation.

The bill's framework will continue to apply, but this subamendment will give the government more flexibility.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** The government already has regulatory powers on this, so we don't need this amendment in order to be able to create regulations around handguns and the Olympic stream. It's already the intent that there will be regulations around that, so we don't need to add this to it.

I do like Madam Michaud's idea of providing a letter annually to ensure that you are part of that stream, but we won't be supporting it.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Damoff.

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, we'll take a recorded vote.

(Subamendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Amendment agreed to on division [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** That brings us to CPC-23, in the name of Ms. Dancho.

I believe Mr. Lloyd might wish to move this.

● (2235)

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Yes, I'm happy to move it, Mr. Chair.

Would you like me to speak to it?

**The Chair:** Before you do, I should note that if CPC-23 is adopted, NDP-18 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Go ahead.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** We had a lot of testimony from a lot of shooting groups, so the original bill included an exemption for Olympic shooting. However, it became very clear to us that there is a very vibrant culture of responsible handgun sport shooters: cowboy action shooting, IPSC and Paralympians, among others. They were not being adequately covered by this legislation.

Understanding that sometimes prescribing things in legislation is not the best way to govern or legislate, we have proposed adding “a handgun shooting discipline” as wording to allow some flexibility in determining which handgun disciplines or sporting activities would be legitimately allowed for getting a restricted licence or a registration for a handgun. That's why we're moving forward with that.

Clearly, this is an important part of culture, particularly in western Canada, and I think it's important that we not sterilize something that has not.... Nobody has provided any evidence that these people conducting these activities are an increased threat to society. We should always err on the side of liberty unless there is evidence to prove otherwise.

Maybe there are other Conservatives who have something to say on this.

**The Chair:** They can put their hand up and get on the list.

At this moment, it's Mr. Kurek.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Certainly, it's one of the concerns that I've heard from a number of constituents. Quite often, it's a surprise. I received a phone call from a retired elementary school principal who had taken up a type of sport shooting with a handgun and was truly distraught. This is not an Olympic sport. It's something that he and his wife had taken up after retirement, and they found a great deal of joy in retirement in doing it.

To complement Mr. Lloyd's point, I think it's really unfortunate that there is such a narrow prescription here. It really misses many of those who have been engaged in handgun shooting more broadly. Not acknowledging that is putting at risk what was described as—and I would agree—a very vibrant subset of Canadian culture. That is no more evident than in western Canada. Whether that be rodeo and the culture associated with that or the indigenous sport shooters, it's not like they necessarily have IOC designations or prescriptions to how they do things.

To ensure there is an expansion to include the full creativity of what these individuals' experiences might be and to not limit what that should look like is, I think, common sense. I think it acknowledges that the understanding of a few here in the nation's capital prescribing across our country is not what is best for this space in Canada.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I have Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Just briefly, Chair, this is one of the central pieces of Bill C-21. It's a policy difference that we have with the Conservative Party of Canada. It's something we are quite proud to be introducing.

We won't be supporting this. It's something that, as a policy, we are deciding to move forward on. We won't be supporting this amendment.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Is there any further discussion?

You have one minute and 14 seconds, Mr. Kram.

**Mr. Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think this seems like a very reasonable amendment, by the simple fact that the number of sports at the Olympics is always changing and tends to be expanding every four years. I remember a time in my life when curling was not yet an Olympic sport, and that raises the question: If we ban activities that are not yet Olympic sports, how are these activities and sports ever going to evolve into Olympic sports if people don't have the opportunity to participate in them?

I think it's very reasonable to broaden the scope of this particular clause. Let's allow people to train and to hone their skills. Then when these activities do become Olympic events, we'll have a leg up and some extra medals for Canada at Olympics time.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

• (2240)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Is there any further discussion? I'll call the vote on amendment CPC-23.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I'd like a recorded division.

**The Chair:** We will have a recorded division.

(Amendment negated: nays 6; yeas 4)

**The Chair:** That brings us to amendment NDP-18, in the name of Mr. MacGregor.

Go ahead, Mr. Julian.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I would like to give a shout-out to Alistair MacGregor for his work on this committee, as of course you know about, in drafting important amendments. This is an important one as well, I would say.

As we get to the end of the amendments, I think the committee has worked really effectively together.

The reality is that this clause in the bill, as it is currently stated, shuts down the possibilities for people who are engaged in a rigorous and disciplined sport. What this amendment would do is include, besides the International Olympic Committee and the International Paralympic Committee, the International Practical Shooting Confederation and the Single Action Shooting Society.

The International Practical Shooting Confederation, as you're aware, has a number of members in Canada. It is part of an international sport shooting association. There are over 100 member countries, including many that have implemented handgun bans. Those include the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Australia. All of those countries, even after putting in place handgun bans, do allow members to train and compete in International Practical Shooting Confederation events.

I voted against the Conservative amendment because it opened the door widely. The current law is very restrictive. This represents, I think, an ability for some people who engage in sport shooting in a very rigorous discipline to, as part of the International Practical Shooting Confederation, still participate in that sport. Potentially, they are future Olympians as well.

This is a narrow focus. We've already passed amendments that allow for rigorous criteria. What this would do is allow members who are part of the International Practical Shooting Confederation to participate.

Alistair MacGregor, of course, has been a proponent for having a disciplined and very rigorous application of the law while allowing future Olympians, and those who train to very rigorous standards through the International Practical Shooting Confederation, to participate.

I would suggest that in the same way we found a way through with airsoft, we've ensured that the bill complies with the highest standards. With airsoft, we have allowed for the government to set a regulatory framework. We've just adopted another amendment that allows the government, as Ms. Damoff has explained, to apply regulations. I would suggest that this amendment makes some sense. It doesn't open the door widely in any way, but it does allow for those who are part of a rigorous, disciplined sport to continue to participate. As I mentioned, some of them may well be the Olympians of tomorrow.

