



MP BRAD TROST'S FOUR GUN CONTROL QUESTIONS LIBERAL RESPONSES PROVIDE VERY FEW ANSWERS

Analysis, Commentary and Supporting Documentation by Dennis R. Young – May 3, 2019

THANK YOU BRAD TROST FOR ASKING THE GOVERNMENT THESE QUESTIONS

MARCH 18, 2019 - MP BRAD TROST'S FOUR ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS

- Q-2319 Firearms Interest Police (FIP) Database Deficiencies
- Q-2320 Auditor General Firearms Program 'major additional costs'
- Q-2321 Benefits of Firearms Ownership
- Q-2322 Effectiveness of Firearms Interest Police (FIP) Database

LIBERAL RESPONSE TO Q-2319: Firearms Interest Police (FIP) Database Deficiencies

EXCERPT: *“Chief Firearms Officers have revoked firearms Licences as the result of FIP notifications being brought to their attention. The number of revocations that have been made based on FIP notifications alone also cannot be quantified within the Canadian Firearms Program databases as they represent only part of a CFO's decision to revoke and do not always result in revocation. As there were 2,663 revocations made in 2017, it would take more time than is allowed for the preparation of this response to review each one to determine if a FIP notification was present and to what extent it contributed to the final decision to revoke.”* [emphasis added]

NOTE #1: The Privacy Commissioner's concerns and recommendations for the FIP Database were not directly addressed in the government's response. EXCERPT: *“Successive Ministers of Justice have declared that they were responsible for all aspects of the Firearms Program, but have failed to effectively resolve the serious problem of inaccurate FIP records. The RCMP, while managing the FIP database for the other firearms partners, claims responsibility for the data quality of only those records that it enters in the system. CFOs are responsible to ensure that all FIP hits against a firearms client are thoroughly reviewed; however, FIP entries are created by police agencies and are not controlled by the CFOs. This situation has left the control of data quality to each individual police agency and has contributed to inconsistencies in FIP entries among the various agencies. To resolve these FIP problems I made the following recommendations in my "Firearms Report" of 2001: 1) Since DOJ's Canadian Firearms Centre is responsible for issues respecting data quality on FIP and in conformity with section 6(2) of the Privacy Act (accurate, complete and up-to-date information), there should be an auditing framework to verify the validity and accuracy of FIP records. 2) The Canadian Firearms Centre FIP Project Team should continue to work towards establishing and implementing common police agency extract standards and procedures, and a copy of the report(s) of improvements should be provided to the Privacy Commissioner.”* [emphasis added]

LIBERAL RESPONSE TO Q-2320: Auditor General Firearms Program 'major additional costs'

PARAGRAPH 10.29 OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL'S 2002 REPORT TO PARLIAMENT STATES: *“Further, in its Regulatory Impact Analysis Statements the Department of Justice did not provide Parliament with an estimate of all the major additional costs that would be incurred. This disclosure was required by the government's regulatory policy. The costs incurred by the provincial and territorial agencies in enforcing the legislation were not reported. In addition, costs that were incurred by firearms owners, firearms clubs, manufacturers, sellers, and importers and exporters of firearms, in their efforts to comply with the legislation were not reported.”*

EXCERPT FROM DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RESPONSE: *“The Department was unable to identify information that could help to outline the unreported costs.”*

EXCERPT FROM PUBLIC SAFETY CANADA RESPONSE: *“A search of PS files related to the question did not yield any relevant records.”*

NOTE #2: Here is a response to one of my ATIP requests that did yield a ‘relevant record’ from Public Safety Canada: An undated [Public Safety Backgrounder on Costs and Crime Statistics](#) noted:

(1) *Neither the costs incurred by provincial and territorial agencies in enforcing the legislation, nor the costs borne by Firearms owners and businesses to comply with the legislation have been calculated. (Auditor General’s Report 2002, Chapter 10).*

(2) *Two Library of Parliament studies estimate that enforcement and compliance costs are substantial, running into the hundreds of millions of dollars. (Compliance Costs of Firearms Registration, 10 October 2003; and, Estimates of Some of the Costs of Enforcing the Firearms Act, 20 March 2003).*

EXCERPT FROM RCMP RESPONSE: *“In the administration of its mandate, the CFP does not collect data regarding costs incurred by the firearms industry in general nor does it collect information regarding unreported costs incurred by the government.”*

LIBERAL RESPONSE TO Q-2321: Benefits of Firearms Ownership

Minister Goodale’s response failed to even acknowledge let alone provide ‘evidence’ of even one of the dozens of Benefits of Firearms Ownership itemized in MP Brad Trost’s written question. This despite providing the Minister and his staff with the name of the [Library of Parliament, Parliamentary Research Branch paper entitled "The Benefits of Gun Ownership", prepared by Lyne Casavant, Political and Social Affairs Division, and Antony G. Jackson, Economic Division, dated April 2, 2004.](#)

LIBERAL RESPONSE TO Q-2322: Effectiveness of Firearms Interest Police (FIP) Database

EXCERPT #1: *“There were a total of 3,547,424 FIP notifications generated in 2017. The CFP only reviews FIP notifications that are matched to a client of the CFP, and therefore does not track FIP notifications to individuals without a firearms licence.”*

EXCERPT #2: *“(d), (e), (t), (g) and (h): Given the time constraints, the RCMP is unable to provide the requested information without assessing each individual FIP notification and resulting CFO review and investigation. This assessment would take more time than is available for responding to this question.”*

IMPORTANT EFFECTIVENESS EVIDENCE STILL NOT PROVIDED TO PARLIAMENT

- (d) *What was the average time it took to complete the investigation of a Firearms Interest Police (FIP) event;*
- (e) *How many FIP events that resulted in firearms being removed from possession of the licensed gun owner;*
- (f) *How many FIP events that resulted in firearms being removed from possession of a person without a firearms license;*
- (g) *What was the average time it took from reporting of the Firearms Interest Police (FIP) event to the firearms being removed from the possession of the licensed gun owner;*
- (h) *What was the average time it took from reporting of the Firearms Interest Police (FIP) event to the firearms being removed from the possession of the person without a firearms license?*

FIP DATABASE EFFECTIVENESS EVIDENCE IS NOT AVAILABLE BY ACCESS TO INFORMATION

EITHER - RCMP response to Access to Information Act Request dated January 11, 2019 - Received January 18, 2019
Important statistics about firearms license holders who are ‘involved in an event involving violence or other offences’ are not tracked.

- No Statistics on the average time it took to initiate an investigation of a FIP event;
- No Statistics on the average time it took to complete the investigation of a FIP event;

- No Statistics on the number of FIP events that resulted in firearms being removed from possession of the licensed gun owner; and
- No Statistics on the average time it took from reporting of the FIP event to the firearms being removed from the possession of the licensed gun owner.