Good morning your honor—im happy to be here and im relieved that so long ago you gave me permission to speak in my own words, in order to represent my self to the best of my ability…

when the detrimental impacts of this impugned regulation, on Canadians such as myself, is considered in it’s entirety–I’m confident that the interests of justice demand that we must receive some form of relief. I am not going to spend much of our short time demonstrating the first part of the RJR MacDonald test. 7 or 8 parties have already submitted detailed applications laying out the grounds for this review, and the facts of our belief—we do not bring this proceeding and allegations lightly, these proceedings come at a great personal cost….but it is our only recourse and- it is the right thing to do.

I believe the evidence proves the relatively low threshold for meeting the first part of the test has been satisfied--- it’s very clear we have a serious issue to be tried. Using only the AGC’s own evidence-- we can see there is a serious issue to be tried here…sure, they’re trying to minimize just how serious—they minimize the amount of Canadians affected, the magnitude of the damage-- but they cannot deny or hide its impacts altogether.

Evidence Number 1) Mr. Smiths testimony at para 16 of his affidavit and exhibit C, (the AGC’s witness admits a letter was mailed to 2.2 million individuals who may be affected by this Regulation ) acknowledgING that at bear minimum the property of 72,000 Canadian RPAL holders (and around 40,000 PAL holders) has been seized—we purport unreasonably. Why is it unreasonable? Because it is based upon fraud and false pretenses---In Mr. Smiths verbal testimony he states that REF “he cannot recall an instance of any AR 15, or any firearm capable of launching a projectile at over 10,000 J of energy or with a bore diameter larger than 20 mm ever being used in a mass shooting or any murder in Canada,” so using the common sense approach available to me, I can assert they have been NO danger to public safety thus far--..Mr. Smith also answers that our property no longer belongs to us and if not for the Amnesty order we would be in criminal possession of that property right now—

(the AGC downplays the number of affected shop owners and the hundreds of thousands of unknown individuals who currently own one of the previously non restricted firearms or would like to own one, sometime in the future) as Mr. Beaulieu had pointed out upon his cross examination. But there are some clues for those who care to look—for example e petition-2574, which received more signatures than any other in Canadian history, (ref # 36 in my NCQ) confirms at least 266,000 people are so affected by this regulation as to sign the petition against it.

Evidence 2) In the RIAS, following the OIC in the Gazette, which the AGC says this court can rely on as evidence--- they cite The 2018 Commissioner of Firearms Report “that there are 4442 licenced firearms businesses, AND a Sept 2019 Conference Board of Canada study that show “sport shooting and hunting contribute almost 6 billion to Canada’s GDP, as well as nearly 3 billion in labour income. The sport shooting and hunting industries also support approximately 48000 jobs.” Now According to multiple affidavits filed in FC this regulation has decimated the sport shooting industry and harmed the hunting industry as well… That Conference Board of Canada report “The Economic Footprint of Angling, Hunting, Trapping and Sport Shooting in Canada, an estimated 1.4million Canadians participate in legal sport shooting (I might add more people sport shoot, than participate in golf, hockey or soccer)…, again, the Respondent is trying to minimize the damage done to us, by dishonestly stating—“the impacts on Canadians may be mitigated by increases in purchases of new firearms that are not being prohibited”

We all know that is bologna, given the change clause. The phrase “**There is also a risk that affected firearms owners may elect to replace their firearms with models unaffected by the ban,** causing a market displacement. **This risk may be mitigated by adding additional makes and models to the list of prohibited firearms in the future**”.

This statement alone speaks volumes--it betrays the truth of the matter—logically the GiC did not prohibit these firearms because they are more deadly than any other firearms, we believe the goal is to eventually ban all firearms or as many of them as possible, they do not want nor intend for us to replace them. The phrase “present in large volumes in the Canadian market” indicates the GiC is NOT prohibiting these firearms because they hold an opinion that these firearms have become unreasonable for use in hunting and sport shooting, but simply based on their prevalence, number or popularity, the phrase “tactical design” betrays a criteria of arbitrary visual characteristics…and By Canada signing onto UN documents which clearly state they are trying to reduce the lawful ownership and use of firearms, as well as the unlawful—it becomes clear their intention, the pith and substance of this regulation-- has nothing to do with public safety or the reasonability of use of these firearms. they respond that these firearms are capable of causing serious harm to a person—so they must be prohibited but—all firearms are capable of doing that. Make no mistake their intention and purpose is to kill Canadian gun culture--my culture—it’s death by a thousand cuts.

