

**CITY OF GREATER SUDBURY FIREARMS REGULATION TASK FORCE
INFORMATION SESSION AND PUBLIC INPUT
WARD 4**

**Garson Community Centre
100 Church St., Garson**

**Thursday, September 8, 2005
Commencement: 7:00 p.m.**

Chair **DR. DARREN STINSON, MEMBER, FIREARMS
REGULATION TASK FORCE, CHAIR**

Present J. Rivet, Member, Firearms Regulation Task Force; G. Lampi,
Member, Firearms Regulation Task Force

City Officials CJ Caporale, Council Secretary

Welcome and
Opening Remarks Dr. Stinson welcomed the twenty-two (22) people in
attendance and advised the purpose of the meeting was to
provide an opportunity for the public to provide comments and
suggestions on the proposed by-law to regulate the discharge
of firearms and other weapons in the City of Greater Sudbury.
He outlined the purpose of the Firearms Regulation Task
Force, what their mandate is and what the timelines are.

PUBLIC INPUT

Submissions were heard in the order that they appeared on
the Speaker's List.

Mr. Harvey
Quackenbush
William St., Garson

Mr. Quackenbush advised that his camp is located on
Bonanza Lake in MacLennan Township. He asked the Chair
if the new by-law will prevent the discharge of firearms within
the City of Greater Sudbury.

The Chair advised that currently there is no new by-law, that all
existing by-laws are still in effect.

Mr. Quackenbush stated that when the (former) Town of Nickel
Centre brought in a new firearms by-law, they wanted to
restrict the discharge of firearms by one mile for shotguns,
two/three miles for rifles in a residential area. If this new by-
law is passed, he would have to sell his camp, because he is
only two-three miles from Skead. The City of Greater Sudbury
has to understand our location. There is a lot of hunting and
bush country towards Kukagami. How are they going to
prevent no discharge of firearms within the City of Greater
Sudbury?

Mr. Harvey Quackenbush

William St., Garson
(continued)

He stated that he does not agree with the proposed by-law, that the existing by-law for Nickel Centre, which has a restriction of 1.5 miles from residential areas, should stay in effect. "If its not broken, don't fix it".

Mr. Rod Jarmovitch
Stacey Cres., Garson

Mr. Jarmovitch suggested that the Task Force look at all the various parameters of the existing by-laws, combine them, and bring back to the public for input. He stated that he has property on Red Deer Lake Road, which is well within the City limits, and the new by-law will deny him hunting or if a bear threatens his property, what is he suppose to do? He stated that he was amazed at the quality of the meetings, with nothing concrete to present to the public. He indicated that everything is being left to the public and that Council does not have to consider their recommendations, that this was an insult.

Mr. Don Boyer
O'Donaghue Dr.,
Garson

Mr. Boyer questioned whether or not native rights to hunt on Crown Land within the City of Greater Sudbury would be taken away once the new by-law is in effect.

The Chair advised that a municipal by-law does not supercede any provincial or federal laws.

Mr. Boyer indicated that Whitson and Garson Lakes are surrounded by a lot of Crown Land and is an area where many hunt bear, deer, moose and duck. With the new by-law, hunters would have to go further into the bush.

Mr. Boyer stated that it would not be right having a by-law that would remove BB guns and air guns from our young hunters. This type of gun teaches youth how to operate weapons and are more forgiving than a shotgun.

He also stated that the current by-law is a good by-law and should stay in effect. One mile is a reasonable distance for the discharge of firearms.

He also indicated that Nickel Centre has a gun range along Garson-Coniston Road, and a shooting range (Garson Rod & Gun Club) on Goodwill Drive, which would be affected.

The Chair advised that all organizations licensed or authorized by the appropriate Authority would be exempt.

Those present agreed that the discharge of a firearm within 1.6 km of five permanent residences was reasonable and that a greater distance be permitted for camps and hunt camps.

The 'Speakers' List' now complete, the Chair asked if there was anyone present who wished to address the Committee.

Mr. Hearley Hinds
Garson

Mr. Hinds indicated that there are areas within the City of Greater Sudbury that will require different rules, such as trappers' camps, which should be exempt, and allow residents to register their summer camps as hunt camps.

