

Minister of Public Safety and
Emergency Preparedness



Ministre de la Sécurité publique
et de la Protection civile

Ottawa, Canada K1A 0P8

AOUT 02 2017
AUG

Mr. Dennis Young
dennisyoung@telus.net

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your correspondence concerning firearms.

Our government believes in implementing effective measures with respect to firearms that priorities public safety. We are mindful of the need for such measures to be manageable for firearms owners and businesses.

To this end, our Government has brought balance to the membership of the Canadian Firearms Advisory Committee by including law enforcement officers, public health advocates, civilian firearms users, representatives from conservation organizations, representatives from women's groups, farmers, and members of the legal community. This ensures that the voices of a diverse and knowledgeable group of Canadians are included in the Committee.

We understand the importance of respecting the tradition of hunting and the practice of sport shooting in Canada, and we will continue working collaboratively with firearms owners and stakeholders as we take reasonable and effective actions to achieve our shared goal of preventing gun violence.

Thank you again for writing.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Ralph Goodale'.

The Honourable Ralph Goodale, P.C., M.P.

Airdrie, Alberta
March 26, 2017

Michael Ferguson, Auditor General
Office of the Auditor General of Canada
240 Sparks Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0G6

Dear Mr. Ferguson and Staff:

Re: Value-for-Money Audits & Cost-Effectiveness of Gun Control Regimes?

Reference is being made to my previous letter on this subject dated January 2, 2017 and the response I received from your Communications branch dated 27 January 2016 (sic). I have attached copies of both letters. <http://dennisryoung.ca/2017/02/04/auditor-general-response-request-audit-of-cost-effectiveness-of-gun-control-regimes/>

Since I wrote, new information has come to light that may assist your team responsible for auditing the RCMP to make a decision to take a closer look at the cost and effectiveness of gun control legislation, policies and programs that have been in effect since 1976.

First of all, is the government's January 30th response to MP Brad Trost's Order Paper Question Q-624 (see attached hard copy and the URL below). Mr. Trost asked the government to simply compare the cost and effectiveness of the gun control regime that was in effect in 1994 with the one passed into law in 1995. Unbelievably, the government was unable to provide an answer.

<http://dennisryoung.ca/2017/02/18/goodales-response-to-mp-brad-trosts-question-q-624-cost-effectiveness-of-facs-vs-pals/>

Given Auditor General Desautel's 1993 report identifying '*weaknesses in the evaluation of previous gun control legislation*' mentioned in my previous letter had never been addressed by the government. On June 15, 2006, Auditor General Fraser specifically pointed out that collecting this evidence, conducting these evaluations and keeping track of these costs were all the primary responsibility of the government. Ms. Fraser stated in her letter to MP Garry Breitkreuz: "*You asked what evidence we have seen that the firearms program has contributed more to public safety and saved more lives than the system that preceded it. Neither of these issues was included in the scope of our audit; they are more in the domain of program evaluation, which our Office does not undertake. Doing so is a management responsibility; we noted in our Report that management has not carried out an evaluation of the program. The topic of your second question-determining which gun control measures work and which ones don't-is also a program evaluation activity and the responsibility of management. Your Committee may wish to investigate what avenues it may have to pursue this matter with the Canada Firearms Centre. In reference to your third question on whether we have seen any evidence that the government intends to comply with its regulatory policy and disclose the program's compliance costs and enforcement costs, we did not address this issue in our follow-up. The information would have to be obtained from the government.*" Copy of her letter is attached for easy reference.

It has been more than twenty years since Auditor General Desautel's report pointed out these program evaluation weaknesses to Parliament. Almost eleven years have passed since MP Breitkreuz released Auditor General Fraser's letter to the public clearly stating that it is the government's program, financial and regulatory responsibilities to amass and evaluate this evidence for Parliament.

Based on the above, taxpayers can only conclude it far past time for the government to fulfil its duty and responsibilities to determine which of our various gun control regimes have been most cost-effective at reducing violent crime, saving lives, and keeping firearms out of the hands of criminals.

Secondly, I would like to point out the variances in gun control spending information that has been made available to Parliament over the years. Please see the spreadsheet I prepared on Firearms Program Spending since 1995 together with the supporting documentation. Your office is probably the only competent body in government that taxpayers would trust to compile accurate financial data and report it to Parliament. In light of Auditor General Desautel's 1993 report, it is a major, embarrassing deficiency that the government is unable to provide any gun control program performance or financial information before 1995. I'm sure if your office asked for this information it must still be in the government accounts.

If you or your audit team have any questions or concerns please do not hesitate to ask.

Yours sincerely,

[Original signed by]

Dennis R. Young
1330 Ravenswood Drive SE
AIRDRIE AB T4A 0P8
Home Phone: 587-360-1111
E-Mail: dennisryoung@telus.net
Website: www.dennisryoung.ca

cc Jean-Denis Fréchette, Parliamentary Budget Officer
Canadian Firearms Advisory Committee



Office of the
Auditor General
of Canada

Bureau du
vérificateur général
du Canada

27 January 2016 ?

*Received
Feb 3, 2017
[Signature]*

Mr. Dennis R. Young
1330 Ravenswood Drive SE
Airdrie, Alberta T4A 0P8

Dear Mr. Young:

As you know, the Office of the Auditor General of Canada conducts independent audits of the programs and activities of federal government departments and agencies, Crown corporations and other federal entities, and reports its findings to Parliament.

We have forwarded a copy of your letter to the team responsible for auditing the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, for their information. Please note that this does not constitute a commitment from our Office to undertake an audit.

Sincerely,

Communications
Office of the Auditor General of Canada
240 Sparks Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G6

Airdrie, Alberta
January 2, 2017

Michael Ferguson, Auditor General
Office of the Auditor General of Canada
240 Sparks Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0G6

Happy New Year Mr. Ferguson and Staff:

Re: Cost-Effectiveness of Gun Control Regimes?