When we look at other countries that have handgun bans in place, they have created an exemption for the International Practical Shooting Confederation. That seems to be a best practice we can follow.

• (2245)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Julian.

Go ahead, Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you, Chair.

I mentioned before that this is a policy area where the New Democratic Party, the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party don't agree.

We had Ken Price from the Danforth Families for Safe Communities here. I remember Ken saying that it's a decision about how you want to move forward as a country.

The Liberal government has put forward a bill that will freeze handguns. We haven't banned them. We have put forward a freeze.

In fact, I will give credit to Ken Price. I remember very distinctly having a meeting with him. He said, "Look, I would love to have handguns banned tomorrow. We've had too much devastation on

the Danforth, but maybe we freeze them and it will take them out of circulation eventually."

The amendment put forward by the New Democratic Party would open this up. We've already allowed an exemption for a pathway for potential Olympians. However, even the International Practical Shooting Confederation said they expect their membership to grow considerably if there is an exemption that allowed it. The concern, of course, is that people who want to get around the handgun freeze will join IPSC.

Allowing an Olympic stream opens it up far too broadly. I know the New Democratic Party, and Mr. MacGregor in particular, felt quite strongly about this, but it's something we feel very strongly about too.

Ken Price said this when he was here at committee:

In terms of a control measure or being able to say what kind of gun should be used or not, or there being a risk that the number of those guns will grow because suddenly somebody is an IPSC elite shooter, we're just very skeptical that that could be managed. We think it undermines an objective we have.

Thank you to Mr. Julian for the work he has put in on this committee and on this bill, but this particular amendment is not one we're able to support.

I would also remind colleagues that handguns are not something that... I think the vast majority of Canadians, when they're polled, support what we're doing in Bill C-21. I see that Mr. Kurek doesn't quite agree with me there, but that's the truth. When you ask Canadians whether they support a freeze on handguns, they do support it.

There is this idea that we need to expand what's in the bill after doing a review within government of the best path forward. We could have chosen a path that didn't allow this Olympic stream, but we decided that we would put this in there. There will be regulations developed on how that path moves forward.

It's very important that we move forward with this and that we decide what kind of country we want to be and how safe we want to be. While I know my Conservative colleagues don't agree with me on that, we feel that this is in the interest of public safety. I think we need to listen to what the Danforth families said and listen to what they went through with a gun in a gun-shop in Saskatchewan that was stolen. This isn't a gun that was smuggled across the border.

I'm sorry, but how much time do I have, Chair?

• (2250)

**The Chair:** You have 31 seconds.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** It was a gun that was in Canada.

I will leave it there for now, Chair. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Blois, you have 15 seconds left.

**Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.):** Mr. Chair, if I had more time, I would give the perspective from rural Canada and where I sit on this particular issue. However, I probably have just a few more seconds.

Unfortunately, I'll have to save that for third reading in the House. Thank you.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I could give unanimous consent to let him have some more time to say what he has to say.

**The Chair:** There is a request for unanimous consent to give—

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** It's five minutes.

**The Chair:**—five minutes more time for another round of questions and answers.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Mr. Chair, the way it works is that it's another 20 minutes. As you see, I'm certainly willing to provide it.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I will be asking for five minutes for Mr. Blois.

**The Chair:** Well, it works as Mr. Julian said.

Do we have unanimous consent to extend this for another 20 minutes?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Chair:** That being the case, is there any further discussion?

Next is Mr. Lloyd, please.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I for one was very interested in what Mr. Blois had to say. A Liberal perspective from rural Canada is an increasingly rare thing to hear these days in the halls of Parliament. I thought hearing something like that would have been a very interesting thing. Unfortunately, the Liberal Party muzzled their own member and wouldn't let him speak, but we are where we are.

This is not a move about public safety. I understand the Danforth families and I feel for them. Ms. Damoff was correct. It was a legal firearm in the hands of a killer, and it was stolen from a gun-shop, but we have an epidemic of smuggled firearms on the street. If it hadn't been a gun stolen from a gun-shop, it would have been a gun smuggled in from the United States. These criminals are determined to get these firearms, and despite our best efforts they are getting them, and more needs to be done.

Mr. Chair, am I able to offer my time to Mr. Blois?

**The Chair:** I don't think that's within the spirit of the motion from the House.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Okay. Well, I'll just continue with what I have to say.

**Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC):** Can we get clarification on that?

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** On a point of order, does the clerk have any perspective on that?

**The Chair:** The House order requires unanimous consent to extend debate on amendments.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Can we cede our time, like a minute of our time? We quite often share during committee questions.

**The Chair:** With unanimous consent, we can do pretty much anything.

Do we have unanimous consent for some of the Conservative time to be used by Mr. Blois?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Could we just suspend for a couple of minutes, Chair?

**The Chair:** Sure. We will suspend at the call of the chair for a few minutes.

• (2250)

(Pause)

• (2300)

**The Chair:** The meeting is resumed.

The Conservatives have offered to give some of their time to Mr. Blois. I believe, if we have unanimous consent, we can do that.

Do we have unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Mr. Blois, welcome. You have three minutes and 52 seconds to speak.

**Mr. Kody Blois:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As you recognized, I am not a permanent member of this committee, so I didn't have the benefit of hearing all the testimony the members have heard throughout the study on Bill C-21 and, of course, on the proposed amendments. However, I want to give a perspective from my riding.

I certainly appreciate where Ms. Damoff is coming from and the idea that, if we open up exemptions too far, it could undermine the government's policy intention. I recognize it and appreciate it. I embrace the fact that we come from different parts of the country with different lived experiences and that we may approach this issue differently.