-Firearms control legislation and property regulation has often been recognized as a serious issue to be tried in past Canadian law precedence.

There is no doubt the Gov can enact legitimate CC regulations, but how far can those regulations infringe on our human rights and property?

This is a serious issue.

3) Now I’d like to speak about our likelihood of success at the hearing on the merits and about the Respondents admission in para 120 of their written representations, referring to the Deschamps exhibits that “these exhibits were not submitted for the truth of their content” Our application and Notice of Constitutional Question clearly lay out the fact that we believe the regulation was enacted by way of fraud or under false pretenses…FC Act s 18.1 (4-d) “ says the FC may grant our relief if it is satisfied the decision being reviewed was made using an erroneous finding of fact, in a perverse or capricious manner without regard for the material before them. I believe that is a polite way of saying fraud.

Let me refresh our memory with the Criminal Code definition of fraud and that I plainly state, I believe, is what has been done to us.

**Fraud**

Marginal note:Fraud

* **380 (1) Every one who, by deceit, falsehood or other fraudulent means, whether or not it is a false pretence within the meaning of this Act, defrauds the public or any person**, whether ascertained or not, **of any property, money or valuable security** or any service,
  + **(a) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a term of imprisonment not exceeding fourteen years, where** the subject-matter of the offence is a testamentary instrument or **the value of the subject-matter of the offence exceeds five thousand dollars;**

.

* **Marginal note: Affecting public market**

**(2) Every one who, by deceit, falsehood or other fraudulent means,** whether or not it is a false pretence within the meaning of this Act**, with intent to defraud, affects the public market price of stocks, shares, merchandise or anything that is offered for sale to the public is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding fourteen years.**

**Marginal note: Sentencing — aggravating circumstances**

* **380.1 (1) Without limiting the generality of section 718.2, where a court imposes a sentence for an offence referred to in section 380**, 382, 382.1 or 400**, it shall consider the following as aggravating circumstances:**
  + (a) **the magnitude, complexity, duration or degree of planning of the fraud committed was significant;**
  + **(b) the offence adversely affected, or had the potential to adversely affect, the stability of the Canadian economy or financial system or any financial market in Canada or investor confidence in such a financial market;**
  + **(c) the offence involved a large number of victims;**
  + (c.1) the offence had a significant impact on the victims given their personal circumstances including their age, health and financial situation;
  + **(d) in committing the offence, the offender took advantage of the high regard in which the offender was held in the community;**
  + (e) the offender did not comply with a licensing requirement, or professional standard, that is normally applicable to the activity or conduct that forms the subject-matter of the offence; and
  + **(f) the offender concealed or destroyed records related to the fraud or to the disbursement of the proceeds of the fraud**.

In this case, my Exhibit Y, Y2 and Exhibit P, among others, prove that members of the GiC—such as the Hon Minister. Blair KNOW full well, that licensees possession of these firearms are not a threat and not a public safety risk—yet they disregarded that knowledge (and tried to conceal it) and came to this erroneous finding of fact (that the ban is necessary for public safety) using fraud, demonstrated in Exhibit L Prof Mausers and the late, great researcher Denis Young’s critique of the 2014 TO police FIESD study, by changing the definition of gun crime and crime gun in this country to include found guns and non violent administrative offenses. To knowingly call an administrative offense—violence – is fraud. To state that seizing these firearms from us is for the public good –and safety is wrong. One example of found crime guns, would be the 609 guns unlawfully seized by RCMP in High River Alberta. Another example of a crime gun now, would be an old timer who forgot to renew his license on time.