Please find attached a copy of the *Access to Information Act* request I submitted to the RCMP on October 10, 2016 and the RCMP's response dated December 7, 2016 in which they state: "*Unfortunately, we were unable to locate any records which respond to your request.*"

I and many of the subscribers to my website were alarmed by the fact that the RCMP did not have these evaluations prepared over the last year for the new Ministers of Public Safety and Justice. Based on the Liberal Government's commitment to evidence-based policy and program development the Ministers would have needed them to justify implementation of their election campaign promises and mandate letters.

As stated in your November 29, 2016 news release, "*It is critical for government departments to understand that their services need to be built around citizens, not process.*" Based on their non-response to the cost-effectiveness information I requested, the RCMP seems satisfied to continue publishing statistics justifying their 'processes' they have in place rather than comprehensive evaluations about how effective their firearms programs are at improving public and police safety, reducing violent crime and keeping firearms out of the hands of known gangsters and convicted criminals.

Your predecessor, Sheila Fraser, gave a good example of this bean-counting approach on May 31, 2006 when she was asked by the Standing Committee on Public Safety about claims that police were accessing the Canadian Firearms Information System (CFIS) 5,000 times a day. She responded: "*I believe that the indicator of the 5,000 hits a day is more of what we call an activity indicator than an indicator of effectiveness.*"

<http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?Language=e&Mode=1&Parl=39&Ses=1&DocId=2236517>

The ineffectiveness of this 'activity indicator' was confirmed a week later when RCMP Commissioner Giuliano Zaccardelli told the same Committee his findings concerning the 5,000 CFIS hits a day: "*They're automatic CPIC checks that they automatically go over. I don't have the number of how many are direct checks.*"

<http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?Language=e&Mode=1&Parl=39&Ses=1&DocId=2261340>

In 1993, Auditor General Denis Desautel's report found many weaknesses in the evaluation of previous gun control legislation. Many of these same weaknesses in the government's evaluation of gun control legislation, policy and programs still exist today.

http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2015/bvg-oag/FA1-1-1993-eng.pdf

Other researchers have been well aware of these weaknesses in the government's evaluation of previous and current gun control legislation, policy and programs. Dr. Caillin Langmann, Resident Physician, McMaster University, testified before the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs

on March 28, 2012: *"This study is significant as it is the only peer reviewed study examining 1974-2008 and as three methods were used to confirm the results. A search for a gradual effect was also conducted as some of this legislation was enacted over a period of years. To summarize these results, no statistically significant beneficial associations between firearms legislation in Canada and homicide by firearms — by subcategory long gun — spousal homicide, or the criminal charge of discharge of firearm with intent were found."* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mha9JsHwvwA>

Dr. Gary Mauser, Professor Emeritus, Simon Fraser University published research in 2014 that revealed: *"Murders involving firearms, law-abiding gun owners (e.g., those with valid licences) are not a threat to public safety. Canadians who have a firearms licence are less than one-third as likely to commit murder as other Canadians. Statistics Canada data show that licensed gun owners have a homicide rate of 0.60 per 100,000 licensed gun owners between 1997 and 2010.9 Over the same period, the national homicide rate averaged 1.85 per 100,000. Virtually all murders committed with firearms involve illegal firearms in the hands of people who do not have a firearms licence. During the sixteen years from 1997 to 2012, there were 9,315 homicides; 2,835 of those involved firearms. Statistics Canada reports that in only 128 cases—that is only 4.5 percent of all firearm homicides—did the accused have lawful possession of the firearm used in the crime."*

http://canadafreepress.com/print_friendly/maintaining-information-on-law-abiding-citizens-on-cpic-serves-no-legitimat

It's time to correct the weaknesses identified by your predecessors with a thorough evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of Canada's gun control regimes over the past forty years. Based on the resulting scientific evidence, Parliament must determine what firearms programs have worked best to improve public and police safety, reduce violent crime, and keep firearms out of the hands of criminals. Based on the Liberal Government's election promises and public statements before, during and since the election (see links below), I think you will find huge support for this purely evidence-based, science-based approach to gun control.

Yours sincerely,

[Original signed by]

Dennis R. Young
1330 Ravenswood Drive SE
AIRDRIE AB T4A 0P8
Home Phone: 587-360-1111
E-Mail: dennisryoung@telus.net
Website: www.dennisryoung.ca

cc Jean-Denis Fréchette, Parliamentary Budget Officer

MINISTER GOODALE REAFFIRMS COMMITMENT TO 'EVIDENCE-BASED' GUN CONTROL POLICIES
<http://dennisryoung.ca/2016/02/13/minister-goodale-reaffirms-commitment-to-evidence-based-gun-control-policies/>

TRUDEAU GOVERNMENT MAKES MORE COMMITMENTS TO "EVIDENCE-BASED POLICY MAKING"
<http://dennisryoung.ca/2015/11/06/trudeau-government-makes-more-commitments-to-evidence-based-policy-making/>

JUSTIN TRUDEAU'S SUPPORT FOR 'EVIDENCE-BASED' GUN CONTROL LAWS
<http://dennisryoung.ca/2015/10/31/justin-trudeaus-support-for-evidence-based-gun-control-laws/>



ORDER/ADDRESS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
ORDRE/ADRESSE DE LA CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES

NO.-N° Q-624	BY / DE Mr. Trost (Saskatoon-Universtiy)	DATE November 23, 2016/Le 23 novembre 2016
-----------------	---	---

RETURN BY THE LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
DÉPÔT DU LEADER DU GOUVERNEMENT À LA CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES

Mr. Lamoureux

PRINT NAME OF SIGNATORY
INSCRIRE LE NOM DU SIGNATAIRE

SIGNATURE
MINISTER OR PARLIAMENT SECRETARY
MINISTRE OU SECRÉTAIRE PARLEMENTAIRE

JAN 30 2017

(TABLED FORTHWITH / DÉPOSÉ AUSSITÔT)



INQUIRY OF MINISTRY DEMANDE DE RENSEIGNEMENT AU GOUVERNEMENT

PREPARE IN ENGLISH AND FRENCH MARKING "ORIGINAL TEXT" OR "TRANSLATION"
PRÉPARER EN ANGLAIS ET EN FRANÇAIS EN INDIQUANT "TEXTE ORIGINAL" OU "TRADUCTION"

QUESTION NO./N° DE LA QUESTION Q-624 ²	BY / DE Mr. Trost (Saskatoon—University)	DATE November 23, 2016
--	---	---------------------------

Reply by the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness
Réponse du Ministre de la Sécurité publique et de la Protection civile

The Honourable Ralph Goodale, P.C., M.P.

