

**Minister Stockwell Day's
Canadian Firearms Advisory Committee
EKOS Firearms Survey**

Note: This document is a transcription from an Adobe Pdf document which is made up of computer screen shots. "Pdfp" followed by a number indicates what page in the original document this transcription represents.

Pdfp 1
Introduction

The Government of Canada has indicated its intention to make changes to federal firearms controls. These changes are to be implemented in a way that reflects the Government's commitment to reduce crime as well as improve efficiency of Canada's firearms laws.

The process to make changes to federal firearms controls is underway. Before legislative changes to firearms controls can be implemented, however, there is a need to consult interested stockholders.

The Government of Canada would like to get input regarding firearms controls to ensure that the legislation in this area continues to meet the needs of Canadians. As part of this consultation process you will be asked for your views on both the current system, as well as on some potential changes to the system. Your organization has been selected to take part in this research because it represents an interested stakeholder group. As such, we ask that when you are responding to the survey that you please frame your responses as representing the views of your organization. The questionnaire should take about 30-35 minutes to complete.

Please note all your responses will be kept completely confidential – your name or organization will never be linked to any of your responses. Comments and questions about the survey and future firearms legislation can be sent to: survey/sondage@psepc.gc.ca. If you have questions about the survey instrument, please feel free to call Mr. Andre Sullivan, Vice President, EKOS Research Associates In. at 1-800-388-2873 or send an email to : firearms@ekos.com

Thank you for taking the time to contribute to this important consultation process.

Pdfp2
Survey Instructions

- Unless otherwise indicated, you may provide only one answer per question
- On each screen, after selecting your answer, click on the continue or back buttons at the bottom of the screen to move forward or backwards in the questioner
- If you leave the survey before completing it, you can return to the survey URL later and enter your PIN, and you will be returned to the page from which you left. Your answers up to that point in the survey will be saved.
- If you wish, you can print each page of the survey as you fill it out.
- If you have any questions about how to complete the survey, please call EKOS Research Associates at 1800-388-2873 or send an email to firearms@ekos.com

Pdfp3

This section deals with firearms prohibitions

As you may know, a person can be prohibited from possessing firearms and regulated items (e.g. prohibited weapons, ammunition, explosives)

Prohibition orders are made by a criminal court and are either mandatory (to be imposed automatically upon conviction for specific offences) or discretionary (to be imposed in appropriate cases upon conviction for specific offences). A person can also be ordered not to possess firearms and other weapons as a preventative measure, for example as part of a condition of bail, probation, house arrest or peace bond.

When a prohibition order is made, any firearm **licence**, registration certificate, or authorization issued to the person is automatically revoked and unless otherwise specified, the items referred to in the order must be surrendered to the authorities or transferred to a valid **licence** holder.

Pdfp4

Before this survey, were you aware that the courts can issue orders to prevent certain individuals from possessing firearms?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp5

Prohibition orders are mandatory when a person is convicted of certain offences. This means that the courts cannot use discretion and must impose the prohibition order. Please indicate whether you support or oppose the courts having to impose a prohibition order for a person convicted of each of the following offences.

(For each of these questions, possible answers are:

1 Strongly oppose

2

3

4 Neither support nor oppose

5

6

7 Strongly support

Unsure

Prefer not to answer

- An offence in which violence against a person was **USED** and for which the person may be sentenced to **10 years in prison or more**.
- An offence in which violence against a person was **threatened or attempted** and for which the person may be sentenced to **10 years in prison or more**
- An offence with a firearm.
- An offence committed with an imitation firearm.

- Other serious firearms related offences such as weapons trafficking or smuggling.

(Pdfp6)

Other serious firearms related offences such as illegal possession of a restricted or prohibited firearm with ammunition.

- Drug trafficking or smuggling.
- Producing drugs.

Pdfp7

For other offences, the courts have the discretion as to whether or not they want to impose a firearms prohibition order. This means that when a person is convicted of other offences, it is up to the courts to decide if a firearms prohibition order is necessary. Please indicate whether you support or oppose the courts having discretion when it comes to issuing a prohibition order for a person convicted of each of the following.

