



True North in  
Canadian public policy

# REPORT CARD ON THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM: Evaluating Canada's Justice Deficit

By Benjamin Perrin and Richard Audas



Public Safety



Support for Victims



Cost and Resources



Fairness and Access



Efficiency



SEPTEMBER 2016

A Macdonald-Laurier Institute Publication

  
**NO. 2**  
Canada's  
Justice Deficit



True North in  
Canadian public policy



## Board of Directors

---

### CHAIR

**Rob Wildeboer**

Executive Chairman, Martinrea International Inc.

### VICE CHAIR

**Jacquelyn Thayer Scott**

Past President and Professor,  
Cape Breton University, Sydney

### MANAGING DIRECTOR

**Brian Lee Crowley**

### SECRETARY

**Lincoln Caylor**

Partner, Bennett Jones LLP, Toronto

### TREASURER

**Martin MacKinnon**

CFO, Black Bull Resources Inc., Halifax

### DIRECTORS

**Pierre Casgrain**

Director and Corporate Secretary of Casgrain  
& Company Limited

**Erin Chutter**

President and CEO of Global Cobalt Corporation

**Laura Jones**

Executive Vice-President of the Canadian Federation  
of Independent Business (CFIB).

**Vaughn MacLellan**

DLA Piper (Canada) LLP

## Advisory Council

---

**John Beck**

Chairman and CEO, Aecon Construction Ltd., Toronto

**Navjeet (Bob) Dhillon**

President and CEO, Mainstreet Equity Corp., Calgary

**Jim Dinning**

Former Treasurer of Alberta

**Hon. David Emerson**

Former federal cabinet minister, corporate director  
and public policy adviser

**Richard Fadden**

Former National Security Advisor to the Prime Minister  
and former Deputy Minister of National Defence

**Brian Flemming**

International lawyer, writer, and policy advisor

**Robert Fulford**

Former Editor of Saturday Night magazine, columnist with  
the National Post

**Wayne Gudbranson**

CEO, Branham Group Inc., Ottawa

**Stanley Hartt**

Counsel, Norton Rose LLP

**Calvin Helin**

International speaker, best-selling author, entrepreneur  
and lawyer.

**Peter John Nicholson**

Former President, Canadian Council of Academies, Ottawa

**Hon. Jim Peterson**

Former federal cabinet minister, Counsel at Fasken  
Martineau, Toronto

**Maurice B. Tobin**

the Tobin Foundation, Washington DC

## Research Advisory Board

---

**Janet Ajzenstat**

Professor Emeritus of Politics, McMaster University

**Brian Ferguson**

Professor, Health Care Economics, University of Guelph

**Jack Granatstein**

Historian and former head of the Canadian War Museum

**Patrick James**

Professor, University of Southern California

**Rainer Knopff**

Professor of Politics, University of Calgary

**Larry Martin**

Principal, Dr. Larry Martin and Associates and Partner,  
Agri-Food Management Excellence, Inc.

**Christopher Sands**

Senior Fellow, Hudson Institute, Washington DC

**William Watson**

Associate Professor of Economics, McGill University

# Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	4
Sommaire.....	6
Introduction .....	8
Discussion and analysis.....	11
Prince Edward Island: B+ .....	13
Newfoundland & Labrador: B .....	14
New Brunswick: B .....	15
Quebec: B .....	16
Nova Scotia: B .....	17
Alberta: C+ .....	18
Ontario: C+ .....	19
British Columbia: C+.....	20
Saskatchewan: C+ .....	21
Nunavut: C+ .....	22
Northwest Territories: C .....	23
Manitoba: C.....	24
Yukon: C.....	25
Conclusion .....	26
Appendices.....	27
Data and methods.....	27
Data sources and limitations.....	29
Report card tables .....	32
Author Biographies.....	50
Endnotes.....	51



# Executive Summary

Canada is suffering from a “justice deficit” – a large and growing gap between the aspirations of the justice system and its actual performance. With few exceptions, our justice system is slow, inefficient, and costly. The Supreme Court sent this message loudly and clearly in its July 8, 2016 decision when it threw out drug trafficking charges from British Columbia; more than four years had elapsed from when the accused was charged to the conclusion of the trial.