Let me be very clear: This bill has a number of very important measures and we need to get it through Parliament, because it would make a difference for public safety. However, I would be remiss not to speak to Mr. Julian's amendment, because I think there is merit in it. Whether it's through this amendment or not, I hope the government will consider ways to allow those competing competitively in other disciplines that are not Olympic sport shooting...such that there is recourse.

I will give you an example. Our former warden in the municipality of East Hants is Jim Smith. He appeared before this committee. He represents Canada and participates around the world in IPSC-related events. One of his colleagues was just representing Canada and lost a handgun. Air Canada, the airline, actually lost the gun. Right now, there's no recourse for that gentleman to obtain a new handgun and continue to compete.

There's a tension on both sides of this. I heard about the idea of a pile-on and I think that is legitimate. I think that has to be examined before we can move forward. However, at the same time, as Mr. Julian talked about, this is an internationally federated body. If there is one organization outside of Olympic shooters this committee and indeed this government should consider, I think it's IPSC.

Mr. Julian went to great lengths, I think, borrowing from some of the work Mr. MacGregor did, to highlight that [*Technical difficulty—Editor*].

**The Chair:** Stop the time. We seem to have a technical difficulty. I think we've lost him.

Mr. Blois, you're back. You have one minute and 20 seconds left.

• (2305)

**Mr. Kody Blois:** The Tories are going to have fun with this one. They're going to make it look like my video somehow got cut.

Mr. Chair, I want to make sure this is on the record. I appreciate where the government is trying to go with some of these elements, but I think this has to be examined. It will be interesting to see whether this goes back to third reading in the House or it can be a regulatory measure.

I don't want to penalize those who are actively competing or have a situation, whether or not it's a lost gun.... You can appreciate these folks who shoot quite often. Sometimes their guns will just wear down and break. We have to have a provision for those who are gun owners today and who are continuing to compete so that if something happens, they have some recourse. I don't know the bill to that extent. I look forward to studying it prior to third reading to a greater extent, once we get through the amendments, but I want to make sure that perspective is on the table.

Again, I've raised it. I'm part of a team. I like what the government is doing on a lot of measures, but this one is a bit difficult. I hope that moving forward, there can be recourse, as Mr. Julian talked about.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Blois.

The Conservatives have 10 seconds left.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I just want to say that Mr. Blois brought up some very good points. Yes, this is a very punitive measure by the government. If indeed we pass this amendment by Mr. Julian and we find in a year or two that this is being used by criminals to threaten public safety, then let's revisit it.

At this time, there is no evidence that this is a threat to public safety, so the Conservatives will be in support of this amendment.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Julian, go ahead.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** How much time do I have left, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** You have 56 seconds.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Okay. I have two points.

First off, the next NDP amendment prescribes “minimum participation requirements for training, competing and coaching” in these disciplines. There's a very tight framework around this.

Second, we are talking about a handgun freeze being put into place. Handgun bans in other countries still allow for participation in IPSC. I would suggest that we're not at the standard of countries like the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Australia, which have handgun bans, yet they have found provisions for an exemption for IPSC.

I understand the arguments against. I think we have to go with best practices. I think countries that have put into place a ban, which Canada is not doing, have allowed for exemptions for IPSC. I think that is a best practice and it makes logical sense to follow it.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Julian.

I believe there is no more discussion.

Let us call the vote. We will have a recorded division.

**An hon. member:** It's a tie vote.

**The Chair:** Well, that's unfortunate.

I know the tradition is that the chair votes to extend debate. I'm not really sure how that works in this case, so I'm going to vote no.

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

• (2310)

**The Chair:** That takes us to NDP-19.

Mr. Julian, go ahead, if you please.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Heeding the words of Mr. Blois and the idea of having “prescribed minimum participation requirements for training, competing and coaching” in these disciplines, as I've mentioned, other countries have exemptions for rigorous participation in sport shooting. Those countries have handgun bans. We have a handgun freeze. It seems to me that to have the government hear what Mr. Blois and others have been saying about the possibility of putting in place regulations that allow for future Olympians to participate makes sense, so I would suggest that NDP-19....

Mr. Chair, we've just had the closest vote on this issue that we've seen throughout this entire saga of a year now for Bill C-21. It was a tie vote that you had to break. I'm sure it was a difficult position you were in, but I think that is a message to the government.

This amendment would provide for some framework around the government to potentially look at the message they are receiving at the committee tonight from members of three of the four parties. I would suggest that adopting NDP-19 would allow for that rigorous framework, but would also allow for the government to perhaps examine, through regulation, how they might look at some of the issues that have come up around sport shooting.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Julian.

Is there any discussion on NDP-19?

Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Chair, we won't be supporting this amendment for the same reasons that I said before.

**The Chair:** Mr. Lloyd.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I'm a bit confused. I thought that this amendment needed the previous amendment to pass in order for this amendment to apply.

Is this a stand-alone amendment, Mr. Julian? I'm just wondering how this, as a stand-alone amendment, achieves what it's trying to achieve.

**The Chair:** Mr. Julian, do you wish to respond?

**Mr. Peter Julian:** It opens the door for the government to look at regulation prescribed on minimum participation requirements.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I think you're giving a great deal of deference to the government to decide. You would think the government would be willing to give itself the power to decide.

I always think that prescribing these things in legislation is a clumsy way of doing things. As we know, things don't always play out cleanly when they're written down. Situations change. The names of organizations change. Mr. Kram was just talking about how Olympic sports will change over time.

However, generally I think Conservatives aren't against this amendment, and so we will be voting in favour.

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion on this amendment?

Seeing none, I guess we shall conduct the vote.

I'm told that a hand-waving vote doesn't really work—it's against the House rules we set up way back when—so we're going to do a voice vote.