(For each of these questions, possible answers are:

1 Strongly oppose

2

3

4 Neither support nor oppose

5

6

7 Strongly support

Unsure

Prefer not to answer

- An offence in which violence against a person was **USED** but for which the maximum prison sentence is **less than 10 years**
- An offence in which violence against a person **was threatened or attempted** but for which the maximum sentence is **less than 10 years.**
- Less serious offences that involve firearms such as unlawful storage.
- Less serious offences that involve firearms such as illegal possession (i.e. not being a **licence** firearms holder)

Pdfp8

There are other circumstances under which a court may issue a firearms prohibition order. For example, even where no charges against a person have been laid, the courts can impose preventative prohibition orders upon application by the police or a firearms officer when there are public safety concerns with respect to a person. They can also impose this type of order after a person's firearms have been seized and the court orders that they not be returned to the person. Would you say that you would support or oppose the courts issuing a firearms prohibition order on a person who has not been charged with any criminal offence, but who raises public safety concerns?

- 1 Strongly oppose
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither support nor oppose
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly support
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp9

As discussed, the issuing of firearms prohibitions order is currently **not** mandatory for all crimes, including some crimes involving violence. Please indicate whether you would support or oppose making firearms prohibition orders mandatory for a person convicted of each of the following offences.

(For each of these questions, possible answers are:

- 1 Strongly oppose
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither support nor oppose
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly support
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

- Any offence in which violence against a person was **used**, such as a bar fight.
- Any offence in which violence against a person was **used** such as domestic violence.
- Any offence in which violence against a person was **threatened**.
- Organized crime offences such as fraud or money laundering.

Pdfp10

The length of the prohibition order issued by the courts depends on the type of prohibition imposed.

- Mandatory prohibition orders remain in force for life with respect to restricted and prohibited firearms and at least ten years for non-restricted firearms. (e.g. , ordinary hunting rifle and shotguns)
- Discretionary prohibition orders remain in force for more than ten years.
- Preventative prohibition orders remain in force for no more than five years or, when they are made in the context of another order, such as a prohibition order, for as long as that order is in force.

Pdfp11

In the case of mandatory prohibition orders, would you support or oppose extending the lifetime prohibition to non-restricted firearms and not just restricted and prohibited firearms?

- 1 Strongly oppose
- 2

- 3
- 4 Neither support nor oppose
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly support
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp12

In the case of discretionary prohibition orders, would you support or oppose the courts being allowed to fix a duration they consider appropriate and not be bound by a **maximum of no more than 10 years**.

- 1 Strongly oppose
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither support nor oppose
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly support
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp13

In the case of preventative prohibition orders, would you support or oppose the courts being allowed to fix a duration they consider appropriate and not be bound by a **maximum of no more than 5 years**.

- 1 Strongly oppose
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither support nor oppose
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly support
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp14

In this section, you may provide any other comments you may have with respect to firearms prohibitions orders?

- Response (in space)
- No further comment.

Pdfp 15

Another way in which a person may be prohibited from possessing firearms is by order of the Chief Firearms Officer (hereafter, CFO s). CFOs are required to review and consider numerous eligibility

criteria in determining whether or not a person should be **licence** to possess and acquire firearms. The same is true when it comes to the revocation of an existing firearms **licence**. CFOs can refuse to issue a **licence** or revoke an existing **licence** based on convictions or discharges for violence, firearms offences, certain drug offences, criminal harassment, mental illness associated with violence, a history of violent behaviors, acts of domestic violence, and contravention of **licence** conditions. By refusing a **licence** or revoking an existing **licence**, the CFO has determined the person to be ineligible to possess firearms.

Pdfp16

Before this survey, were you aware that CFOs could refuse and revoke firearms **licence**?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp17

All valid firearms **licence** holders are subject to continuous eligibility monitoring. This means that police reports or violent incidents, even those where no charges are laid, can trigger the review of a **licence** holder's eligibility. If the incident is sufficiently serious by itself or, when considered with other factors identifies a pattern of concern, the individual's firearms **licence** can be revoked by a CFO and that individual must surrender or otherwise lawfully dispose of his or her firearms.