But until now, the extent of inefficiency and underperformance in the Canadian criminal justice system has never been fully assessed. The Macdonald-Laurier Institute *Report Card on the Criminal Justice System* aims to enhance accountability and transparency with a view towards its reform and ongoing improvement for the benefit of all Canadians.

Using Statistics Canada data and quantitative statistical methods, we assess each province and territory’s criminal justice system based on five major objectives: public safety, support for victims, costs and resources, fairness and access to justice, and efficiency.

*Canada is suffering from a “justice deficit”: a large and growing gap between the aspirations of the justice system and its actual performance.*

## Overall Ranking and Grades

PROVINCE	RANK	PUBLIC SAFETY	SUPPORT FOR VICTIMS	COST AND RESOURCES	FAIRNESS AND ACCESS	EFFICIENCY	OVERALL
PE	1	B+	B+	B+	B	A	<b>B+</b>
NL	2	B	B+	C+	B+	B	<b>B</b>
NB	3	B+	C+	B+	B	B	<b>B</b>
PQ	4	B	C+	B	B+	C+	<b>B</b>
NS	5	B	B	C+	B+	C+	<b>B</b>
AB	6	C+	B	B+	C	C+	<b>C+</b>
ON	7	B	B	B	C+	C	<b>C+</b>
BC	8	C+	C	B	C+	B	<b>C+</b>
SK	9	C	C+	C	C+	B	<b>C+</b>
NU	10	C	F	F	A+	A	<b>C+</b>
NW	11	C+	F	F	B+	A	<b>C</b>
MN	12	C+	C	D	C+	C	<b>C</b>
YK	13	C	F	F	B+	B+	<b>C</b>

A few of the highlights from the report cards for each province and territory are:

1. The cost of public safety per person is lowest in Quebec, Ontario, and British Columbia, while it is highest in the territories, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan.
2. The territories have disproportionately high per-capita crime rates – far exceeding any of the provinces. Among the provinces, violent crime rates per capita are highest in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Newfoundland & Labrador, while they are lowest in Ontario, Quebec, and Prince Edward Island.

3. Public perceptions of the police are generally higher in the Atlantic Provinces than in the Western Provinces.
4. There are serious issues with efficiency in Ontario's justice system. It has the worst record in Canada for the proportion of charges stayed or withdrawn (43.1 percent on average), compared with a mere 8.6 percent in neighbouring Quebec. At just 55.3 percent on average, Ontario is also a significant outlier for the percentage of accused persons found guilty.
5. British Columbia received a failing grade for its weighted clearance rate for violent crime (on average slightly over half of violent crimes were solved by police).
6. In terms of support for victims, restitution orders (where offenders are required to compensate their victims) are infrequent in Canada and ordered in less than 1.0 percent of cases in Quebec, Manitoba, and Nunavut.
7. Referrals to victim services per 1,000 crimes are highest in Ontario, Manitoba, and Alberta, while they are lowest in the territories, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island.
8. The number of accused persons on remand (in jail awaiting trial) per 1,000 crimes is highest in Manitoba and Ontario, while it is lowest in Newfoundland & Labrador, Prince Edward Island, and Northwest Territories. Keeping large numbers of accused on remand is costly and suggests undue delays in case processing.
9. In terms of access to justice, legal aid expenditures on criminal matters per crime are highest in Ontario, Newfoundland & Labrador, and Nova Scotia, and lowest in New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and the Northwest Territories.
10. Disproportionate levels of Aboriginal incarceration relative to the population are a problem in every jurisdiction in Canada, but are particularly acute in Alberta, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and British Columbia.

It is our hope that this first criminal justice system report card will generate tough questions for the many actors responsible for administering the justice system in each of these jurisdictions, enhance the collection of key data on its performance, and spur much needed reform.