Mr. Robert Roy
Bowland's Bay

Mr. Roy advised that there should be exemptions for shotguns which do not carry far. Federal regulations allow hunters to fire lead shots if he is further than 400 meters, approximately 1500 feet, from any body of water. There is no reason why a shotgun can not be fired within 400 meters of any dwelling. Anyone who has a shotgun, rifle or any kind of weapon used for the purpose of hunting, knows through their training not to shoot in or near a residential area. These laws are regulated by the Federal and Provincial governments.

Mr. Roy indicated that the City of Greater Sudbury "has really put their foot into this". They are dealing with the Federal government, Canadian Firearms Centre (CFC), the Provincial government who regulate their hunting licences, and the Wildlife Management Units (WMU) which regulates where and when they can hunt.

Mr. Roy stated that if a "carte blanche" by-law is passed he would have to hunt in Gogama or further.

Mr. Andre Menard
Wahnapitae

Mr. Menard agreed with Mr. Roy's comments regarding the use of shotguns. He indicated that he has hunted partridge, rabbit, ducks, etc. for the past twenty years. Regarding safety, he indicated that when using air rifles and air pistols, if the proper backdrop is used in their backyard, there should not be a problem with someone getting hurt. In regards to shotguns, the distance in a residential area should be less than a rifle, this is safe. Rifles should have a farther area. The shooter is responsible for knowing what his backdrop is. Again the question is, has there been any accidents in the City of Greater Sudbury? One mile is too far for most firearms.

Mr. Mike Curran
Garson-Coniston
Rd.,
Garson

Mr. Curran stated that this Task Force is looking for common sense and different ways to determine what everyone has said. The Task Force will have to define rural and residential and determine the difference and also the difference between Crown Land, private land and public land and whether it is in a residential area or not. They will have to determine a safe distance for shotgun and for rifles. He indicated that in Southern Ontario, the different counties allow only rifles or shotguns because of the distance and power. The Task Force will have to consider the speed and velocity of the bullet and firearm concerned. When living in a rural area, the Task Force will have to determine the safe distance from the lot line. The City of Greater Sudbury has no right to dictate to landowners whether or not they can hunt on their own property.

Mr. Curran stated that roads will have to be considered regarding distance. Is the road paved, gravel, the distance from the centre line, etc. Use common sense.

He indicated that the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and the Greater Sudbury Police Services have no problem with status quo.

He stated that a buffer zone has to be created and considered a safety zone for both the resident and the hunter.

During amalgamation, the City of Sudbury advised Nickel Centre that all firearm by-laws would remain in effect.

A discussion with those present continued regarding distance, zoning, safety, responsibility, and whether or not existing by-laws have been upheld.

Mr. Haven Hinds
Skead Rd., Garson

Mr. Hinds indicated that Southern Ontario firearm by-laws should not be considered when determining the by-laws in Northern Ontario. These are two different areas.

Mr. Hinds stated that the provincial government does not require him to obtain a Firearms Acquisition Certificate (FAC) for a BB gun, airgun, etc., so why would the City require a permit?

Mr. Andre Menard
Wahnapitae

Mr. Menard questioned why no has considered by-laws in areas that have not amalgamated? He stated that the City of Greater Sudbury should consider the Federal/Provincial laws.

Mr. Robert Roy
Bowland's Bay

Mr. Roy stated that status quo has suited everyone for many years and that the need for a firearms by-law is not required. He indicated that exemptions should be for farmers, trappers, protection of property, etc. He is afraid we have an "urbanite Council and the people advising these Councillors will go with a big city attitude that firearms should be banned outright". He stated that the provincial and federal regulations have been good four many years.

He also stated that if you are in a safe zone and shooting away from a road, house, and have a proper backdrop, there is no reason why you can not hunt on your own property. The regulations are already in place. The City should take the best of the by-laws and amalgamate them for the greater good. He doesn't want to be told he can not hunt partridge in an area where there is no one.

Mr. Denis Michaud
Falconbridge

Mr. Michaud indicated that having different areas with different regulations, such as distance, location, etc. might be confusing.

Closing Remarks

Dr. Stinson advised that minutes of each of the public input meetings will be provided to the Task Force who will review all comments and prepare a report for Council. He thanked those present for their input at this meeting. He reminded everyone of the meeting at Tom Davies Square, Tuesday, September 13th, 2005.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Dr. Darren Stinson, Chair

Corrie-Jo Caporale, Recording Secretary