An eligibility review may also take place if the CFO is notified of public safety concerns by a professional or any member of the public. While such a notification can trigger a review, it does not automatically result in a **licence** revocation as the CFO must investigate the concern and exercise his or her discretion whether or not to revoke the **licence**.

CFOs are not enforcement officers. When a **licence** is revoked, the person is given a period of time to dispose of their guns or have the CFO's decision reviewed by a judge. The police of the local jurisdiction are notified when a **licence** is revoked. If the person does not take steps to dispose of their guns by the set time, they may be subject to criminal liability for illegal possession and the police can take whatever enforcement action they deem to be appropriate.

Pdfp18

For each of the following, please indicate whether or not you think that evidence of this type of behaviour involving a **licensed** firearms owner should result in a CFO revoking a firearms **licence**. (For each of these questions, possible answers are:

Yes

No

Unsure

Prefer not to answer

- Violent behaviour
- Mental illness or mental instability
- Participation in any form of criminal activity including illegal gambling, impaired driving, and petty theft.
- Uttering threats
- Posting threatening messages on the internet on blogs or websites.

Pdfp19

When CFOs revoke a **licence** it is for an indeterminate period. This means that individuals who have had their **licence** revoked and want to possess firearms again, must apply for a new firearms **licence**. The CFO must determine whether or not they will issue a new **licence**.

In your opinion, if someone has had their firearms **licence** revoked, do you think there should be a minimum amount of time before they are allowed to reapply for a **licence**?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp20

How long do you think they should have to wait before re-applying?

- Less than a year
- 1 to 2 years
- 3 to 5 years
- 6 to 10 years
- More than 10 years
- Indefinitely – they should never be able to get a **licence** again
- Depends on the nature of the offence
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp21

CFOs in every province are required to keep a record of prohibition orders issued by the courts and ensure that the automatic **licence**, registration and authorization revocations are documented. They are also responsible for keeping track of and issuing a Notice of Refusal to persons who applied for a **licence** after they are prohibited. It is the responsibility of the police to ensure that prohibition orders are ultimately enforced.

Pdfp 22

Before this survey, were you aware that CFOs were required to keep a record of prohibition orders, revocations and Notices of Refusal?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp23

When a prohibition order is issued, the CFO is notified and records the order. The following information about the prohibited person is included in the record: name, date of birth, type of prohibition order, length of prohibition order, and the date issued. Additionally, if the person has applied for a **licence** or is already a **licence** holder, this information is entered against them in a

firearms database. The information is also entered by the police into their own computerized databases.

Pdfp24

There are a number of potential things that could be done to change the tracking and monitoring of individuals who are prohibited from possessing firearms. Please indicate whether or not you would support or oppose each of the following initiatives.

(For each of these questions, possible answers are:

1 Strongly oppose

2

3

4 Neither support nor oppose

5

6

7 Strongly support

Unsure

Prefer not to answer

- The enhancement of a registry with all the names of individuals who are prohibited from possessing firearms.
- Requiring individuals prohibited from possessing firearms having to report changes in their place of residence to the police
- Requiring individuals prohibited from possessing firearms having to report to the police on a regular and ongoing basis
- Imposing monetary fines on individuals prohibited from possessing firearms if they do not provide information to a CFO in a timely manner

Pdfp25

When it comes to ensuring public safety, what kind of priority should be placed on improving the tracking and monitoring of individuals in Canada who are prohibited from possessing firearms?

- 1 Very low priority
- 2
- 3
- 4 Moderate priority
- 5
- 6
- 7 Very high priority
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp 26

In this section, you may provide any other comments you may have with respect to firearms safety training

- Response (space for the response)
- Unsure
- No further comments

Pdfp27

Since 2001, Canadians have needed to obtain a firearms **licence** if they want to: 1) possess a firearm, 2) register a firearm, and 3) obtain ammunition.