# Sommaire

Le Canada souffre d'un « déficit de la justice » : un large écart allant croissant entre les aspirations du système de justice et ses performances réelles. À quelques exceptions près, notre système de justice est lent, inefficace et coûteux. La Cour suprême a clamé ce message haut et clair dans sa décision rendue le 8 juillet 2016, lorsqu'elle a invalidé des accusations portées dans une affaire de trafic de drogues en Colombie-Britannique, plus de quatre ans s'étant écoulés entre le dépôt des accusations et la cessation du procès.

Or, jusqu'à présent, on n'a jamais pleinement évalué l'ampleur de la sous-performance et de l'inefficacité du système de justice pénale canadien. Le bilan du système de justice (*Justice System Report Card*) de l'Institut Macdonald-Laurier vise à renforcer la reddition de comptes et la transparence dans l'optique d'une réforme et d'un processus d'amélioration continue au bénéfice de tous les Canadiens.

En utilisant les tendances moyennes des données observées au cours des dernières années et des méthodes statistiques quantitatives, nous évaluons le système de justice pénale de chaque province et territoire relativement à cinq grands objectifs : la sécurité publique, le soutien aux victimes, les coûts et les ressources, l'équité et l'accès à la justice ainsi que l'efficacité.

Les notes globales attribuées au système de justice pénale de chaque province et territoire sont présentées ci-dessous en ordre de classement :

PROVINCE	RANG	SÉCURITÉ PUBLIQUE	SOUTIEN AUX VICTIMES	COÛTS ET RES-SOURCES	ÉQUITÉ ET ACCÈS	EFFICACITÉ	NOTE GLOBALE
Î.-P.-É.	1	B+	B+	B+	B	A	<b>B+</b>
T.-N.-L.	2	B	B+	C+	B+	B	<b>B</b>
N.-B.	3	B+	C+	B+	B	B	<b>B</b>
Qc	4	B	C+	B	B+	C+	<b>B</b>
N.-É.	5	B	B	C+	B+	C+	<b>B</b>
Alb.	6	C+	B	B+	C	C+	<b>C+</b>
Ont.	7	B	B	B	C+	C	<b>C+</b>
C.-B.	8	C+	C	B	C+	B	<b>C+</b>
Sask.	9	C	C+	C	C+	B	<b>C+</b>
Nt	10	C	F	F	A+	A	<b>C+</b>
T.N.-O.	11	C+	F	F	B+	A	<b>C</b>
Man.	12	C+	C	D	C+	C	<b>C</b>
Yn	13	C	F	F	B+	B+	<b>C</b>

Voici quelques faits saillants du bilan préparé pour chaque province et territoire :

1. Le coût de la sécurité publique par personne est le plus bas au Québec, en Ontario, en Colombie-Britannique, mais le plus élevé dans les territoires, Manitoba et en Saskatchewan.