PRINT NAME OF SIGNATORY
INSCRIRE LE NOM DU SIGNATAIRE

SIGNATURE
MINISTER OR PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY
MINISTRE OU SECRÉTAIRE PARLEMENTAIRE

QUESTION

With regard to gun control laws in effect between 1979 and 2001, the period when the Firearms Acquisition Certificate Program was in effect, and between 2001 and present, the period when the Possession and Acquisition Licence and Possession Only License Programs were in effect: (a) what was the average annual cost for administering federal firearms laws, regulations, policies, and programs; and (b) for each of these two periods, what are the statistics that show which period was most effective at (i) reducing violent crime, (ii) reducing homicides, (iii) reducing the number of armed crimes involving firearms?

REPLY / RÉPONSE

ORIGINAL TEXT
TEXTE ORIGINAL

☒

TRANSLATION
TRADUCTION

☐

Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP)

- (a) The Canadian Firearms Program is unable to provide an annual cost to administer federal firearms laws, regulations, policies and programs from 1979 – 1996 because centralized federal firearms administration was not in place before 1996 following the passage of Bill C-68 *Firearms Act* in December 1995. The annual amounts spent presented in the table below for the RCMP was taken from historical data of the Department of Justice (fiscal years 1995-1996 to 2002-2003) and of the Department of Public Safety – Canada Firearms Centre (fiscal years 2003-2004 to 2005-2006) and the RCMP – Canadian Firearms Program (fiscal years 2006-2007 to 2015-2016) to administer the *Firearms Act*.
- (b) While the Canadian Firearms Program does not keep these statistics, studies on related topics conducted by Statistics Canada can be found online, including at <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2014001/article/11925-eng.htm> and <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2016001/article/14668-eng.htm>.

Year	Amount spent (as reported in the relevant Departmental Performance Report)
1995-1996 ¹	\$ 12,800,000
1996-1997 ¹	\$ 26,100,000
1997-1998 ¹	\$ 50,300,000
1998-1999 ¹	\$130,800,000
1999-2000 ¹	\$ 131,200,000
2000-2001 ¹	\$ 200,300,000
2001-2002	\$ 136,600,000
2002-2003	\$ 78,300,000
2003-2004	\$ 101,600,000
2004-2005	\$ 92,800,000
2005-2006	\$ 68,500,000
2006-2007	\$ 76,600,000
2007-2008	\$ 62,300,000
2008-2009	\$ 65,800,000
2009-2010	\$ 58,100,000
2010-2011	\$ 58,000,000
2011-2012	N/A ²
2012-2013	N/A ²
2013-2014	N/A ²
2014-2015	N/A ²
2015-2016	\$ 51,188,002

The figures identified above fluctuate over the years to account for changing priorities like legislative amendments as well as changes in expenditure reporting methodologies. As an example, beginning in 2009-2010 the amounts identified relate specifically to direct program costs and do not include program support functions of the RCMP. In addition, the amounts above do not include supporting functions from other government departments.

¹ For fiscal years 1995-1996 to 2000-2001, costs for the firearms program were not separated out from the Department of Justice's "Law and Policy" business line in Department of Justice Departmental Performance Reports. The firearm program costs for these years were however subsequently reported on page 26 of the Canada Firearms Centre's 2004-2005 Departmental Performance Report, which provided a historical perspective on program costs.

² For these years, the RCMP's Program Alignment/Activity Architecture, as approved by the Treasury Board of Canada, did not separate out the costs of the Canadian Firearms Program from the Canadian Law Enforcement Services program as identified in the RCMP's Departmental Performance Report. As such the RCMP is not in a position to provide these costs without further analysis, which would require more time and resources.



INQUIRY OF MINISTRY DEMANDE DE RENSEIGNEMENT AU GOUVERNEMENT

PREPARE IN ENGLISH AND FRENCH MARKING "ORIGINAL TEXT" OR "TRANSLATION"
PRÉPARER EN ANGLAIS ET EN FRANÇAIS EN INDIQUANT "TEXTE ORIGINAL" OU "TRADUCTION"

QUESTION NO./N° DE LA QUESTION Q-624 ²	BY / DE M. Trost (Saskatoon—University)	DATE 23 novembre 2016
--	--	--------------------------

Reply by the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness
Réponse du Ministre de la Sécurité publique et de la Protection civile

L'honorable Ralph Goodale, C.P., député

PRINT NAME OF SIGNATORY
INSCRIRE LE NOM DU SIGNATAIRE

SIGNATURE
MINISTER OR PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY
MINISTRE OU SECRÉTAIRE PARLEMENTAIRE

QUESTION

En ce qui concerne les lois sur le contrôle des armes à feu en vigueur de 1979 à 2001, période où le Programme des autorisations d'acquisition d'armes à feu était en vigueur, et les lois en vigueur de 2001 jusqu'à présent, période où les Programmes de permis de possession et d'acquisition et de permis de possession seulement sont en vigueur : a) quel était le coût annuel moyen pour l'administration des lois, règlements, politiques et programmes fédéraux sur les armes à feu; b) pour chacune de ces deux périodes, quelles sont les statistiques démontrant quelle période a été la plus efficace pour (i) la réduction du nombre de crimes violents, (ii) la réduction du nombre d'homicides, (iii) la réduction du nombre de crimes commis avec des armes à feu?