A **licence** must be kept current as long as an individual possesses a firearm.

There are 2 types of firearms **licence**: 1) Possession Only **licence** (POL) and 2) Possession And Acquisition **licence** (PAL)

- POLs allow individuals to use the firearms they currently own, but do not allow them to acquire new firearms. No new POLs are being issued. Only renewal of a POL is allowed.
- PALs allow for the acquisition and import of a firearm and are the only **licence** available to new applicants. As a general rule, applicants must meet the safety training requirements of the Canadian Firearms Safety Course to be eligible for this **licence**.

There are currently about 1.2 million POL **licence** holders in Canada. For the most part, these **licence** holders have already owned firearms for a decade and often longer. Under the current legislation, POL **licence** holders may purchase ammunition but they may not acquire new firearms unless they first acquire a PAL. Generally, this means that POL **licence** holders must first take the Canadian Firearms Safety Course despite their usually lengthy association with firearms. POL **licences** cannot be renewed once they expire. However, increasing numbers of POLs have expired without being renewed, putting their owners in the position of either upgrading to a PAL or turning in their firearms.

Pdfp28

Before this survey, were you aware of the difference between POLs and PALs?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp29

Would you say you support or oppose creating a single **licence** category that combines POLs and PALs into a single **licence** for those who are currently **licence** firearms owners?

- 1 Strongly oppose
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither support nor oppose
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly support
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp30

Before someone can even be considered eligible for a firearms **licence**, they must meet a number of basic requirements (i.e. minimum age and safety requirements). These next few questions explore these mandatory requirements

Pdfp31

Right now individuals who wish to apply for a firearms **licence** must be at least 18 years of age, individuals under 18 years of age are not allowed to acquire firearms by any means (i.e. gift, purchase). If they are between the ages of 12 and 17, they may, however, borrow firearms in certain cases if they obtain a “Minor’s **licence**” or under the direct supervision of a **licensed** adult.

Pdfp32

Before this survey, did you know that there was a minimum age for acquiring firearms?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp33

Would you say that you strongly oppose there being a minimum age for acquiring a firearms **licence**?

- 1 Strongly oppose
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither support nor oppose
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly support
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp34

Regardless of what the current age requirement is, what do you think should be the minimum age for obtaining a firearms **licence**?

() years

- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp35

In this section, you may provide any other comments you may have with respect to the minimum age for acquiring firearms **licence**.

- Response (space for the response)
- No further comment

Pdfp36

Firearms safety training is required for all first time **licensees** (i.e. everyone applying for a PAL) unless subject to alternate safety provisions.

There are two firearms safety training courses: 1) Canadian Firearms Safety Course (CFSC) and 2) Canadian Restricted Firearms Safety Course (CRFSC). Both courses teach firearms users about safe handling, social responsibilities, use, storage, display and transportation of firearms and ammunition. To be eligible for a **licence** to possess and acquire non-restricted firearms (i.e. PAL), applicants must have passed the written and practical test for the CFSC. They must also pass the test for the CRFSC to possess and acquire restricted or prohibited firearms.

Individuals who are 18 years of age and older are only required to meet the safety requirements (i.e. take the written and practical tests) once. This does not apply to individuals who have been prohibited from possessing a firearm at some point (they need to re-qualify)

In Manitoba and Quebec, some provincial hunter-safety courses have been designated as equivalent to the CFSC. The CFO may also offer “alternative certification” to individuals who have lawfully owned a firearm since 1979 and who meet the safe-handling practices standards set for **licencing**.

Pdfp37

Before this survey, did you know that there was a requirement for all first-time **licencees** to complete firearms training in order to obtain a firearms **licence**?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp38

Based on what you know, would you say that the current firearms safety training

- Needs to be improved
- Does not need to be improved
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp39

When it comes to ensuring public safety, what kind of priority do you think the Government of Canada should place on improving firearms safety?

- 1 Very low priority
- 2
- 3
- 4 Moderate priority
- 5
- 6
- 7 Very high priority
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp40

In this section, you may provide any other comment you may have with respect to firearms safety training.