Actually, I think we'll have to have a recorded division on this.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** On a point of order, Mr. Kurek.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** It's somewhat a point of information. I know we've found a great deal of success at other committees that if it doesn't pass on division, you just go to a recorded vote.

**The Chair:** Well, that's a good approach.

Right now, I think we'll just go to a recorded vote, because I think we're going to need it.

(Amendment negated: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 43 as amended agreed to on division [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(On clause 44)

**The Chair:** That takes us to CPC-24.

Go ahead, Mr. Lloyd.

• (2315)

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I'll move this on behalf of Ms. Dancho.

I believe it's in the bill about advertising of firearms. There was some concern by the government that this was somehow leading to violence.

Conservatives wanted to put forward this amendment because we don't want to have any unintended consequences. For example, in the film industry, there are certainly images of people getting shot and the advertising of that. We wouldn't want to penalize the film industry, or the Canadian Forces or public safety personnel.

I'd be interested to hear what the government has to say about it.

**The Chair:** Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Chair, overall, we support it. I just wonder whether the Conservatives would consider an amendment. It's adding the words “in their usual course of business”.

I'll just read the whole thing, Chair: “Subsection (1) does not apply to persons or businesses that advertise, in their usual course of business, directly to or on behalf of the film industry, the Canadian Forces or public safety personnel.”

**The Chair:** There is an amendment on the floor.

Is there any discussion on this amendment?

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** If I'm hearing it right, the “usual course of business” is what you've requested to be added. What do you mean by “usual course of business”? I'm sorry to ask you.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Here's the thinking I had on that: You mentioned the film industry, for example. If there's a company that is advertising to the film industry, it would be during the normal course of business to be advertising to the film industry; if it was just Joe that set up to advertise something and it's not his normal business, then he wouldn't be allowed to advertise. It wouldn't be a company that would normally be in this business.

I don't think that weakens it at all, Dane. I think it's just clarifying that this is their normal business that they're advertising to the film industry or to the Canadian Forces or to Public Safety. It's not somebody who sells widgets and then decides to just do the advertising. It's meant to clarify, not to weaken it in any way at all.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Okay. Well, this might be the only Conservative amendment that gets passed, but I will support this. I think it could be a friendly subamendment and I guess we'll see how it plays out in the legislation, should it pass.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like the officials to tell me how they think this can be translated into French:

[English]

“in their usual course of business”

[Translation]

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Personally, I think I would write "aux personnes ou aux entreprises dans leur pratique normale d'opération."

We would have to talk about it at greater length.

[English]

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion?

Madam Michaud, go ahead.

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** When a comma is missing or there are passages that are not logical, the legislative clerk can make changes without first obtaining the committee's consent.

In this case, do we need to know immediately how it is going to be worded in French?

[English]

**Mr. Philippe Méla:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[Translation]

No, Ms. Michaud. We can get the translation tomorrow, once all the ends have been tied up.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** You have my full confidence, Mr. Clerk.

• (2320)

[English]

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion on the subamendment? It's really an amendment, but never mind. We won't get into that.

All in favour of the subamendment?

I'm told that it's not proper procedure when we're on Zoom, but we'll try to correct our errors and not do this anymore. That's unanimous, I believe.

(Subamendment agreed to [See Minutes of Proceedings])

**The Chair:** Now we go back to the main amendment by Madam Michaud.

Do you wish to speak again to this?

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I thank my Conservative colleagues for moving this amendment. It seems to make sense. I do see a certain logic in it. It might have a major impact on the film industry and on public safety departments and organizations in Canada.

I am going to vote in favour of the amendment.

[English]

**The Chair:** All right. Is there any further discussion on the main amendment as amended?

I see none, so shall we pass this unanimously?

I believe it's unanimous.

(Amendment as amended agreed to [See Minutes of Proceedings])

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** We should have had more conflict.

**The Chair:** I'm sure we'll have other opportunities.

Shall clause 44 as amended carry?

(Clause 44 as amended agreed to on division [See Minutes of Proceedings])

(On clause 45)

**The Chair:** That brings us to clause 45 and amendment NDP-20.

Mr. Julian, if you please, go ahead in the name of Mr. MacGregor.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Mr. Chair, I believe this is consequential to the adoption of NDP-1. We adopted it last night and came back to it earlier this evening. Because we defined “protection order”, it would simply remove lines 9 and 10 from page 29, which talks about defining the expression “protection order” for the purpose of this act.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Julian.

Go ahead, Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I have a question for the officials.

Is this just a coordinating amendment? What impact would this have? We want to make sure the government can consult with provinces, territories and indigenous stakeholders and will be able to develop regulations.

Could you let us know what impact deleting this would have?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I believe that, at the beginning of the session today, there was a subamendment made to NDP-1 that reinserted the regulation-making authority for the government. Therefore, you may want to consider keeping the regulation-making authority for protection orders.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** To clarify, if we delete this, are we removing the regulatory ability?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** It's an important coordinating amendment to keep both of them.

In the beginning, in the definition—I would have to go back and look; perhaps the legislative clerk could read it out again—it talks about means as prescribed, I believe. It would be important to list them in both places.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** In that case, Mr. Chair, I'll ask, through you, for unanimous consent to withdraw it.

**The Chair:** Absolutely. I think we have that consent.

(Amendment withdrawn)

**The Chair:** That brings us to G-44, in the name of Mr. Noormohamed.

Would you like to move this, Ms. Damoff?

• (2325)

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I would be happy to move it, Mr. Chair.

Before we started this bill, many months ago, I did a handy-dandy little cheat sheet of my own, with all the ghost gun amendments. G-44 is, I believe, the last coordinating amendment that will add “firearm parts”. Much like the previous 40 amendments, this is adding two words to this particular clause. It’s a coordinating amendment married to the amendments we passed last night.