REPLY / RÉPONSE

ORIGINAL TEXT
TEXTE ORIGINAL

☐

TRANSLATION
TRADUCTION

☒

Gendarmerie royale du Canada (GRC)

- a) Comme le gouvernement fédéral n'a centralisé l'administration des armes à feu qu'en 1996 à la suite de l'adoption du projet de loi C-68, *Loi sur les armes à feu*, en décembre 1995, le Programme canadien des armes à feu n'est pas en mesure de fournir le coût annuel lié à l'administration des lois, des règlements, des politiques et des programmes fédéraux sur les armes à feu de 1979 à 1996. Les montants annuels dépensés présentés dans le tableau qui suit pour la GRC sont tirés de données historiques du ministère de la Justice (exercices 1995-1996 à 2002-2003), du ministère de la Sécurité publique – Centre des armes à feu Canada (exercices 2003-2004 à 2005-2006) et de la GRC - Programme canadien des armes à feu (exercices 2006-2007 à 2015-2016) pour appliquer la *Loi sur les armes à feu*.
- b) Bien que le Programme canadien des armes à feu ne tient pas ses statistiques, des études sur des sujets connexes par Statistique Canada peuvent être trouvées en ligne aux sites suivants; <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2014001/article/11925-fra.htm> et <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2016001/article/14668-fra.htm>.

Exercice	Montant dépensé (tiré du Rapport ministériel sur le rendement pour l'exercice en question)
1995-1996 ¹	12 800 000 \$
1996-1997 ¹	26 100 000 \$
1997-1998 ¹	50 300 000 \$
1998-1999 ¹	130 800 000 \$
1999-2000 ¹	131 200 000 \$
2000-2001 ¹	200 300 000 \$
2001-2002	136 600 000 \$
2002-2003	78 300 000 \$
2003-2004	101 600 000 \$
2004-2005	92 800 000 \$
2005-2006	68 500 000 \$
2006-2007	76 600 000 \$
2007-2008	62 300 000 \$
2008-2009	65 800 000 \$
2009-2010	58 100 000 \$
2010-2011	58 000 000 \$
2011-2012	S.O. ²
2012-2013	S.O. ²
2013-2014	S.O. ²
2014-2015	S.O. ²
2015-2016	51 188 002 \$

Les données fournies plus haut fluctuent au fil des ans en fonction des nouvelles priorités (p. ex. modifications législatives) et des changements dans les méthodes de déclaration des dépenses. Par exemple, depuis 2009-2010, les montants sont liés aux coûts de programme directs et ne comprennent pas les fonctions de soutien au programme de la GRC. De plus, les montants ci-dessus n'englobent pas les fonctions de soutien d'autres ministères.

¹Pour les exercices 1995-1996 à 2000-2001, les coûts du programme des armes à feu n'étaient pas consignés séparément des coûts du secteur d'activité « Droit et Orientation » dans le Rapport ministériel sur le rendement du ministère de la Justice. Toutefois, les coûts du programme des armes à feu pour ces exercices sont fournis dans le Rapport ministériel sur le rendement du Centre des armes à feu Canada pour 2004-2005 (page 30), qui donne un aperçu rétrospectif des coûts du programme.

²Pour ces exercices, l'architecture d'harmonisation/des activités de programmes de la GRC, approuvée par le Conseil du Trésor du Canada, ne faisait pas de distinction entre les coûts du

Programme canadien des armes à feu et ceux des services canadiens d'application de la loi dans le Rapport ministériel sur le rendement de la GRC. Par conséquent, la GRC n'est pas en mesure de fournir les coûts à moins de procéder à une analyse plus approfondie, ce qui nécessiterait plus de temps et de ressources.



FAXED

15 June 2006

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz, MP
Yorkton-Melville
House of Commons
Room 452-D, Centre Block
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Dear Mr. Breitkreuz:

Thank you for your letter of 1 June 2006, and your appreciative comments about our audit of the Canadian Firearms Program. I was pleased to meet with members of the Standing Committee on Public Safety on 31 May and to answer their questions. Your letter included some additional questions, which I will answer here.

You asked what evidence we have seen that the firearms program has contributed more to public safety and saved more lives than the system that preceded it. Neither of these issues was included in the scope of our audit; they are more in the domain of program evaluation, which our Office does not undertake. Doing so is a management responsibility; we noted in our Report that management has not carried out an evaluation of the program. The topic of your second question—determining which gun control measures work and which ones don't—is also a program evaluation activity and the responsibility of management. Your Committee may wish to investigate what avenues it may have to pursue this matter with the Canada Firearms Centre.

In reference to your third question on whether we have seen any evidence that the government intends to comply with its regulatory policy and disclose the program's compliance costs and enforcement costs, we did not address this issue in our follow-up. The information would have to be obtained from the government.

Regarding your question about our access to the cost-benefit analysis, the audit team did seek access to certain reports but was advised that they were Cabinet confidences of a type that is not accessible by the Office of the Auditor General. We did not seek access to the 1999 Economic Impact Study. The designation of these documents as Cabinet confidences restricts our access to them.

Finally, the audit team's review of indirect costs was limited to the departments that reported costs in their performance reports.

I hope this information answers your questions. We are pleased to consider questions on any matters that lie within our mandate.

Yours sincerely,

Sheila Fraser, FCA

FIREARMS PROGRAM SPENDING - 1995 TO PRESENT

SOURCE DATA	Trost Q-624 30-Jan-17	ATIP Spreadsheets Breitkreuz/Young	Breitkreuz Q-18 29-Nov-04
1995/96	\$ 12,800,000	\$ 12,752,931	\$ 12,800,000
1996/97	\$ 26,100,000	\$ 26,138,592	\$ 26,100,000
1997/98	\$ 50,300,000	\$ 50,322,300	\$ 50,300,000
1998/99	\$ 130,800,000	\$ 129,069,626	\$ 130,800,000
1999/2000	\$ 131,200,000	\$ 123,580,937	\$ 131,200,000
2000/2001	\$ 200,300,000	\$ 165,394,370	\$ 200,300,000
2001/2002	\$ 136,600,000	\$ 122,309,542	\$ 170,200,000
2002/2003	\$ 78,300,000	\$ 62,644,847	\$ 91,800,000
2003/2004	\$ 101,600,000		\$ 120,600,000
2004/2005	\$ 92,800,000	\$ 94,048,100	
2005/2006	\$ 68,500,000		
2006/2007	\$ 76,600,000		
2007/2008	\$ 62,300,000	\$ 56,846,702	
2008/2009	\$ 65,800,000	\$ 65,839,649	
2009/2010	\$ 58,100,000	\$ 62,126,992	
2010/2011	\$ 58,000,000	\$ 62,210,453	
2011/2012		\$ 63,057,798	
2012/2013		\$ 58,961,504	
2013/2014		\$ 57,744,971	
2014/2015			
2015/2016	\$ 51,188,002		
GRAND TOTAL:	\$ 1,401,288,002		

NOTE: The above 'Amounts Spent' do not include expenditures the Auditor General of Canada described as unreported "major additional costs" for the firearms program: including economic costs, enforcement costs, compliance costs for law-abiding firearms owners; and costs to all federal government departments and agencies owing and using firearms and the costs to provincial, regional, and municipal governments that own and use firearms.