- Response (space for the response)
- No further comment

Pdfp41

There are three principal legal categories of firearms in Canada: 1) non-restricted, 2) restricted firearms, 3) prohibited firearms.

- Prohibited firearms include firearms such as fully automatic weapons, short barreled handguns and sawed off shotguns.
- Restricted firearms include longer barreled handguns and certain types of semi-automatic rifles.
- Non-restricted firearms include most rifles and shotguns commonly used for activities such as hunting.

Pdfp42

Before this survey, were you aware of the differences between the legal firearm categories in Canada?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp43

Restricted firearms are generally acquired for target shooting, collecting and in some cases, protection or life and employment purposes. Generally speaking, an individual obtaining a restricted firearms **licence** must pass the additional Restricted Firearms Safety Course and usually also become a member of an approved gun club. Would you say that you support or oppose there being additional requirements for restricted gun ownership?

- 1 Strongly oppose
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither support nor oppose
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly support
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp44

In the interest of better protecting public safety, it has been suggested that individuals applying for restricted firearms **licences** should be subject to enhanced screening such as mandatory interviews with a CFO. Would you say that you would support or oppose enhanced screening of individuals applying for restricted firearms **licences**?

- 1 Strongly oppose
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither support nor oppose
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly support
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp45

What is the main reason why you OPPOSE enhanced of individuals applying for restricted firearms licences?

- Response (space for the response)
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdsp46

After meeting the age and safety training requirements, the next step in obtaining a firearms licence is for the applicant to submit detailed personal information to the CFO of their province or territory. These background checks are intended to prevent people who pose a threat to themselves or to others from legally acquiring or possessing a firearm. A CFO only issues a licence if the applicant meets the required safety criteria.

Right now, background checks are conducted:

1. when individuals are first applying for a firearms licence;
2. when individuals are renewing their firearm's licence; and
3. when an incident occurs that triggers a review of a licence holder (i.e. in this case, CFOs commence background checks to determine is a licence holder is still eligible to hold a licence).

Pdfp47

Before this survey, did you know that background checks are conducted on every person who applies for or renews a firearms licence?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp48

Currently, the following personal information is required for the background checks:

- Two personal references contacted at the discretion of the CFO
- Personal identification issued by federal, provincial, territorial, regional or municipal government

- Criminal history for past 5 years (i.e. prior charges, convictions).
- History of prohibition of firearms possession for past 5 years (i.e. for applicant or any member of their household).
- History of mental health problems for past 5 years (e.g., attempted suicide, diagnosis or treatment for depression, substance abuse, behavioral and emotional problems).
- History of violence for past 5 years (e.g., from police or social service reports).
- Details of a divorce, separation or breakdown of a significant relationship, or job loss.

Other personal information, such as statements or signatures from former or current spouses, common-law partners or other conjugal partners are not required, but if they are not supplied, the CFO will notify these individuals of the applicant's desire to obtain a firearm.

From your perspective, how necessary are each of the following pieces of information for a firearms application.

For each of these questions, possible answers are:

- 1 Not at all necessary
- 2
- 3
- 4 Somewhat necessary
- 5
- 6
- 7 Extremely necessary
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

- Personal references
- Personal identification issued by federal, provincial, territorial, regional or municipal governments such as driver's **licence** or a health card
- (Pdfp49) Criminal history for the past 5 years (i.e. prior charges, convictions)
- History of prohibition of firearms possession for the past 5 years (i.e. for the applicant or any member of their household)
- History of mental problems for the past 5 years (e.g., attempted suicide, diagnosis or treatment for depression, substance abuse, behavioral and emotional problems)
- History of violence from the past 5 years (e.g., from police or social service reports)
- Details of a divorce, separation or breakdown of a significant relationship
- Details of job loss
- Statements or signatures from former or current spouses, common law partners or other conjugal partners

Pdfp50

Overall, would you say that the information applicants are currently required to provide for a firearms **licence**...