I think all of us are losing track of which day we are in, but it was last night we passed it, maybe even the day before. It might have been the day before. Yes, I think Mr. Lloyd is right.

Anyway, I trust that, as with all the other firearm parts amendments, we can pass this unanimously.

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion on this amendment?

I’m seeing none.

(Amendment agreed to [See Minutes of Proceedings])

**The Chair:** That brings us to BQ-22, in the name of Madam Michaud.

[Translation]

Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The purpose of amendment BQ-22 was to regulate the transportation, storage and use of airsoft pistols. However, it was simply decided to remove airsoft pistols from the bill, because, we were told, the government already had the ability to regulate the use of these pistols.

What I am going to do is simply not move this amendment.

[English]

**The Chair:** Okay. BQ-22 is withdrawn.

That takes us to BQ-23.

[Translation]

Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Amendment BQ-23 is the second last amendment to coordinate with the previous ones regarding cartridge magazines. For the benefit of colleagues who were not here, everyone was in favour of almost all the amendments concerning cartridge magazines. The purpose of amendment BQ-23 is to require that a valid licence be presented for the acquisition of a cartridge magazine, on the same basis as for ammunition.

Everyone should therefore be able to vote for this amendment.

Thank you.

[English]

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion on BQ-23?

Seeing none, do we have unanimous consent?

**An hon member:** On division.

(Amendment agreed to on division [See Minutes of Proceedings])

**The Chair:** That brings us to BQ-24.

[Translation]

Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is the last amendment concerning cartridge magazines. If it is adopted, the entire bill would be consistent with the new provision requiring a valid licence for cartridge magazines.

I invite my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I have Mr. Lloyd.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I have a quick question for the officials. Is “cartridge magazine” the appropriate terminology?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Yes. It’s actually defined in the Criminal Code.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Thank you.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** If I may, though, I have a quick question.

You’re regulating the import and the export.

[Translation]

I thought you also intended to regulate acquisition. Do you have the regulatory authority to do that?

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** All the amendments I have moved coordinate with amendment BQ-3. This was a recommendation by legislative counsel. If something is missing, I can see about it with the legislative clerk, so that everything is in order.

Did you mean there is something missing?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I think we will consult the legislative clerk to make sure the necessary regulations are adopted, if it is not already part of the Criminal Code.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Perfect.

Thank you.

• (2330)

[English]

**The Chair:** Did you require some time to consult? Is that what I just heard?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I think if we can... Maybe not now, but I think we’d go back and look at this, because I think there are a few others that you’re talking about at report stage, and this might be something you can do at report stage.

**The Chair:** Very well. Thank you.

Is there any further discussion on this amendment?



G Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Just to clarify what you were saying there, do you think there may be other places where we need to add “magazine”? Is that what you were saying?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Thank you for the question.

It's because you are changing paragraph 117(k.1) with regard to respecting the importation and exportation and then you're adding “cartridge magazine”. I just have a little moment of doubt to just make sure that if there is regulation-making authority that you want to do for acquiring, because the intent is to require a licence to purchase a magazine, and I would just want to make sure that's absolutely clear.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion?

Go ahead, Mr. Hoback.

**Mr. Randy Hoback:** If you're unsure about it, is this something we should park or should we actually deal with it at this point in time?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I think there are different ways that you could look at this, and it could be a coordinating amendment that you do at report stage, as for others that the committee has decided to park.

**The Chair:** If this becomes an issue and if it could be dealt with at report stage, I think it would be best, because we're going to be running out of time to get back to things we've parked. I propose that we proceed to a vote on this amendment.

Do we have unanimous consent?

**An hon. member:** On division.

(Amendment agreed to on division [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Shall clause 45 as amended carry on division?

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** No. I want to discuss this one, actually.

**The Chair:** Mr. Lloyd, go ahead.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I'm wondering if the officials.... Does the government currently have the capability for the Governor in Council to be making regulations for the repurchase? I have a problem with the term “repurchase”, because it wasn't the government that sold the firearms in the first place. I think a better term would be “purchase of handguns by the Minister”. Is this something that we need to actually put into law in words? Doesn't the minister already have the authority to do this?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I'm sorry. Are you saying that the government has the authority to repurchase? I don't see that written in the clause.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

I think that instead of talking about clause 45, Mr. Lloyd is already talking about amendment BQ-25, which I have not yet moved.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Oh, sorry. I had something wrong on my page here. My apologies. I withdraw.

(Clause 45 as amended agreed to on division [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** This brings us to BQ-25, new clause 45.1.

Madam Michaud, please move it.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Are you allowing me to move amendment BQ-25?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I think I have to disallow it, but you have to move it before I can disallow it.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I know what you are going to tell me, but this amendment deals with the firearms buyback. The government has been talking about a firearms buyback for a long time, but they keep dragging their feet about providing details for the program so much as been said about. This has been stressful for firearms owners whose firearms might become illegal or prohibited. They don't know what will become of their firearm and whether they will be able to sell it back to the government.

I therefore wanted to move this amendment so the government would act quickly. However, given that it concerns the Treasury Board, I understand that it will be deemed to be inadmissible, Mr. Chair. I still wanted this to be quite clear.

• (2335)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

In the opinion of the chair, the amendment proposes a new scheme that would impose a charge on the public treasury. An amendment may not infringe upon the financial initiative of the Crown, so it's inadmissible on that basis, unfortunately.

We'll carry on to—

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Kristina, do you want to challenge the chair? I'll support you.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** That's nice of you, but I respect the decision of the chair.

Thank you.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** If we did manage to pass it, the Speaker would yank it out quicker than you could think...unless we give him some of this pizza.

We have BQ-25.1 and BQ-25.2. Do you wish to move them so that I can rule them inadmissible also?

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Mr. Chair, I had more hope for my next two amendments, but I understand your intention.