CANADIAN FIREARMS CENTRE
EXPENDITURES BY FISCAL YEAR
1995-96 to 2002-03

GARRY BREITKREUZ, M.P.
YORKTON - MELVILLE

	1995-96 Expenditures	1996-97 Expenditures	1997-98 Expenditures	1998-99 Expenditures	1999-00 Expenditures	2000-01 Expenditures	2001-02 Expenditures	2002-03 Expenditures	Cumulative Expenditures 1995-96 to 2002-03
SALARIES, BENEFITS & ALLOWANCES:									
Salaries - CFC	994,314	2,422,917	2,936,439	5,560,454	6,226,374	12,105,203	25,374,225	16,106,693	71,732,619
Salaries - OGDs	75,055	111,214	4,083,224	13,631,580	25,921,140	35,639,461	8,127,963	9,192,490	96,565,458
Overtime	1,069,369	2,534,131	156,620	701,552	333,016	877,572	434,997	245,797	2,938,223
Sub Total: Salaries	213,874	506,826	7,146,283	19,898,586	32,480,530	48,632,236	33,938,785	25,544,980	171,236,300
Employee Benefit Plan (ERP)	1,283,243	3,040,057	1,429,657	3,079,987	6,496,108	9,408,982	6,487,198	4,812,291	33,215,550
Sub Total: Salaries & ERP	1,283,243	3,040,057	8,577,940	23,878,583	38,976,638	58,111,218	40,425,983	30,357,270	204,451,850
OPERATING & MAINTENANCE:									
Travel	607,504	1,315,129	1,640,021	2,726,176	1,473,462	3,600,361	1,987,953	1,086,732	14,537,347
Relocation	12,341	60,818	20,335	285,701	18,623	115,075	64,830	26,123	510,352
Training and Development	25	29,989	6,017	367,783	136,608	325,835	183,140	147,109	1,263,969
Membership Fees	7,353	2,410	13,375	5,330	6,737	12,394	13,209	13,273	87,184
Conferences and Travel Fees	11,892	23,090	18,672	8,901	10,213	13,557	1,808	12,444	87,731
Hospitality	64,350	128,286	318,084	324,230	10,775	62,417	4,221	14,083	507,370
Telecommunications	85,767	144,435	342,677	2,996,004	2,795,884	4,084,643	3,481,103	3,087,703	16,986,037
Postage and Freight	1,544	1,544	3,574	1,527,411	1,600,536	4,686,114	2,079,122	2,821,179	13,257,261
Information	4,446	34,032	1,285,701	56,397	5,790	34,798	68,713	9,019	188,318
Advertising	158,141	477,850	1,285,701	2,487,525	2,019,446	16,749,157	3,195	3,195	192,834
Printing	288,976	355,532	371,600	4,290,204	1,570,184	5,058,428	988,179	211,661	29,513,047
Professional and Other Services	133,792	1,872,934	2,407,644	2,805,903	932,184	1,482,782	3,472,316	376,657	13,279,758
Temporary Personnel	268,835	612,076	808,248	639,800	193,564	517,201	66,468	11,528	589,676
Contract Services	2,173,556	6,630,841	23,403,454	58,729,376	47,450,784	52,576,754	30,751,196	15,481,802	237,187,863
Litigation Costs	35	35	360,298	770	62	2,389,222	1,352,450	342,423	3,518
Office Supplies and Utilities	338,141	559,083	305,178	428,586	830,225	2,398,222	1,153,802	1,153,802	8,262,786
Maintenance	202,690	184,876	34,779	117,028	108,112	861,441	89,676	10,819	6,050,526
Tenant Services	1,887	26,941	18,336	17,369	13,715	18,124	11,550	9,310	117,222
Library	76,711	515,389	1,439,157	1,691,107	1,164,848	2,397,780	1,182,418	42,192	9,919,977
Rental	8,736	16,587	5,795	242,869	87,148	59,482	30,532	1,452,387	493,341
Other Miscellaneous Operating Cost	108,164	358,015	92,166	401,755	71,238	226,037	171,664	72,448	1,471,487
Furniture and Equipment	575,196	1,552,246	1,709,935	2,181,166	490,418	646,501	891,494	869,151	8,786,099
Information Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OGDs - Operating Expenditures	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fixed Assets (assets & liabilities)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sub Total: Operating	6,359,358	18,207,506	34,472,174	86,536,716	69,994,984	106,276,463	60,862,708	30,567,014	409,276,722
Total: Salaries, ERP & Operating Costs	6,642,601	18,248,263	43,950,114	110,416,598	108,971,620	164,380,681	101,286,691	60,724,904	613,730,572
CONTRIBUTIONS:									
Aboriginal & Other Agreements	6,110,330	7,890,329	35,286	11,500	11,115	9,450	802,725	123,281	993,357
C-17 Agreements	-	-	6,442,474	2,725,761	22,270,908	33,964,695	24,540,066	17,410,438	23,168,894
Transition Agreements	-	-	794,432	5,047,370	22,282,023	35,974,146	35,342,791	17,533,719	5,841,602
C-08 Agreements	6,110,330	7,890,329	7,272,192	20,390,329	22,282,023	35,974,146	35,342,791	17,533,719	122,791,808
Sub Total: Contributions	6,110,330	7,890,329	7,272,192	20,390,329	22,282,023	35,974,146	35,342,791	17,533,719	152,785,661
Total GROSS EXPENDITURES - CFC:	12,752,937	26,138,592	50,322,306	130,807,027	131,253,643	200,353,829	136,628,482	78,258,623	766,526,433
NET REVENUES	-	-	-	(1,731,401)	(7,672,706)	(34,066,459)	(14,319,940)	(15,613,776)	(74,313,282)
Total NET EXPENDITURES - CFC:	12,752,937	26,138,592	50,322,306	129,075,626	123,580,937	166,287,370	122,308,542	62,644,847	692,213,151