- is too intrusive
- is sufficient in order to make a proper assessment
- is not stringent enough to make a proper assessment
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp51

When it comes to ensuring public safety, what kind of priority do you think the Government of Canada should place on improving the screening of individuals for a firearms **licence**?

- 1 Very low priority
- 2
- 3
- 4 Moderate priority
- 5
- 6
- 7 Very high priority
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp52

In this section, you may provide any other comments you may have with respect to the screening of individuals applying for a firearms **licence**.

- Response (space for the response)
- No further comment

Pdfp53

Changes could be made to some of the screening requirements used in firearms applications. In this section, some of these potential changes will be explored.

Pdfp54

Rather than just requiring references from two adults who have known the applicant for at least three years, an applicant could require references reflecting a variety of personal and professional relationships such as family, friends, employers, employees, professionals (e.g. lawyer, doctor) or roommates.

There are a number of arguments in favour of and opposed to the requirement to have additional references. Please rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following arguments.

Requiring reference from a wider variety of individuals would increase the likelihood of discovering activities or behaviours that would affect an applicant's **licence** eligibility.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp55

References such as employers, doctors, or lawyers might not necessarily be as aware of the personal circumstance of the individual applicant as friends or family.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Requiring references from individuals with professional designations would make this process more consistent with other application processes such as applying for a passport.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp56

Requiring references from individuals with professional designations could make it more difficult to comply with process because not all applicants may have professional contacts.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp57

Overall, would you say that you support or oppose introducing a requirement for additional background references reflecting a variety of personal and professional relationships for every person who applies for a firearm **licence**?

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3

- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp58

Why do you say that?

- Response (space for the response)
- Unsure
- No further comment

Pdfp59

Currently, spouses and former spouses (over the previous two years) may sign a firearms application form to acknowledge their present or former partner's application for a firearms **licence**. Should a current or former spouse not sign the form, the CFO must contact the current or former spouse, if his or her whereabouts can be determined, before a **licence** may be issued. Where there is a signature, the CFO may still contact current or former spouses. Interviews with all current and former spouses could be made a mandatory part of the application process.

There are a number of arguments in favour of and opposed to the requirement to interview all current and former spouses. Please rate the degree which you agree or disagree with the following arguments.

Requiring CFOs to interview all current and former spouses would help to identify activities or behaviours that may be a safety risk in an applicant that might not otherwise come to light.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp60

CFOs should not have to interview all current and former spouses if they have already signed the **licence** application

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6

- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp61

Overall, would you say that you support or oppose requiring CFOs to interview all current and former spouses?

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp62

Why do you say that?

- Response (space for the response)
- Unsure
- No further comment

Pdfp63

Right now it is up to the discretion of the CFO as to whether or not they wish to contact an applicant's references. Through risk management considerations, references are generally contacted only when law enforcement records or other police files suggest that there may be questions about an applicant's eligibility for a firearms **licence**. Under a new system, CFOs could be made to contact all references of firearms applicants.

There are a number of arguments in favour of and opposed to CFOs having to contact references of firearms applicants. Please rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following arguments.

Requiring CFOs to contact all references of firearms applicants would help identify activities or behaviours that may be a safety risk in an applicant that might not otherwise come to light.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp64

It would be too costly for CFOs to have to contact all references of firearms applicants.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp65

Overall, would you say that you support or oppose requiring CFOs to contact all references of firearms applicants?

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp66

Why do you say that?

- Response (space for the response)
- Unsure

Pdfp67

Another way of identifying potential risks would be to require gun clubs to report to CFOs any behaviour of members and visitors that causes concern. While this would not screen applicants out of the beginning of the process, it would give CFOs grounds to revoke the **licences** of unstable individuals.

There are a number of arguments in favour of and opposed to requiring gun clubs to report the behaviour of members or visitors. Please rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following arguments.