Nonetheless, I am going to talk about the intent behind these amendments. They are about creating a safeguard. We know that the government can put an unrestricted firearm in the category of restricted firearms, for example. We wanted it to be a bit more difficult to do the opposite, that is, to put a restricted firearm in the unrestricted firearms category. So the purpose of this amendment is to create a kind of additional safeguard by ensuring that this decision must be made by the House.

However, from what I understand, when a regulation is made by the Minister, for example, we, the members of the committee, receive the information relating to it and we can ask the Minister to come to testify on the subject. That is a somewhat interesting option, similar to the one the committee might choose if it wanted to study the report from the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians, the NSICOP, for example.

This is somewhat how I see this amendment, although it does not necessarily give us any power. The intent is to create a safeguard relating to declassifying restricted firearms. However, I will let you do what you have to do, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** All right. I had thought that this also imposed a charge on the treasury, but it doesn't. The notes say that it would be inadmissible because it goes beyond the scope of the bill. However, the House has given us enormous latitude and scope, so I think we'll debate this and consider it admissible at this point.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I am very grateful.

If my colleagues have questions, I invite them to ask them. That will be all for me.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you, Chair.

This is the amendment that would refer regulations to the committee. Is that correct?

Perhaps the officials could tell us what the process is now for regulations that are passed. I think that would be helpful in understanding. It's my understanding that we...

I'll let you explain it. You'll do better than I would.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Thank you for the question.

I'll start in French to clarify some of the points that Madam Michaud made.

[*Translation*]

I want to point out that when the government makes amendments to classify a firearm, it is not applying the regulations relating to the

application of the Firearms Act. The classifications are actually found in the Criminal Code, and when the regulations that allow them to be amended are applied, they come under the Criminal Code. However, the information about those regulations is not transmitted to the committee at present. So the information relating to the regulations that allow changes like the ones being considered to be made could not be transmitted to the committee.

• (2340)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Madam Michaud.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In view of the answer that Ms. Mainville-Dale has just given, I understand that I should perhaps have proposed these amendments when we were examining the part of Bill C-21 that related to the Criminal Code, and that now, these amendments do not really apply.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I would also like to point out that this is very unusual.

Under the normal regulatory processes, the statutory instrument gives the government or the Governor in Council the power to make regulations in accordance with the process in place.

[*English*]

Now I will answer in English with regard to what the normal process is for regulations.

Normally in legislation, regulation-making authority is given to the Governor in Council. The government uses those authorities to propose regulations. It goes to Canada Gazette, part I. Canadians are consulted, and they have a chance to make comments. Then it goes back for approval.

In the case of the Firearms Act, any regulations that are made under the Firearms Act are required to be not only tabled in Parliament but also referred to committees of both houses of Parliament. The amendments proposed here propose to change it to not both houses of Parliament but just the House of Commons. The current regulation-making powers in the Firearms Act require that the regulations be referred to a committee and after 30 sitting days "may be made".

It's up to the committee whether it decides on, or makes, any interventions with the government. The change that is proposed here would require the approval of this committee, because it is only the House of Commons that is included in this proposed amendment.

**The Chair:** You may carry on, I believe.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Since we have not much time left and not many amendments to examine, I will not move amendments BQ-25.1 and BQ-25.2. That way we will maybe save a bit of time.

[English]

**The Chair:** I believe we have unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment and the next one.

(Amendment withdrawn)

(Clause 46 agreed to on division)

(On clause 47)

**The Chair:** Is there a question on clause 47?

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Yes.

Can the officials give us an explanation of the impact of this clause?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Thank you for the question.

With regard to clause 47, this provision specifies that individuals who would not be eligible to acquire handguns under the proposed restrictions, i.e., non-exempted persons, would still be able to acquire any handguns that they purchased in the period between the tabling of the bill and its date of coming into force.

It is basically just a clarification. However, I will note that the government did bring into force regulations last fall, in October 2022, which brought into effect the restriction on handgun transfers.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** What is the relation between the regulation that was in place in October and this amendment?

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** I'm not sure which one would apply first. Maybe I can lean on my colleagues from Justice for that.

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** With respect to clause 47, it's transitional with respect to what's in the Firearms Act. Basically, if you have initiated that process in advance of the coming-into-force date, that process should continue in the sense that the new provision that comes into force while that process is under way wouldn't apply.

I think what my colleague is referring to is that as of the institution of the regulatory handgun freeze, there won't be a lot of those cases.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** This is not going to retroactively punish anyone.

**Mr. Sandro Giammaria:** No.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Okay.

That can go on division.

**The Chair:** Very well.

(Clauses 47 and 48 agreed to on division)

(On clause 49)

**The Chair:** For clause 49 we have the availability of the CNSC, if they would like to join us at the table. They have been waiting. These guys have been waiting for months.

If my notes are correct, from the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission we have Pascale Bourassa, acting director general, directorate of security and safeguards; and Pierre-Daniel Bourgeau, counsel, legal services.

Shall clause 49 carry?

• (2345)

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I would just ask the witnesses here, who have been watching this whole time, if there's anything they'd like to say about this clause and what the impact will be on their sector.

**Ms. Pascale Bourassa (Acting Director General, Directorate of Security and Safeguards, Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission):** Thank you for giving the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission the opportunity to respond to your questions.

I'd like to make a general statement with respect to the proposed amendments to the Nuclear Safety and Control Act. This is to put in place better clarity on an already existing scheme that we have in place for the security of nuclear facilities across Canada.

Basically, it's bringing two changes. One is to give the commission the opportunity to designate peace officers for our nuclear security officers, and the second is making provisions to authorize our designated licensees to be able to purchase arms.

This is the gist, if you want, of the amendments that are being proposed.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Thank you.

Before I turn it over to my colleague and use up all the Conservative time, I worry that this amendment, which I think is positive.... I worry about where these members of yours are going to be able to purchase any firearms in this country after this bill passes. We'll see. Maybe there will be a specialty store just for nuclear safety personnel.

Thank you. I'll pass it on.

**The Chair:** Mr. Kurek, go ahead.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Thank you, Chair.

To make a general comment, I find it really ironic and somewhat troubling, quite frankly, that we're having to seek carve-outs—in this case for a federally regulated space, and justifiably so—that would allow for firearms to be purchased. It's troubling that the government seems to be carving out these things.

Of course, I know that we in this place all appreciate very much the security personnel and peace officers who work diligently on our streets. I know of the tragedy that struck one of them earlier today.

There are a whole host of concerns. We're telling Canadians that they cannot use firearms or handguns, but we're anticipating and even carving out areas of society where we expect them to protect us. The irony is rich and, I think, very unfortunate. It speaks to some of the flawed logic and ideology that is driving this legislation. It certainly leaves a sour taste in the mouths of many of my constituents and, I would suggest, many across the country, including in many Liberal ridings as well. It's surprising, Mr. Chair.

I have a question for these folks.

Ironically, when I get an email from somebody in Toronto asking me to fight on their behalf because their MP won't return their emails or calls, man, it's quite a situation. It's because they're a sport shooter or a collector, or it's because they fall within this designated category of which the Liberals have said it's no longer acceptable to be able to practise their sport—whatever the case is. I think that's really very unfortunate.

Mr. Chair, I would ask the question in relation to the constitutional provisions that designate the responsibility for firearms to provinces.

I'm wondering whether our folks from the nuclear commission, and maybe our departmental officials as well, can comment as to where this overlap between provincial licensing and the carve-out for nuclear facilities and designated peace officers would be.

• (2350)

**Ms. Pascale Bourassa:** Nuclear installations are federally regulated. Hence, we were proposing amendments that will allow this federal approach to ensuring that the nuclear installations—high-security sites across Canada—have efficient and effective nuclear security programs in place. Because it's federally legislated, then we apply this federal approach.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Thank you.

I would like to follow up, if I could, Chair.

**The Chair:** You have 34 seconds.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Okay. Thank you.

Are there peace officers, designated law enforcement personnel, on these federally regulated facilities currently? If so, what level of government are they certified under?

**Ms. Pascale Bourassa:** There are some nuclear security officers who have peace officer status in some provinces at the provincial level.

What we're trying to achieve here is to have a consistent, federal, uniform approach, so that all the installations across Canada will have peace officer status at the federal level.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Can you list the provinces where this would currently apply?

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, but there's no more time.

We will go to Mr. Julian and then Madame Michaud.

Mr. Julian.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As we talk about this clause, I just want to thank you and all members of the committee.

We've gone through almost all the amendments, with a half-dozen minor amendments to come, and an important one upholding the rights of indigenous people, which I'm sure will be accepted unanimously. That's been quite an endeavour over the last couple of days.

You've led us brilliantly, Mr. Chair. I'd like to thank the officials as well.

We got through all the volume. We had 178 pages when we started this yesterday. We got through everything. It's quite remarkable.

As we consider this, one of these last clauses, I want to thank everybody for working together really effectively. I think it is a good indication of how strong our democracy is when we work together.

Most of the amendments that were adopted were adopted with the support of all four parties. That shows real co-operation and engagement in making the bill better. The bill coming out of committee is much better than the bill that came in.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Julian, and thanks on behalf of everyone you thanked.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** I hadn't asked to have the floor, Mr. Chair.

However, I will use my time to offer my own thanks to the members of the committee, and especially to the officials, who have been here for several days. I also want to thank all the technicians, the interpreters, the clerks, and the analysts, who have also been here for several consecutive hours. I am extremely grateful to them.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Mr. Julian started some thank yous, and I know, when we get to midnight, that the way we're doing this is going to change a bit. We won't get an opportunity to speak to the amendment in the bill that ensures that we're not derogating indigenous people's section 35 charter rights.

However, mostly I just want to say thank you to our colleagues, to the chair, to the clerks, to the legislative clerks and to the officials who have been so kind, so patient and so incredibly knowledgeable in guiding us through this. It's a long time that we've all been sitting here, and we are internally grateful for the dedication that you, as public servants, have to what you do for our country. Thank you for helping guide us through this bill.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

It's great to hear these sentiments. It kind of feels like we're done, except we're not. We have “miles to go before [we] sleep”. Let us go back to the business at hand.

Shall clause 49 carry?

(Clause 49 agreed to on division)

**The Chair:** Shall clause 50 carry?

Mr. Lloyd.

• (2355)

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Thank you.

I don't want to be the only party that doesn't get to say anything. I want to thank the officials. I know there have been a bunch of late nights. There have been many months of engagement on this. I want to thank our able committee staff for their dedication and the late nights and with regard to all the requests we make. I know it's not easy. I want to thank the interpretation staff, as well. I know that a lot of these are very highly technical terms, but I don't think we've had a single serious translation problem—well, not many—so I want to say that's a testament to the professionalism of the translation staff.

One thing I will say is that there were some things in this legislation that... You know, I don't believe that this was the best way to get through this. This is a very complicated piece of legislation, and a lot of these things are going to impact people in very serious ways. We're talking about changes to the Criminal Code. We're talking about changes to the Firearms Act that carry criminal penalties. To speed through these things in five minutes.... It's certainly efficient, as the government wants it. However, we're trying to build legislation for our country, and it's serious legislation that has serious impacts on folks. Despite opposing the overall agenda of the government on this front, as Conservatives I think we came here with a genuine desire to try to mitigate the damage to law-abiding firearms owners in this country. I don't think we were successful overall, but this will continue. I look forward to future debates, because I think there's a lot of improvement that needs to be made.

With that, I want to thank our colleagues from all parties. It's been a lot of long nights together, and there have been a lot of strong disagreements on things. A lot of people email our offices—I'm sure we all get them—and say, "Why can't you guys all get along better?" I say to them that this is what parliamentary democracy is about. It's not about everyone agreeing about everything. It's about everyone standing up for what they believe in, pushing up against each other in debate. The country gets not the perfect thing—and, certainly, Conservatives think that this legislation is far from perfect—but something that somewhat resembles the will of the nation.

I appreciate the exercise that we've done here today. Unfortunately, it was time-allocated, so we weren't able to take the time needed to improve this legislation in the way that we would have wanted. However, I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and it's a real privilege to be a member of Parliament with this team of extraordinary people from across the country.

With that, I will close my remarks. Thank you, Mr. Chair, for all your hard work.

**The Chair:** Thank you. You've magically brought us to the witching hour. It is 11:59.

(Clause 50 agreed to on division)

**The Chair:** We've reached the point where there's no further debate. Given that there are no amendments for clauses 51 through 69, may we have unanimous consent to carry them all?

• (2400)

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Chair, we want to go through each clause.

**The Chair:** Shall clause 51 carry?

(Clause 51 agreed to on division)

**The Chair:** For clause 52, I thank the members from the CNSC for joining us. Theoretically, at this point, we have the members from the CBSA here as well. We can't ask them questions, of course, but I would certainly like to....

From the Canada Border Services Agency, we have Mr. Jeff Robertson, who has valiantly stuck around for these many hours and days, even. Thank you for coming. Mr. Robertson is the manager of the inadmissibility policy unit in the strategic policy branch. Unfortunately, there is no more debate, but thank you.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** You can have a quick point of order.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** I just note that we have a witness before the committee who, by nature of the motion that was passed in the House, is not allowed to give testimony.

**The Chair:** Thank you for your point of order.

(Clauses 52 to 54 inclusive agreed to on division)

(Clauses 55 to 57 inclusive agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I have a point of order. Do the officials still need to stay, since we cannot ask them questions?

**The Chair:** I think that's a valid point.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** We're just keeping track.

Are we allowed to stay?

**The Chair:** You are absolutely allowed to stay.

**Ms. Rachel Mainville-Dale:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** We welcome your company. We appreciate your company, but I think it is the sense of the committee that, if you wish to leave, you are free to do so. Thank you.

Again, we really appreciate all the time you've spent. We're going to need to have a reunion one of these days, but not at midnight.

We are on clause 58.

(Clauses 58 to 60 inclusive agreed to on division)

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** For clause 60, I want it known that I said, "of course".

**The Chair:** That will be in the minutes, I'm sure.

We'll continue, starting with clause 61.

(Clauses 61 to 64 inclusive agreed to on division)

(Clauses 65 and 66 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clauses 67 and 68 agreed to on division)

(Clause 69 agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

(On clause 70)

• (2405)

**The Chair:** That brings us to clause 70. We have four amendments. On CPC-25—

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I'd like a recorded vote.

**The Chair:** It's a recorded vote on CPC-25.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Next is CPC-26.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I'd like a recorded vote.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair: The Chair:** Next we go to CPC-27.

Is that on division...?

**An hon. member:** Hold up.

**The Chair:** I think we need a recorded vote on this.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** We're now on CPC-28.

• (2410)

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I'd like a recorded vote.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 70 agreed to on division)

(On clause 71)

**The Chair:** That brings us to CPC-29.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I'd like a recorded vote.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Next is CPC-30.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I'd like a recorded division.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Turning to CPC-31, I expect we'll need another recorded division.

**An hon. member:** Indeed.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 71 agreed to on division)

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Go ahead.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Did we miss one? Was it G-44.1?

**The Chair:** That's new clause 72.1. Thank you for keeping us awake here.

We're on clause 72.

(Clause 72 agreed to on division)

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** What happened to clause 71? Did we pass that?

**The Chair:** I thought we passed that on division. Did we not?

**A voice:** We did.

**The Chair:** Okay. That brings us to new clause 72.1 in amendment G-44.1.

• (2415)

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** We request a recorded division.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(On clause 73)

**The Chair:** That brings us to clause 73 and amendment G-45. If—

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** It's withdrawn.

**The Chair:** Is amendment G-45 withdrawn?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** We are withdrawing it. G-45 is withdrawn.

**The Chair:** We now have G-45.1.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** We request a recorded division.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** That brings us to PV-14, which cannot be moved due to a conflict. PV-14 is blocked.

We'll vote on clause 73 as amended.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** We request a recorded vote.

(Clause 73 as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

New schedule G-46 has been withdrawn, so we get to the good stuff now.

Shall the title carry?

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I'd like a recorded division.

**The Chair:** Absolutely.

(Title agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

**The Chair:** Shall the bill as amended carry?

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I'd like a recorded division.

(Bill C-21 as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

**The Chair:** Shall the chair report the bill as amended to the House?

• (2420)

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I'd like a recorded vote. It's the last chance to stop this thing.

**The Chair:** There's actually one more chance.

(Reporting of bill to the House agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

**The Chair:** Shall the committee order a reprint of the bill as amended for the use of the House at report stage?

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** I'd like a recorded vote.

**The Chair:** This is the last one I'm giving you.

(Reprint of the bill agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

It has been a long and winding road that has led us to this point. I would like to thank you all. We all have the bruises, I know.

I would like to thank all of the committee staff in all the various shifts, our many clerks and legislative clerks, and our ever-patient witnesses. Thank you all and good night.

---







Published under the authority of the Speaker of  
the House of Commons

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

---

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité  
du Président de la Chambre des communes

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

---

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :  
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>