Exhibit Y the Reducing violent crime engagement paper, which was approved by Hon Minster Blair, then Minister of Border Security, states unequivocally

**“The vast majority of owners of handguns and of other firearms in Canada lawfully abide by requirements, and most gun crimes are not committed with legally-owned firearms”**

““Assault weapon” is not a legally defined term in Canada’s firearms legislation, Because assault weapon is not a legally-defined term, providing a count of how many are held in Canada is not possible. However, there are about 100,000 legally-owned restricted and prohibited non-handgun firearms – usually rifles and shotguns – registered to individuals. **Individuals own these in the context of sport shooting activities, because they form a part of a collection, or for hunting**.”

**Note the lack of owning them to kill people, just like Mr. Multani’s kirpan –our firearms are not symbols of violence and are not owned for such purposes.**

**“Jurisdictions differ in their approaches to controlling handguns and assault weapons**. For example, Australia and the UK have both enacted bans that limit or prohibit handguns. Federally, the US enacted a federal ban on assault weapons, but this ban expired in 2004 and no federal legislation to renew or replace the ban has since been enacted**. In all cases the data does not conclusively demonstrate that these handgun or assault weapon bans have led to reductions in gun violence**,

**From my NCQ—the Government of Canada’s own data**

**in general the evidence in A Literature Review on Illegal Firearms document and**

**the IFTF Report alone, recognizes Canadian gun control Legislation has not had a substantial effect on homicide rates is that the**

***“the law disproportionately affects people who were***

***already at a very low risk for criminality. This is supported by the finding that more than 80% of***

***firearm homicides in Canada are committed by persons using illicitly owned firearms****”*

(Dauvergne & DeSocio, 2008; McPhedran, Baker, & Singh, 2011).‖ 23.)

*“Similarly,* ***in 2007, Ontario’s Firearms Tracing and Enforcement Program (FATE) traced 705***

***crime guns, of which 90% were prohibited or restricted. In this sample, 69% were traced to the***

***United States***(Heemskerk & Davies, 2008).‖23.) that does not mean 29% was from Canada

*“****In another study examining 1,929 guns seized by the police in Quebec between 2010 and 2011****,*

*86% of the firearms were crime guns and 65% were handguns (Morselli & Blais, 2014).*

*Importantly,* ***of the 1,595 firearms where information about where the gun originated was available, 83% were from the United States****, while only 16.7% were sourced from Canada”*

(Morselli& Blais, 2014)23.)

From Exhibit Y2 (Youngs ATIP request)- PS Question and Answer period (2017 Bill C-71) PAGE 952-956 of my Motion Record

**Q6. Why are owners of the CZ 858 and Swiss Arms rifles eligible for grandfathering? Is**

**there a risk to public safety?**

A6. **Individual owners have, to the Government's knowledge, been in possession of CZ or SA**

**firearms without significant incident, with one exception (If pressed: 2012 attack on Parti**

**Quebecois leader Pauline Marois).** Add SIDE NOTE Smiths chart Allowing individuals to retain their firearms would be

contained to a limited pool of qualified individuals. Moreover, this pool through attrition

will shrink over time, as these firearms cannot be bequeathed to next of kin. Additionally,

as all models of these firearms will be classified as prohibited, stricter licensing

requirements and transportation controls will now apply to these firearms in the interest

of public safety.

**Q7. Are there alternatives to grandfathering?**

**A 7. The Government considered a number of options but in the end, given the safety record**

**of these owners and significant investments made** (i.e., a CZ-858 can be worth up to

approximately $1000 CAD; a Swiss Arms rifle up to approximately $4000 CAD), **the**

**Government decided this was the best course of action,** given the additional safety

requirements being imposed.

**Q15. Why are we leaving these firearms in the public domain?**

Al 5. **Out of fairness to the firearms owners affected, the government has decided to allow**

**those who meet eligibility requirements to retain their firearms via grandfathering.**

**Owners of the affected firearms will need to meet licensing and registration requirements**.

to own these firearms, and will not be able to transfer their firearms, other than to

individuals also within the grandfathered pool. Consequently, these firearms will be

removed from circulation in Canada via attrition. This approach will ensure both the

enhancement of public safety, and reasonable, practical treatment of affected firearms

owners.