Requiring gun clubs to report activities or behaviours that concern the club to the CFO may permit identification of **licence** holders who pose a risk to themselves or others but are otherwise unknown to CFOs.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdftp68

Requiring gun clubs to report activities or behaviours that concern the club to the CFO puts too much responsibility on gun clubs to supervise shooting at their facility.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Requiring gun clubs to report activities or behaviours that concern the club to the CFO makes gun clubs take more responsibility for what happens at their place of business.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdftp69

Requiring gun clubs to report activities or behaviours that concern the club to the CFO will not help identify dangerous individuals because most firearms owners do not belong to a gun club.

Requiring gun clubs to report activities or behaviours that concern the club to the CFO puts too much responsibility on gun clubs to supervise shooting at their facility.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree

- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Which of the following two statements is closest to your own point of view? Requiring gun clubs to report activities or behaviours that concern the club to the CFO is ...

- ineffective because it does not prevent dangerous people from being **licenced** in the first place.
- effective because it will help identify potential risks not screened out during the initial process.
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp70

Overall, would you say that you support or oppose requiring gun clubs to report activities or behaviours that concern the club to the CFO?

- 1 Strongly oppose
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither support nor oppose
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly support
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp71

Why do you say that?

- Response (space for the response)
- Unsure
- No further comment

Pdfp72

Currently, restricted **licence** holders are required to obtain an Authorizations to Transport (ATT) for their restricted firearms to transport them from their place of residence to the firearms range, They must also obtain a new and separate ATTs in each province in which they wish to travel every time they wish to transport their restricted firearms anywhere else – such as to a gunsmith or gun show.

Under current regulations, restricted firearms must also always be transported double locked (i.e. in a locked container with another lock on the firearm itself)

Pdfp73

Before this survey, were you aware of the requirements to obtain ATTs for restricted firearms?

- Yes

- No
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

There are a number of arguments in favour of and opposed to requirements to obtain ATTs for restricted firearms. Please rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following arguments.

ATTs are a useful means of controlling firearms.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp74

The resources devoted to administering ATTs would be better employed elsewhere.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

ATTs should be made part of a restricted **licence** allowing the **licence** holders to securely transport their firearms to approved locations (i.e. gun ranges, gunsmith)

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp75

Overall, would you say you support or oppose the requirement to obtain ATTs for restricted firearms?

- 1 Strongly oppose
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither support nor oppose
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly support
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp76

In addition to contemplating making changes to screening requirements for firearms licences, the Government of Canada is also considering changes to licence terms.

Pdfp77

Since 2001 Canadians have required a firearms licence if they wish to possess firearms. licences are generally issued for five year terms. Prior to 2001, Canadians who simply possessed firearms did not require a licence, but those who wished to acquire firearms had to obtain a Firearms Acquisition Certificate (FAC). Obtaining an FAC required front-end police screening and training.

Under the system introduced in 2001, many firearms licences have not been renewed, despite the fact that individuals continue to possess firearms. This raises the potentially serious public safety and compliance issues with current firearms laws.

This presents two options: 1) Continue with the system established in 2001 which means firearms licences must still be renewed every five years. 2) Adopt a more flexible system, akin to the previous FAC system, which in most cases, will no longer require regular renewals. This next section explores some of the options.

Pdfp78

How familiar would you say you are with the current licencing system?

- 1 Not at all familiar
- 2
- 3
- 4 Moderately familiar
- 5
- 6
- 7 Very familiar
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp79

And how satisfied would you say you are with the way the current licencing system is functioning?

- 1 Not at all satisfied

- 2
- 3
- 4 Moderately satisfied
- 5
- 6
- 7 Very satisfied
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp80

There are a number of arguments in favour of and opposed to maintaining the current **licence** system. Please rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following arguments.

The current **licence** system should be maintained because it allows for renewals on a regular basis which enables CFOs to reconfirm personal history for risk factors (e.g. change in marital status, loss of employment).

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp81

The current **licence** system needs to be changed in order to increase compliance rates.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp82

Overall, would you say that you support or oppose maintaining the current **licencing** system?

- 1 Strongly oppose
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither
- 5

- 6
- 7 Strongly support
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp83

Why do you say that?

