

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE FIREARM ENGAGEMENT PAPER
“REDUCING VIOLENT CRIME: A DIALOGUE ON HANDGUNS AND ASSAULT WEAPONS”

By Daniel Balofsky – February 3, 2019

From: Daniel Balofsky <dbalofsky@gmail.com>
Sent: February 3, 2019 11:49 PM
To: dialogue.rvc-rcv@canada.ca
Subject: QUESTIONS ABOUT THE FIREARM "ENGAGEMENT PROCESS"

Dear Public Safety Canada,

I am writing to you about some deep concerns I have regarding your recent Reducing violent crime: A dialogue on handguns and assault weapons, online engagement-process (October 11 to November 10, 2018), especially regarding non-Canadian content. Specifically, please explain:

(1) The underlying Government of Canada engagement paper, entitled Reducing violent crime: A dialogue on handguns and assault weapons, states that: Firearms in Canada are classified by the Criminal Code as falling into one of three classes ... “Assault weapon” is not a legally defined term in Canada's firearms legislation. Public Safety Canada admits that “assault weapon” is not a term defined in Canadian firearm legislation; as such, please explain why what is supposed to be a Canadian engagement process uses and references the term “assault weapon” over 10 times in the 12-page Government of Canada engagement paper.

(2) Further, that same underlying Government of Canada engagement paper states that: For illustrative purposes, the US Department of Justice has used the following description: “in general, assault weapons are semiautomatic firearms with a large magazine of ammunition that were designed and configured for rapid fire.” An explanatory footnote in the engagement paper then clarifies: US Department of Justice, Public Safety and Recreational Firearms Use Protection Act (known as the Federal Assault Weapon Ban), enacted in 1994 and expired in 2004. Again, please explain why what is supposed to be a Canadian engagement process references an American description of the term “assault weapon”. Furthermore, please explain why the Canadian engagement paper chose for illustrative purposes a dated description related to American legislation that expired nearly a decade-and-a-half before this Canadian engagement process began.

(3) In light of the above items, I further ask these straightforward questions. Public Safety Canada’s website described the October 11 to November 10, 2018 period as an: Online engagement session open to all Canadians

As such, please indicate:

(i) What measures, if any, were put in-place to ensure that the “online engagement session” only recorded the responses of Canadians?

(ii) What percentage of “online engagement session” responses can Public Safety Canada state, with certainty, indeed came only from Canadians?

I thank you in advance for taking the time to read and respond to this communication, and I politely await your reply.

Sincerely,

Daniel Balofsky