Completed July 15, 2014

SALARIES, BENEFITS & ALLOWANCES:

	Fiscal Year 07/08	Fiscal Year 08/09	Fiscal Year 09/10	Fiscal Year 10/11	Fiscal Year 11/12	Fiscal Year 12/13	Fiscal Year 13/14	Cumulative Expenditures 07/08 to 13/14
Expenditures	Expenditures	Expenditures	Expenditures	Expenditures	Expenditures	Expenditures	Expenditures	
Salaries - CFP	19,480,099	25,487,823	26,042,798	26,303,271	27,189,137	25,580,651	25,784,412	175,868,191
Salaries - OGD's	1,339,306	1,277,223	1,343,191	1,237,213	1,237,000	1,237,000	1,237,000	8,907,933
Overtime	284,608	310,839	1,343,191	137,664	293,156	334,467	863,760	3,567,685
Sub Total: Salaries	21,104,013	27,075,885	28,729,180	27,678,148	28,719,293	27,152,118	27,885,172	188,343,809
Employee Benefit Plan (EBP)	4,220,803	5,415,177	5,745,836	5,535,630	5,743,859	5,430,424	5,577,034	37,668,762
Sub Total: Salaries & EBP	25,324,816	32,491,062	34,475,016	33,213,778	34,463,152	32,582,542	33,462,206	226,012,571

OPERATING & MAINTENANCE:

Travel	339,634	737,443	613,217	478,372	596,257	493,509	503,568	3,762,000
Relocation	153,828	74,867	176,919	197,864	218,149	45,399	207,662	1,074,688
Training and Development	92,402	149,375	41,713	85,327	132,123	111,583	234,377	846,900
Membership Fees	1,229	2,274	3,131	4,094	4,036	1,175	2,841	18,780
Conference and Travel Fees	9,490	14,792	25,133	13,490	122,322	135,914	21,900	343,041
Hospitality	4,843	8,053	1,793	1,514	6,214	5,210		27,627
Telecommunications	1,720,686	1,471,129	1,753,297	1,653,594	1,704,436	3,899		8,307,041
Postage and Freight	1,082,671	1,154,247	1,191,808	1,731,199	1,291,329	1,629,087	921,504	9,001,845
Informatics Operating Costs	6,521,697	3,907,421	2,556,024	1,191,231	106,711	5,782	1,362	14,290,228
Advertising	34	2,442	0	107	232	1,011	115	3,941
Printing	1,187,645	285,929	376,079	588,611	1,162,856	1,160,006	1,045,743	5,806,869
Professional and Other Services	3,363,886	2,371,210	3,758,662	4,102,602	4,343,824	4,203,318	3,786,354	25,929,856
Temporary Personnel	175,994	147,626	112,874	1,470		51,367		489,331
Litigation Costs	1,161,977	1,310,595	1,083,050	568,187	227,058	1,028,386	279,469	5,658,722
Office Supplies and Utilities	442,868	805,505	556,660	494,333	418,636	355,990	437,219	3,511,211
Maintenance	513,977	794,097	663,667	805,753	181,858	151,522	116,873	3,227,747
Tenant Services	33,442	15,055	16,479	31,694	42,780	48,486	56,708	244,644
Rental	224,804	345,312	298,201	306,115	322,970	345,452	321,315	2,164,169
Other Miscellaneous Operating Cost	139,125	192,221	234,957	240,387	237,021	385,032	284,820	1,713,563
Furniture and Equipment	140,871	153,901	83,641	689,951	249,831	831,366	327,708	2,477,269
Informatics Equipment	510,711	240,880	60,692	72,815	1,024,247	436,901	277,738	2,623,984
OGD's Operating Expenditures	328,816	334,368	296,289	290,051	463,000	463,000	463,000	2,638,524
Fixed Assets (assets & liabilities)	703,986	5,247,849	681,375	1,751,273	1,416,244	121,041	507,043	10,428,811
Sub Total: Operating	18,854,616	19,766,591	14,585,661	15,300,034	14,272,134	12,014,436	9,797,319	104,590,791
Total: Salaries, EBP & Operating Costs	44,179,432	52,257,653	49,660,677	48,513,812	48,735,286	44,596,978	43,259,525	330,603,362

CONTRIBUTIONS:

Aboriginal and/or & Other Community	197,500	44,500	55,000	256,554	235,005	250,161	255,000	1,293,720
Opt-in Provinces	12,469,770	13,537,496	13,011,315	13,440,087	14,087,507	14,114,365	14,230,446	94,890,986
Sub Total: Contributions	12,667,270	13,581,996	13,066,315	13,696,641	14,322,512	14,364,526	14,485,446	96,184,706
Total Gross Expenditures - CFP	56,846,702	65,839,649	62,126,992	62,210,453	63,057,798	58,961,504	57,744,971	426,788,068

**CFP Revenues are not included.

GFR W05 VOL. 1
878-3
FINANCIAL MGMT REPORT 2005/06

CANADA FIREARMS CENTRE

Fiscal Year 2004/05
As at March 31, 2005
(\$,000)