- Response (space for the response)
- Unsure
- No further comment

Pdfp84

Another option would be to introduce a continuous **licence** for firearm ownership and as under the previous FAC system, an applicant would be screened at the time he or she is **licensed** to possess and acquire firearms. Further screening would occur if police or the CFO were made aware of or had a safety concern about the **licence** holder.

There are a number of arguments in favour of and opposed to introducing a continuous **licence**. Please rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following arguments.

Introducing a continuous **licence** would reduce the burden on law-abiding firearms owners.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp85

Introducing a continuous **licence** does not account for the possibility that a **licence** holder's eligibility could change over time.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Introducing a continuous **licence** would reduce the costs of administering the firearms program.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp86

Introducing a continuous **licence** reduces the ability to discover emerging risk factors.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Even if a continuous **licence** was introduced, it would remain important to ensure that records are kept up-to date (i.e. current photograph of **licencee**, changes of address).

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp87

Overall, would you say that you support or oppose introducing a continuous **licence** system?

- 1 Strongly oppose
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither support nor oppose
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly support

- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp88

A third option would be to retain a requirement to renew restricted firearms **licences**. Restricted firearms are required for individuals possessing restricted and prohibited weapons. Retaining the requirement to renew this type of **licence** would permit for more regularized check-up screening of individuals holding restricted **licences**.

There are a number of arguments in favour of and opposed to having to renew restricted firearms **licences**. Please rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following arguments.

licence renewals are not required for restricted **licence** holders any more than they are for non-restricted **licence** holders.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp89

licence renewals for restricted **licence** holders should be retained in order to more closely monitor individuals holding restricted firearms.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Retaining **licence** renewals for restricted **licence** holders would permit more regularized eligibility screening for restricted firearms owners.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5

- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp90

Retaining **licence** renewals for restricted **licence** holders are unnecessary as enhanced front-end screening and continuous gun club membership requirements of those individuals provides enough of a safeguard.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither agree nor disagree
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly agree
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp91

Overall, would you say that you support or oppose retaining a requirement to renew restricted firearms **licences**?

- 1 Strongly oppose
- 2
- 3
- 4 Neither
- 5
- 6
- 7 Strongly support
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp92

Why do you say that?

- Response (space for the response)
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp93

This last section explores current fee structure for obtaining a firearm **licence**.

Pdfp94

Did you know that there are fees typically associated with obtaining a firearms **licence**?

- Yes

- No
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp95

Some people argue that gun owners should not be required to pay any fees for a **licence** or background checks because **licencing** provided a public safety benefit to all Canadians. Others say the firearms owners should pay all or some of the costs associated with **licencing** and background checks.

Which of the following statements is CLOSEST to your own point of view?

- Governments should pay for all fees associated with **licencing** and background checks
- Government and applicants should share fees associated with **licencing** and background checks
- Applicant should pay for all fees associated with **licencing** and background checks
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp 96

In this section, you may provide any other comments you may have with respect to the current fee structure for obtaining a firearms **licence**.

- Response (space for the response)
- No further comment

Pdfp97

Giving yourself time to reflect on the issues covered in this survey as well as other issues about firearms controls and public safety in general, what would you say is the most urgent concern for your organization at this time? Please provide a brief response in the space provided.

- Do not have urgent concern
- Response (space provided)
- No further comments

Pdfp98

The last few questions will be used only for statistical purposes. Your responses will not be linked back to your organization.

Pdfp99

Which of the following best categorizes the type of the organization you belong to for which you are responding to this survey?

- Police or law enforcement
- Victim's group
- Woman's group
- Criminal justice system
- Medical or public health
- Family violence
- Firearms owners
- Hunting/trapping

- Wildlife excursion/hunting tourism
- Suicide prevention
- Licenced firearm business
- Firearm manufacturer
- Sport shooting
- Injury prevention
- Aboriginal group
- Other (please specify)
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp100

Overall, would you say that your organization is more likely to favour, oppose, or have no strong position on greater firearms controls in Canada?

- Favour
- Oppose
- No strong position
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer

Pdfp101

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey