

From: William Rosbotham <[REDACTED]>
Sent: September 24, 2018 2:59 PM
To: Office of the Legislative Counsel
Subject: Bill 32 (correction of previous statement)

To Whom it my concern,

I would like to thank you for taking the time to read and consider my email. I recently learned that there has been movement to enforce Bill No. 32, Body Armour Control Act. While I appreciate and support the concern for police safety, this piece of legislation seems very close-minded in scope and appears to create law based on some preconceived notions of use and effectiveness of body armour.

To begin, I would like to address the very definition of what is declared body armour within this bill:

(a) "body armour" means

(i) a garment or item designed, intended or adapted for the purpose of protecting the human body from projectiles discharged from a firearm, as defined in the Criminal Code (Canada),

(ii) a garment or item designed, intended or adapted for the purpose of protecting the human body from an item or object used to, or adapted to, stab, pierce, puncture or otherwise wound the body, or

(iii) a prescribed garment or item;

With a definition as broad as (ii), this might be anything from sports equipment, leather riding equipment, fencing equipment, archery greaves, gloves for hawk or dog training, or even the costumes worn by historical re-enactors or role-players. When definitions are this broad, they only draw the long arm of the law onto unsuspecting citizens and create expensive and embarrassing court battles for everyone involved. If nothing else, this bill must be made more clear as to its intent.

Additionally the list of those authorized to possess body armour within this legislation should also be addressed:

(a) police officer;

(b) a conservation officer;

(c) a special constable or by-law enforcement officer appointed under the Police Act;

(d) a sheriff or deputy sheriff;

(e) a correctional services employee;

(f) a security agent;

(g) a security agency;

(h) the holder of a valid body armour seller's permit; or

(i) a prescribed person or a member of a prescribed class of persons.

It is extremely clear that this bill seeks to claim that only those directly serving the province should be entitled to possess body armour; however, this does not address the much larger list of who should be afforded the protection of this safety equipment. Mechanics and HVAC personnel may use Kevlar coverings and protective clothing when working with high-pressure lines. Those taking part in shooting sports on a range may use body armour as a part of their personal protective equipment in order to protect them from any ricochets or spalding from metal targets. Even the modern hunter may wear a plate or Kevlar underneath their bright orange vest, because accidents can happen. These people are not second-rate citizens on account of them not directly serving the province, nor are they criminals seeking to subvert our lawful society. They are everyday citizens looking to conduct their lives in the safest way possible. Should they be forced to turn in safety equipment that they paid money, and sales taxes, to possess? This bill treads very close to the charter rights of which politicians seem so proud of but continue to ignore or do their best to loophole. Bills like these make a mockery of our so called "rights". The utter madness of banning passive protective equipment that is designed to save lives just seems crazy to me.

Finally the effective enforcement of this bill seems to be almost impossible without some form of overly aggressive police tactics. This is the most naive and ill informed part of the bill. Who hands in their body armour? Why the mechanics, hunters, sport shooters, re-enactors, animal trainers, archers, and fencers that we have seen above, compensation free, while criminal elements remains a criminal element. They can freely obtain body armour from other provinces or nations, as it is generally seen as protective equipment in other jurisdictions, and the spirit of this bill is subverted. The only for certain fate that this bill strikes into motion is that everyday citizens will not have access to safety equipment and that they will have to turn in any armour that they possess for no compensation.

I hope that you reconsider the effectiveness, nature, and spirit of this bill. Otherwise all my hopes in common sense legislation and politics will be lost.

Regards,

William Rosbotham

From: William Rosbotham <[REDACTED]>
Sent: September 23, 2018 12:58 PM
To: Office of the Legislative Counsel
Subject: Bill 35

To Whom it my concern,

I would like to thank you for taking the time to read and consider my email. I recently learned that there has been movement to enforce Bill No. 35, Body Armour Control Act. While I appreciate and support the concern for police safety, this piece of legislation seems very close-minded in scope and appears to create law based on some preconceived notions of use and effectiveness of body armour.

To begin, I would like to address the very definition of what is declared body armour within this bill:

(a) "body armour" means

- (i) a garment or item designed, intended or adapted for the purpose of protecting the human body from projectiles discharged from a firearm, as defined in the Criminal Code (Canada),
- (ii) a garment or item designed, intended or adapted for the purpose of protecting the human body from an item or object used to, or adapted to, stab, pierce, puncture or otherwise wound the body, or
- (iii) a prescribed garment or item;

With a definition as broad as (ii), this might be anything from sports equipment, leather riding equipment, fencing equipment, archery greaves, gloves for hawk or dog training, or even the costumes worn by historical re-enactors or role-players. When definitions are this broad, they only draw the long arm of the law onto unsuspecting citizens and create expensive and embarrassing court battles for everyone involved. If nothing else, this bill must be made more clear as to its intent.

Additionally the list of those authorized to possess body armour within this legislation should also be addressed:

- (a) police officer;
- (b) a conservation officer;
- (c) a special constable or by-law enforcement officer appointed under the Police Act;
- (d) a sheriff or deputy sheriff;
- (e) a correctional services employee;
- (f) a security agent;

- (g) a security agency;
- (h) the holder of a valid body armour seller's permit; or
- (i) a prescribed person or a member of a prescribed class of persons.

It is extremely clear that this bill seeks to claim that only those directly serving the province should be entitled to possess body armour; however, this does not address the much larger list of who should be afforded the protection of this safety equipment. Mechanics and HVAC personnel may use Kevlar coverings and protective clothing when working with high-pressure lines. Those taking part in shooting sports on a range may use body armour as a part of their personal protective equipment in order to protect them from any ricochets or spalding from metal targets. Even the modern hunter may wear a plate or Kevlar underneath their bright orange vest, because accidents can happen. These people are not second-rate citizens on account of them not directly serving the province, nor are they criminals seeking to subvert our lawful society. They are everyday citizens looking to conduct their lives in the safest way possible. Should they be forced to turn in safety equipment that they paid money, and sales taxes, to possess? This bill treads very close to the charter rights of which politicians seem so proud of but continue to ignore or do their best to loophole. Bills like these make a mockery of our so called "rights". The utter madness of banning passive protective equipment that is designed to save lives just seems crazy to me.

Finally the effective enforcement of this bill seems to be almost impossible without some form of overly aggressive police tactics. This is the most naive and ill informed part of the bill. Who hands in their body armour? Why the mechanics, hunters, sport shooters, re-enactors, animal trainers, archers, and fencers that we have seen above, compensation free, while criminal elements remains a criminal element. They can freely obtain body armour from other provinces or nations, as it is generally seen as protective equipment in other jurisdictions, and the spirit of this bill is subverted. The only for certain fate that this bill strikes into motion is that everyday citizens will not have access to safety equipment and that they will have to turn in any armour that they possess for no compensation.

I hope that you reconsider the effectiveness, nature, and spirit of this bill. Otherwise all my hopes in common sense legislation and politics will be lost.

Regards,

William Rosbotham