Question 3 from that series is interesting, as is the entire document actually

**Q3. How does this initiative impact firearms used in recent tragic events, like the AR-**

**15?**

A3. **In Canada, the AR-15 is classified as restricted in accordance with the criteria defined in**

**the *Criminal Code.* Restricted firearms are tightly controlled, and individuals who**

**possess them are subject to a number of requirements set out in laws and regulations that**

**place emphasis on maintaining public safety**, including:

• having passed the Restricted Firearms Safety Course;

• thorough background checks, including interviews by the CFO, as needed;

• holding a valid firearms licence with privileges to possess restricted firearms; and,

• continuous eligibility screening.

**The Government has committed to allow firearms classification determinations to be**

**made by technical police experts. In alignment with this commitment, the Government**

**does not intend to change the classification status of the AR-15**.

**Is this why they chose the vague term un-named variants**

**Irreparable Harm**

**-the AGC was too confident of the heavy weight given to Gov Regulations, their track record of fraud, lies, manipulation and past rights violations --shouldn’t warrant such a heavy weight being given**

The Respondent seems fixated on the-financial harm Applicants are suffering—Wolverine with the—Pellarin and Beaulieu reports, our friend Mr. Baker at Iron Sights ,the Singers at Macabee…financial harm is but one small part-- they refuse to address the emotional harm we are suffering and have not addressed the cultural harm I carefully laid out in my affidavit. Regular citizens, communities and families, not only businesses are suffering irreparable harm…..

Exhibits B,C,D,E and F to my affidavit—prove that

—we are a culture with many members—Canadian gun culture exists and gun culture-- owning and shooting firearms, is Canadian history and heritage (so much so that sport shooting is featured on the 2010 Vancouver Olympics memorial quarter coin) and it’s our birthright—it is MY heritage and culture. (the right to participate in hunting and sport shooting is written into the law, it is granted by the CC and protected by s. 26 and 27 of the Charter), we fit the GoC def of a culture-which is distinctly defined as separate from race and ethnic origin—for some of us, belonging to and participating in gun culture is tied to our personal identity—

Those exhibits prove that our cultural values are primarily safety and law abiding behavior—we provide financial, physical and emotional support and security to our communities and to our country. Our contribution to public safety greatly outweighs any risk to it posed by us… We believe our culture is under attack, as laid out in my Exhibits G, I ,L ,M, O, R, V1 and V2—that our enemies are using slander , defamation, lies, sanctions, regulatory harassment, discrimination, and that a type of cultural genocide is being perpetrated upon us. Provincial Court judge Demetrick agrees with us—he noted in the case of R V Rogan that firearms possession, and I assert here--modern firearms, logically may be the ONLY way that some rural Canadians can protect their section 7 rights to life and security of the person. He also agrees that our world history of tyranny and genocide has shown us that the danger of having an imbalance of power, where only military and police have these firearms, greatly outweighs the danger of private possession of these firearms.

Harming our culture and destroying our cultural artifacts and practices and stopping us from passing those onto future generations is unacceptable, it violates Canadas multiculturalism act, s 27 of the Charter and can damage our mental health.

The Sworn affidavit of Peter Minuk para 21” since May 1 I have been unable to participate in the only pastime I was previously able to enjoy. As a result my quality of life has declined significantly.”

The sworn Affidavit of Lindsay Jamieson (Applicant in another case FC# T-677-20)

“para 9 SOR 2020/96 prohibited both his primary sporting rifle and primary hunting shotgun”

“para 13 this situation is causing me a great deal of anxiety and stress”

The sworn Affidavit of Nils Robert Ek (Applicant in another case FC# T-677-20)

“para 5 target shooting at the age of 12, always used various firearms” **gun culture**

**[para 20 “**my participation in hunting and sport shooting has been drastically and adversely affected, there are no other activities which can substitute for those experiences”

“para 25 the RIAS/change clause makes it clear that any replacement firearms will be seized, the reg is applied in a manner that makes it impossible for him to pursue his hunting and sporting activities”

The sworn Affidavit of Mark Nichol (Applicant in another case FC# T-677-20)

A certified range safety officer says para 16 “this reg had devastating consequences on sport shooting CQB, SRC…and devastating consequences on his ability to discuss his hobby, and he has suffered a loss of social gatherings and comraderie…” **(culture?)**

Para 19 and 20 “the only activity that the whole family enjoys, and that he has suffered a devastating (rather irreparable) loss of father son bonding time, and will continue to suffer”

This is only a small sample of the emotional harm done to us. This harm, the loss of trust in our government, the slander and defamation against us, the loss of our cultural venues and gathering places—firearm shops and shooting ranges and loss of our artifacts can never be undone—how is gun culture to survive if there is no where to shoot and no where to buy? How can they remove half of our equiptment and say that we are not harmed?

.

This case law is very relevant

In the case47 of Canada (Attorney General) v. PHS Community Services Society, 2011 SCC 44 the Federal Minister of Health had granted an exemption (to possession and trafficking of controlled substances) in the past, to the supervised injection site so that they could operate legally. The Minister had failed to reinstate the exemption and the consequences of that failure was an endangerment of the life, liberty and security of those clients. Factual evidence was relied on to show that in the 8 years of the supervised injection site’s operation, they had proven to save lives with no known impact on public safety or health. Since the injection site did not present a proven public safety risk (the refusal was not logically connected to public safety mandate) but would violate a charter right, it was found to be arbitrary and the Minister was forced to grant the exemption. There were those that argued that enabling the drug addicts to carry and use drugs in that area was a risk to public safety

and did increase crime, but that couldn’t be satisfactorily proven so the site was allowed to continue operate

–The AGC maintains we can avoid the loss of our liberty by simply following the law, well the parts of it we can understand anyways—the named, newly prohibited firearms. In the case precedence I have sited, AGC v PHS supervised injection site—we found that the minister of PS mandate is not to blindly enforce the law, his over riding mandate is public safety and in those unusual cases where the law is not in the interests of the public safety this must be remedied. The injection drug users were not told by the courts—your lives are not at risk—simply follow the laws against drug use and you can avoid overdosing. The facts and reality showed-- the supervied injection sites save lives and contribute to public safety—and did not considerably detract from it. As I hope the courts will find in the case of the licensee community

clarify s. 7 violations life and security (1-taking away our best means of defense and stopping us from training with those firearms—, 2-police confrontations and jail can be violent) and 3-our liberty –the courts have deemed it un-just to make a citizen chose between one charter right and another- in this case (either submit to an unreasonable seizure of our property or forfeit our liberty)

The FRT reclassifications have serious legal consequences ( demonstrated by Timmins letter), the vagueness of the terms in the Regulation “military assault style, unknown variant or modified version, and the fact that how to measure bore diameter and muzzle energy remains undefined at law—was a big known issue the SJCOSR complained and a private members bill was proposed- to remedy the vague terms…., they were ignored…this proves the terminology is purposefully vague.

The AGC states (at para 15) the term variants is not new and has been used in the 1998 regulations, that may very well be so, but the term un-named variants is new and is an unlawful subdelegation of authority to the RCMP-- the term is hopelessly vague and it allows the RCMP technicians—with no legal experience--and as little as a highschool diploma to prohibit firearms at will—it needlessly endangers our liberty…

The AGC has summed up our purported harms into 5 categories, ignoring the emotional and cultural aspects of harm we are facing—because they have no defense for that. They downplay removing our property and rights as only affecting our sports and hobbies, they refuse to acknowledge not only the diminished shooting skills of law enforcement and military members presenting a safety risk—but also my diminished shooting skills and removal of my primary means of defense and our primary means of recreation and my cultural artifacts.

**And now we come to the Balance of convenience stage which is reputed to be the hardest to achieve-given the heavy weight afforded to the government**

Restoring the status quo and temporarily restoring firearm owners’ rights and privilleges is the most convenient and just approach in this circumstance—nobody will be hurt by this-licensees are not shooting people down in the streets, nor the ranges nor hunting grounds. The court must weigh the aspects of a definite legal, financial, emotional and cultural harm done to us vs. the very rare occurrence (and I mean RARE, in smiths chart ~.925 ppl per year, many years with none) of a homicide being committed with one of our firearms. The AGC maintains the courts must presume the regulation was validly enacted until the applicants prove otherwise…I think the preponderance of evidence in our case shows that this is not merely gun control in the classic (FA sense) of keeping firearms out of the hands of those not qualified or incapable of using them safely --we are capable and qualified they have said so --this is a total theft on fraudulent grounds—the wording of the regulation has violated all of the fundamental principles of justice and the consequences of this regulation affects the rights and property of every single Canadian. The ends of this regulation does not justify the means, the ends being of no measurable benefit to anyone and of no logical connection to the means. We allege that no one benefits from this OIC but we suffer greatly.

-The Government, THE RCMP and PS have all but proven the balance of convenience for us, acknowledging that we are no danger to public security because we have their blessing to possess these firearms until 2022, and to use other firearms. By granting us licenses, and deeming us safe and responsible to possess and use firearms, which are no different from the newly prohibited ones, they have all but proven we are not a credible risk to straw purchase or become mass murders.

-our experts are valid and have signed the code of conduct form and do not have ties to pro firearms orgs, their only expert ( is compromised as a decision maker and an interested party) and they will not swear to the truth of the scientific contents of the academic studies they’ve used –Dr.’s Alper and Chapman are compromised, they are anti firearm activists. If the views of Drs. Langmann and Mauser are not representative of the academic and medical community at large as the AGC purports, why has the Respondent not produced an expert witness from that community to refute our experts?

I think the reason is no one wants to swear to academic dishonesty on the stand.

Dr langmann maintains that most ER gun shot wounds are gang related and occasionally self inflicted…

Dr . Mauser’s overwhelming body of evidence proves that

-public saftey and violent firearm crime will not be affected by the regulation

-90% of guns used in homicide are never owned lawfully or registered

-the use of firearms in homicides has been greatly exaggerated by the resspondent

-there is no evidence which provides for the necessity of a prohibition and in fact much evidence proving it’s detrimental effect

-millions of Canadians have possessed firearms legally and peaceably for over a century without issue

-firearms have important benefits for Canadians

-licensed owners do not pose a public safety threat, statistics Canada data proves, firearm licensees are less likley to commit murder than the average Canadian. PS is informed of these facts yet persists in denying and hiding this data.

-gang crime is responsible for gun crime, not lawful owners

-for example during the 14 (1998-2012) years of the long gun registry he proved, with a special stats can request-- that less than 9% of firearms used in homicides were attributed to domestic sources: these sources are all domestic sources combined not just licensees-- stolen from lawful owners/police/military, straw purchased by or used by the lawful owner to commit the murder.

-

Matt Hipwell “7 these early opportunities to participate in competitive sport shooting enriched him deeply” Dr Mausers exhibit from library parliament confirms this.

He asserts “he was able to excel in his RCMP firearms training because of his personal practice and family history of involvement ..

Paras 10-16 detail exactly how personal practice with these firearms has resulted in his career success and ability to meet stringent qualifications of shooting skills resulting in his RCMP FTI, ERT, SWAT career and keeping Canadians and delegates safe at the G8/G20 summits

Para 18—2013-2014 as an ERT and FI, he was qualified to assist with the roll out of RCMP police carbines which were deemed important to officers safety (and by extension public) safety.

Mr. Hipwell participating in what I call gun culture, I don’t know if he calls it that—has benefitted the safety of Canadians—not detracted from it. para 24 Mr Hipwells firearms experience and practice TO THIS DAY, Helps bolster public safety by providing sales and expertise to policing and security agencies. Wolverine loosing 30% of their profits, harms Canada and harms me directly.

In our case, the RCMP, CFP and the Minister of Public Safety, has granted us (firearm licensee’s and businesses) the privilege and right to use and possess these firearms for many decades past, so long as we did so within the confines set out in the reasonable and justifiable law (licensing, safety courses, registration). Those laws were deemed rationally connected to public safety, this OIC cannot be. The GiC has deemed our firearms reasonable and safe for many decades past, nothing has changed,. We rely on factual evidence to prove that we are not a risk to public safety and in many instances, we contribute to it. The RCMP, CFP and GiC has already recognized we are no threat, because they granted us the licenses, did background checks and allow us to still possess other firearms and the newly prohibited ones (until April 30, 2022). If our possession of these firearms is a public safety threat as they claim, why can we still possess those and other firearms? If we are at risk to become mass shooters or we illegally sell our firearms, why haven’t our licenses been revoked? There are those who are bias against us,who say we are a risk, just like about the drug users at the safe injection site, but they cannot prove it. We can prove we are not a threat using Mauser, Langman’s data and the Governments own data. Law makers and public officials have repeatedly stated that firearm licensee’s are overwhelmingly law abiding and pose no threat. Lives are at risk by this OIC, liberty and property is violated (metaphorically, physically) and our security is at risk.