Canada Firearms Centre - Roll-Up

IFMS Codes	Description	Budget			Actuals	Forecasts	Variance to Budget	Variance to Forecasts
		April 1, 2004 (A)	Adjustments (B)	Revised Allocation Aug. 4, 2004 (A + B = C)	Actual Expenditures (D)	Expenditures Projection to Year-End Jan. 31, 2005 (E)	Surplus / (Deficit) (C-D=F)	Surplus / (Deficit) (E-D=G)
1101	Salary - Regular Employees	14,478.4	(750.5)	13,727.9	12,982.4	12,951.6	745.5	(30.8)
1102	Salary - Determinate & Casual Employees	2,104.1	1,317.8	3,421.9	3,016.1	2,760.0	405.8	(256.1)
1109	Bilingual Bonus	114.2	(2.4)	111.8	97.3	94.5	14.5	(2.9)
1170	Salary - OGD	59.0	125.8	184.8	167.0	540.2	17.8	373.2
1301	Overtime	193.5	1.2	194.7	205.0	116.0	(10.3)	(89.0)
Misc.	Other Salary & Wages	204.5	63.2	267.7	839.0	420.3	(571.3)	(418.7)
	Sub-Total Salary	17,153.8	755.1	17,908.9	17,306.9	16,882.7	602.0	(424.2)
	Employee Benefit Plan	3,688.1	162.3	3,850.4	3,721.0	3,629.8	129.4	(91.2)
1160	Executive Interchange	353.4	(353.4)	(0.0)	382.0	409.3	(382.0)	27.3
15	Travel	1,679.0	(1,090.0)	589.0	556.8	501.4	32.1	(55.5)
17	Relocation	230.9	(85.9)	145.0	127.9	120.0	17.1	(7.9)
	Training & Development	614.1	(243.6)	370.5	166.2	205.4	204.3	39.2
	Membership Fees	-	-	-	9.1	14.5	(9.1)	5.4
	Conference and Travel Fees	135.0	(122.0)	13.0	4.3	5.2	8.7	0.9
24	Hospitality	65.5	(47.1)	18.3	16.8	16.9	1.6	0.2
25	Telecommunications	2,751.0	(192.5)	2,558.5	2,095.5	2,150.3	462.9	64.8
26	Postage & Freight	370.5	(60.7)	309.8	1,111.4	355.5	(801.6)	(756.0)
28	Informatics Operations	-	-	-	86.2	21.8	(86.2)	(64.4)
30	Information	-	-	-	15.9	18.6	(16.9)	1.7
31	Publishing & Advertising	485.0	(435.0)	50.0	-	15.0	50.0	15.0
32	Printing	1,176.6	(1,020.4)	156.2	115.0	159.7	41.2	44.7
35	Professional & Other Services	767.2	(173.5)	593.7	1,173.3	664.5	(579.6)	(508.8)
36	Temporary Personnel	-	-	-	201.3	193.0	(201.3)	(8.3)
37	Contract Services	40,280.8	8,865.6	49,146.4	46,816.6	47,835.8	2,329.8	1,019.2
40	Litigation Costs	-	-	-	13.8	7.2	(13.8)	(6.6)
45	Office Supplies & Utilities	529.0	(305.7)	223.3	339.4	277.2	(116.1)	(62.2)
46	Repairs & Maintenance	2,270.0	(77.0)	2,193.0	1,385.8	2,229.2	807.2	843.4
47	Tenant Services	168.4	(65.0)	103.4	86.6	129.6	16.8	42.9
50	Furniture & Equipment < \$10,000	267.8	(231.3)	36.5	104.8	31.0	(68.3)	(73.8)
51	Informatics Equipment	2,992.4	(1,392.3)	1,600.1	(30,208.0)	2,160.6	31,808.2	32,368.6
55	Library	-	-	-	32.8	18.3	(32.8)	(14.5)
58	Rentals	1,068.3	96.0	1,164.3	788.1	1,093.9	376.2	305.8
81	Prepaid Accounts	-	-	-	397.8	-	(397.8)	(397.8)
84	Furniture & Equipment > \$10,000	-	-	-	30,859.3	-	(30,859.3)	(30,859.3)
Misc.	Other Miscellaneous Costs	8,720.7	(3,983.7)	4,737.1	3,778.2	5,252.6	958.8	1,474.4
	Sub-Total Operations & Mtnc	64,572.1	(564.0)	64,008.0	60,076.1	63,477.1	3,931.9	3,401.0
	Contributions	14,500.0	-	14,500.0	12,582.1	13,191.4	1,937.9	629.3
	Gross Total	100,267.3	(0.0)	100,267.2	94,048.1	97,590.3	6,219.1	3,542.2

6/2/2005

A0171475_1-000002

38th Parliament, 1st Session

Edited Hansard • Number 034

Monday, November 29, 2004

Questions on the Order Paper

Hon. Raymond Simard (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Minister responsible for Official Languages and Minister responsible for Democratic Reform, Lib.):
Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 17 and 18.

[Text]

Question No. 18—

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz:

Having regard to statements made by the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness on May 20, 2004, that funding for the Firearms Registry component of the Program will be capped at \$25 million per year, starting next fiscal year: (a) what has been the total cost of the firearms program for each year since 1995; (b) how much was spent on the firearms owner licencing component of the program for each year since 1995; (c) how much was spent on the registration component of the program for each year since 1995; (d) how much will it cost to implement fully all components of the firearms program; (e) when will the firearms program be fully implemented; and (f) how much will it cost to maintain the firearms program each year after it is fully implemented?

Hon. Roy Cullen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.):

Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), the total cost of the firearms program for each year since 1995 is:

	CAFC Costs	Indirect Costs	Total Costs
1995-96	\$ 12.8 million		\$ 12.8 million
1996-97	\$ 26.1 million		\$ 26.1 million
1997-98	\$ 50.3 million		\$ 50.3 million
1998-99	\$130.8 million		\$130.8 million
1999-2000	\$131.2 million		\$131.2 million
2000-01	\$200.3 million		\$200.3 million
2001-02	\$136.6 million	\$ 33.6 million*	\$170.2 million
2002-03	\$ 78.2 million	\$ 13.6 million	\$ 91.8 million
2003-04	\$101.6 million	\$ 19.0 million	\$120.6 million

* Includes indirect costs for the period of 1995-96 to 2001-02. Indirect costs are program costs incurred by other government departments that are not reimbursed by CAFC.

In response to (b), the cost for the licensing component of the program since 1995 is:

<http://cssa-cila.org/garryb/publications/Article472.htm>



Office of the
Auditor General
of Canada

Bureau du
vérificateur général
du Canada

27 January 2016 ?

*Received
Feb 3, 2017
[Signature]*

Mr. Dennis R. Young
1330 Ravenswood Drive SE
Airdrie, Alberta T4A 0P8

Dear Mr. Young:

As you know, the Office of the Auditor General of Canada conducts independent audits of the programs and activities of federal government departments and agencies, Crown corporations and other federal entities, and reports its findings to Parliament.

We have forwarded a copy of your letter to the team responsible for auditing the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, for their information. Please note that this does not constitute a commitment from our Office to undertake an audit.

Sincerely,

Communications
Office of the Auditor General of Canada
240 Sparks Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G6

Airdrie, Alberta
January 2, 2017

Michael Ferguson, Auditor General
Office of the Auditor General of Canada
240 Sparks Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0G6

Happy New Year Mr. Ferguson and Staff:

Re: Cost-Effectiveness of Gun Control Regimes?

Please find attached a copy of the *Access to Information Act* request I submitted to the RCMP on October 10, 2016 and the RCMP's response dated December 7, 2016 in which they state: "*Unfortunately, we were unable to locate any records which respond to your request.*"

I and many of the subscribers to my website were alarmed by the fact that the RCMP did not have these evaluations prepared over the last year for the new Ministers of Public Safety and Justice. Based on the Liberal Government's commitment to evidence-based policy and program development the Ministers would have needed them to justify implementation of their election campaign promises and mandate letters.

As stated in your November 29, 2016 news release, "*It is critical for government departments to understand that their services need to be built around citizens, not process.*" Based on their non-response to the cost-effectiveness information I requested, the RCMP seems satisfied to continue publishing statistics justifying their 'processes' they have in place rather than comprehensive evaluations about how effective their firearms programs are at improving public and police safety, reducing violent crime and keeping firearms out of the hands of known gangsters and convicted criminals.

Your predecessor, Sheila Fraser, gave a good example of this bean-counting approach on May 31, 2006 when she was asked by the Standing Committee on Public Safety about claims that police were accessing the Canadian Firearms Information System (CFIS) 5,000 times a day. She responded: "*I believe that the indicator of the 5,000 hits a day is more of what we call an activity indicator than an indicator of effectiveness.*"

<http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?Language=e&Mode=1&Parl=39&Ses=1&DocId=2236517>

The ineffectiveness of this 'activity indicator' was confirmed a week later when RCMP Commissioner Giuliano Zaccardelli told the same Committee his findings concerning the 5,000 CFIS hits a day: "*They're automatic CPIC checks that they automatically go over. I don't have the number of how many are direct checks.*"

<http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?Language=e&Mode=1&Parl=39&Ses=1&DocId=2261340>

In 1993, Auditor General Denis Desautel's report found many weaknesses in the evaluation of previous gun control legislation. Many of these same weaknesses in the government's evaluation of gun control legislation, policy and programs still exist today.

http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2015/bvg-oag/FA1-1-1993-eng.pdf

Other researchers have been well aware of these weaknesses in the government's evaluation of previous and current gun control legislation, policy and programs. Dr. Caillin Langmann, Resident Physician, McMaster University, testified before the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs

on March 28, 2012: *"This study is significant as it is the only peer reviewed study examining 1974-2008 and as three methods were used to confirm the results. A search for a gradual effect was also conducted as some of this legislation was enacted over a period of years. To summarize these results, no statistically significant beneficial associations between firearms legislation in Canada and homicide by firearms — by subcategory long gun — spousal homicide, or the criminal charge of discharge of firearm with intent were found."* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mha9JsHwvwA>

Dr. Gary Mauser, Professor Emeritus, Simon Fraser University published research in 2014 that revealed: *"Murders involving firearms, law-abiding gun owners (e.g., those with valid licences) are not a threat to public safety. Canadians who have a firearms licence are less than one-third as likely to commit murder as other Canadians. Statistics Canada data show that licensed gun owners have a homicide rate of 0.60 per 100,000 licensed gun owners between 1997 and 2010.9 Over the same period, the national homicide rate averaged 1.85 per 100,000. Virtually all murders committed with firearms involve illegal firearms in the hands of people who do not have a firearms licence. During the sixteen years from 1997 to 2012, there were 9,315 homicides; 2,835 of those involved firearms. Statistics Canada reports that in only 128 cases—that is only 4.5 percent of all firearm homicides—did the accused have lawful possession of the firearm used in the crime."*

http://canadafreepress.com/print_friendly/maintaining-information-on-law-abiding-citizens-on-cpic-serves-no-legitimat

It's time to correct the weaknesses identified by your predecessors with a thorough evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of Canada's gun control regimes over the past forty years. Based on the resulting scientific evidence, Parliament must determine what firearms programs have worked best to improve public and police safety, reduce violent crime, and keep firearms out of the hands of criminals. Based on the Liberal Government's election promises and public statements before, during and since the election (see links below), I think you will find huge support for this purely evidence-based, science-based approach to gun control.

Yours sincerely,

[Original signed by]

Dennis R. Young
1330 Ravenswood Drive SE
AIRDRIE AB T4A 0P8
Home Phone: 587-360-1111
E-Mail: dennisryoung@telus.net
Website: www.dennisryoung.ca

cc Jean-Denis Fréchette, Parliamentary Budget Officer

MINISTER GOODALE REAFFIRMS COMMITMENT TO 'EVIDENCE-BASED' GUN CONTROL POLICIES
<http://dennisryoung.ca/2016/02/13/minister-goodale-reaffirms-commitment-to-evidence-based-gun-control-policies/>

TRUDEAU GOVERNMENT MAKES MORE COMMITMENTS TO "EVIDENCE-BASED POLICY MAKING"
<http://dennisryoung.ca/2015/11/06/trudeau-government-makes-more-commitments-to-evidence-based-policy-making/>

JUSTIN TRUDEAU'S SUPPORT FOR 'EVIDENCE-BASED' GUN CONTROL LAWS
<http://dennisryoung.ca/2015/10/31/justin-trudeaus-support-for-evidence-based-gun-control-laws/>