As an example, in the affidavit of Anthony Bernardo, even the insurance companies deem the CSSA’s shooting activities low risk48. CSSA’s activities contribute greatly to the safety of Canadians by providing safety training courses and advice, as do many firearms, shops, organizations and shooting ranges (CCFR,Wolverine, KKS Tactical ect). Gun culture provides economic, ecological and physical benefit and is very low risk for accidents or violence—like the safe injection sites, there is no logical reason to harm or shut down our industries and venues, or needlessly jeopardize and violate our legal, property and equality rights.

We contribute to public safety and do not detract from it.

In para 19 (AGC written reps) and Mr. Smith maintains it is easy for the average firearm owner to determine if their firearm is prohibited under the auspices of muzzle energy and bore diameter…well let me tell you I am an average firearm owner (actually given my scores on the PAL and RPAL maybe above average) and it is not easy for me to determine this…

Earlier I said “Firearms control legislation and property regulation has often been recognized as a serious issue to be tried in past Canadian law precedence.” I’d note several things I found out reading the Supreme court judgments on FA 2000—they consistently define gun control as keeping firearms out of the hands of those incapable of using them safely –we are proven capable—this impugned regulation is not gun control at all, it’s a total theft on fraudulent grounds.

“The [*Firearms Act*](https://qweri.lexum.com/calegis/sc-1995-c-39-en) **The criteria for acquiring a licence are concerned with safety.  Criminal record checks and background investigations are designed to keep guns out of the hands of those incapable of using them safely.  Safety courses ensure that gun owners are qualified**.

**Parliament’s intention was not to regulate property, but to ensure that only those who prove themselves qualified to hold a licence are permitted to possess firearms of any sort.**

**ordinary guns are often used for lawful purposes**

**we found that “guns are property**”

**Hon. Fraser C.J.A. “ guns preserve lives and serve as useful tools**”

I do not merely question the wisdom of the regulation as the AGC is asserting, I question it’s legality, I don’t question whether the regulation is foolish, I question whether my property is being unreasonably seized under false pretenses. If the regulation didn’t hurt at least 120,000 ppl and violate our rights, the balance of convenience might be in the AGC’s favour, but since it is so detrimental to my culture and my countrymen and provides no benefit to anyone, we must obtain some relief before its too late to undo some of this damage.

Obj to Smith, already submitted in writing (oath, relevant decision maker, input in OIC) ADD

30 Oct 30, 2020 cross exams of Mr. Smith page 51 (para 17)- page 52 (para 17) and Nov 05,2020 page 81 (para 8)-page 82

(para 25)

On cross- exams Mr. Smith alluded to the Governments fears about licensee’s when he said people

possess AR 15’s for “defense” purposes and when he said that our 3 gun target competitions may not be

legitimate and that we might participate in them for some nefarious reason other than sport/competition

13 The term reasonable, again, being value-loaded,

14 would also require a consideration as to whether the

15 target competition in question was legitimate or not,

16 whether it was actually sporting or really meant for

17 some other purpose….

Mr smith is not only an employee of the respondent—he is the respondent

Sinister, proves he is bias and not impartial…he does not take our activities at face value…this is an insinuation that we are dishonest, and sneaky and potentially practicing target shooting for some other purpose than competition and sport, I wonder what he meant and had I caught it, I would have clarified with him…and in fact id like the chance to…

General Dispositions générales

**Onus on the accused Charge de la preuve**

117.11 Where, in any proceedings for an offence under

any of sections 89, 90, 91, 93, 97, 101, 104 and 105, any

question arises as to whether a person is the holder of an

authorization, a licence or a registration certificate, the

onus is on the accused to prove that the person is the

holder of the authorization, licence or registration certificate