2. Les territoires affichent des taux disproportionnellement élevés de criminalité par habitant : ces taux dépassent de loin ceux de toutes les provinces. Parmi les provinces, les taux de crimes violents par habitant sont les plus élevés en Saskatchewan, au Manitoba et à Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador, mais les plus bas en Ontario, au Québec et dans l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard.
3. Les perceptions du public à l'égard des forces de police sont généralement plus positives dans les provinces de l'Atlantique que dans les provinces de l'Ouest.
4. Le système de justice ontarien éprouve de graves problèmes d'efficacité. La province affiche le pire bilan au Canada en ce qui concerne la proportion d'accusations suspendues ou retirées, laquelle est de 43,1 % en moyenne comparativement à seulement 8,6 % au Québec voisin. Avec un pourcentage de seulement 55,3 % d'accusés déclarés coupables, l'Ontario est aussi à ce titre un cas particulier.
5. En Colombie-Britannique, le taux pondéré de classement des affaires d'infractions criminelles avec violence est médiocre (en moyenne, juste un peu plus de 50 % des crimes violents ont été résolus par les autorités policières).
6. En ce qui concerne le soutien aux victimes : les ordonnances de dédommagement (lorsque les délinquants sont tenus de compenser le préjudice subi par leurs victimes) sont rares au Canada et imposées dans moins de 1,0 % des cas au Québec, au Manitoba et au Nunavut.
7. Le nombre de personnes orientées vers les services aux victimes est le plus élevé pour 1 000 délits en Ontario, au Manitoba et en Alberta, tandis qu'il est le moins élevé dans les Territoires du Nord-Ouest, au Nouveau-Brunswick et dans l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard.
8. Le nombre d'accusés placés sous garde (en attente d'un procès) pour 1 000 délits est le plus élevé au Manitoba et en Ontario, alors qu'il est le moins élevé à Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador, dans l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard et les Territoires du Nord-Ouest.
9. Sur le plan de l'accès à la justice, les dépenses d'aide juridique en matière pénale sont les plus élevées par crime en Ontario, à Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador et en Nouvelle-Écosse, et les moins élevées au Nouveau-Brunswick, dans l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard et dans les Territoires du Nord-Ouest.
10. Les taux d'incarcération des Autochtones sont disproportionnellement élevés par rapport à la population dans tous les territoires de compétence au Canada, mais le problème est particulièrement aigu en Alberta, en Ontario, en Saskatchewan, au Manitoba, et en Colombie-Britannique.

Nous espérons que ce premier bilan du système de justice pénale suscitera des débats incisifs avec les nombreux responsables de l'administration du système de justice dans chacun de ces territoires de compétence, améliorera la collecte des données clés sur la performance du système et mènera à une réforme fort nécessaire.

# Introduction

On July 8, 2016, the Supreme Court of Canada finally said what has been tacitly understood for years – our criminal justice system is suffering from a “culture of delay and complacency” (*R. v. Jordan*, 2016 SCC 27, para. 29). The Court sent out a strong message. It threw out drug trafficking charges from British Columbia after more than four years had elapsed from when the accused was charged to the conclusion of the trial. On the same day, it also threw out child sex offence charges from Ontario due to an almost three-year delay (*R. v. Williamson*, 2016 SCC 28). Our justice system is failing Canadians – especially victims.

In our recent paper published by the Macdonald-Laurier Institute, *Canada’s Justice Deficit: The Case for a Justice System Report Card*, we examined the significant challenges facing the justice system in Canada and found that, with few exceptions, our justice system is slow, inefficient, and costly.

Canada is suffering from what we called a “justice deficit”: a large and growing gap between the aspirations of the justice system and its actual performance. Our justice system is complex and largely un-navigable without a lawyer. The advent of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and Supreme Court of Canada decisions related to its protections has resulted in dramatically increased litigation, including a litany of procedural motions and enhanced obligations on Crown prosecutors to disclose potentially relevant information to the defence. Lengthy delays have resulted in stays of proceedings of even the most serious criminal charges. A large number of administration of justice charges (e.g. failure to appear for court appearances, breach of probation, unlawfully at large, and failure to comply with court orders) have also clogged up the courts.

*Our justice system  
is complex and  
largely un-navigable  
without a lawyer.*

In provinces and territories that have not taken concrete steps to stem the tide, we see rising case processing times, a growing population of accused persons on remand pending trial, increasing costs across the board, and a growing number of people unable to afford a lawyer. This inefficient system is imposing economic and social costs on Canadians. The Supreme Court of Canada itself has now recognized that the system is plagued by “unnecessary procedures and adjournments, inefficient practices, and inadequate institutional resources are accepted as the norm and give rise to ever-increasing delay” (*R. v. Jordan*, 2016 SCC 27, para. 40).

In our recent paper, we argued for enhanced transparency and accountability as a remedy. We noted that there are regular report cards that quantitatively assess other major institutions in our country, notably health care, education, and governance. They have identified critical areas for improvement, increased transparency, and accountability of the diverse actors in these systems, and generated necessary reforms. When each of these report cards first began, they were criticized and resisted by establishments that were not accustomed to such scrutiny. Yet, in time, they became not only accepted, but a critical part of reform and ongoing improvement. The justice system is equally in need of such a regular hard look – an objective assessment to catalyze its enhancement.



This report card is one tool for shedding light on some of the major strengths and challenges in the criminal justice system in each province and territory. Regular monitoring, analysis, and assessment of the performance of Canada's judicial system would help tremendously to enhance the transparency and accountability of this central branch of government that is responsible for the protection of the rights and freedoms of all Canadians.

This report card is based on comparable statistics; it assesses each province and territory on how well they measure up against the core objectives of Canada's criminal justice system. It does not seek to justify or explain the differences in performance between the jurisdictions, but to report the data and let it speak for itself. For example, whether Crown prosecutors have to approve criminal charges, or whether the police can simply lay them on their own, can have a major impact on the proportion of charges subsequently stayed or withdrawn. Performance or perceptions of police may vary depending on whether a province has its own provincial and municipal forces (as in Ontario and Quebec), or relies on contracts with the RCMP for some of its policing (as is the case in British Columbia). We hope this will start a debate about the causes and solutions to problems facing the criminal justice system.

While available data provide some valuable insights, it is clear to us that better and more data regarding the actual performance of the criminal justice system is needed. Data on the civil justice system is so poor that a report card for it is not even possible. These gaps and blind spots are troubling and should be addressed by the provinces and territories, working with Statistics Canada.

Canada's justice system is one of the pillars of our democratic society. It seeks to protect the safety, lives, and property of all Canadians. It is the mechanism whereby our laws are given effect and enforced. It is how criminal conduct is addressed and where civil wrongs are righted. The objectives of the justice system are myriad and may be the subject of reasonable debate. However, a number of primary objectives of our criminal and civil justice systems can be reasonably identified, as summarized below.

**Table 1: Objectives of Canada’s criminal justice system**

<p><b>PUBLIC SAFETY</b></p>	<p>The fundamental purpose of our criminal justice system is to protect society, ensuring respect for the law and maintaining a just, peaceful, and safe society.<sup>1</sup> In short, it should protect the safety, lives, and property of Canadians.</p> <p>The criminal justice system should ensure that convicted offenders are given appropriate sanctions to hold them accountable for breaking the law.<sup>2</sup> Offenders should be given support to rehabilitate and reintegrate into the community so that they can become productive members of society and not re-offend.<sup>3</sup> Society must also be protected from violent repeat offenders.</p>
<p><b>SUPPORT FOR VICTIMS</b></p>	<p>Under the <i>Canadian Victims Bill of Rights</i>, <i>Criminal Code</i>, and numerous provincial and territorial statutes, victims of crime have rights related to information, protection, participation, and restitution.<sup>4</sup> They may also need services to assist them in coping with the harm caused by their criminal victimization.</p>
<p><b>COSTS AND RESOURCES</b></p>	<p>As a public function funded by taxpayers, the justice system should be run in a cost-effective manner, while meeting its core objectives.</p>
<p><b>FAIRNESS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE</b></p>	<p>The justice system must guarantee the constitutional rights of accused persons and provide them with fair and impartial trials, as guaranteed under section 11(d) of the <i>Charter</i>.</p> <p>Indigent accused persons whose liberty is at stake should have access to legal advice and representation to ensure their legal rights are protected throughout the criminal justice process.<sup>5</sup> An unrepresented party faces the often “insurmountable hurdle”<sup>6</sup> of presenting his or her case, leading to adjournments and lengthy proceedings adding to the cost of running the court.<sup>7</sup></p> <p>There should also be cause for concern about fairness if the justice system consistently disproportionately punishes offenders of a certain race, ethnicity or background.</p>
<p><b>EFFICIENCY</b></p>	<p>A well-functioning criminal justice system should ensure prompt and thorough investigations, and timely prosecutions and trials. Criminal trials should take place within a reasonable time, as guaranteed under section 11(b) of the <i>Charter</i>.<sup>8</sup> Lengthy and persistent delays in proceedings result in the potential erosion of the case to be tried (including its evidence), hardship for the accused and victims, increased costs, and may bring the entire administration of justice into disrepute.<sup>9</sup></p> <p>A just, swift and efficient criminal justice system should prevent crime from occurring in the first place because of general deterrence and reduced recidivism over time. It should serve as a disincentive to those contemplating criminal behavior and incapacitate habitual offenders.</p>

1 See *Criminal Code*, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46, s. 718.

2 See *Criminal Code*, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46, s. 718.

3 See *Criminal Code*, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46, s. 718(d).

4 See Bill C-32, *An Act to Enact the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights and to Amend Certain Acts*, 2nd Sess, 41st Parl; Department of Justice, *A Crime Victim’s Guide to the Criminal Justice System* (Department of Justice: Ottawa, 2008) at 25; *United Nations, United Nations Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power*. UN GA Res A/RES/40/34, 29 November 1985;

5 See Rt. Hon. Beverley McLachlin, “The Challenges We Face,” Remarks delivered at the Empire Club of Canada. Available at: Supreme Court of Canada <<http://www.scc-csc.gc.ca/court-cour/judges-juges/spe-dis/bm-2007-03-08-eng.aspx>> [The Challenges We Face]; *R. v. J.W.*, 2013 O.N.C.A. 723 (CanLII), at para 14; *BCGEU v British Columbia* (Attorney General), [1988] 2 S.C.R. 214, 1988 CanLII 3 (S.C.C.) at para 26.

6 The Challenges We Face.

7 The Challenges We Face.

8 See *R. v. Askov*, [1990] 2 S.C.R. 1199; *R. v. Morin*, [1992] 1 S.C.R. 771; *R. v. Beason* (1983), 1983 CanLII 1873 (O.N.C.A.), 36 CR (3d) 73 (Ont CA); Department of Justice, *Canada’s System of Justice. The Final Report on Early Case Consideration of the Steering Committee on Justice Efficiencies and Access to the Justice System*. Government of Canada. Available at <http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/tp-pr/cs-jjc/esc-cde/ecc-epd/p1.html>

9 Newfoundland and Labrador, Department of Justice and Public Safety, 2008, *Report of the Task Force on Criminal Justice Efficiencies. Government of Newfoundland & Labrador*, p. 6. Available at [http://www.justice.gov.nl.ca/just/publications/report\\_on\\_criminal\\_justice\\_efficiencies.pdf](http://www.justice.gov.nl.ca/just/publications/report_on_criminal_justice_efficiencies.pdf).

The criminal justice system in Canada involves a range of actors, including:

- Complainants or victims and accused or offenders
- Police (local police, provincial police in certain provinces, the RCMP)
- Lawyers (Crown prosecutors and defence counsel as well as duty counsel lawyers and law students operating through legal clinics)
- Courts (including provincial, superior, and appellate courts comprised of registry staff, justices of the peace, judges, and justices)
- Corrections and conditional release officials and institutions (including federal penitentiaries, provincial jails, parole boards, and institutions for persons who are found not criminally responsible on account of mental disorder or unfit to stand trial)
- Victim services, both provincial or territorial, police-based, and community-based
- Non-governmental organizations, which play a variety of roles in assisting victims and offenders in the justice system

Each of these justice system participants has a particular role to play and many of them have constitutional or legislative mandates. They also operate independently of one another.

## Discussion and analysis

Based on the methodology, data sources, and calculations, all described in the Appendix, the overall grades for the criminal justice system, in order of performance, for each province and territory are as follows:

PROVINCE	RANK	OVERALL
PE	1	B+
NL	2	B
NB	3	B
PQ	4	B
NS	5	B
AB	6	C+
ON	7	C+
BC	8	C+
SK	9	C+
NU	10	C+
NW	11	C
MN	12	C
YK	13	C

A few of the highlights from the report cards for each province and territory are:

1. The cost of public safety per person is lowest in Quebec, Ontario, and British Columbia, while it is highest in the territories, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan.
2. The territories have disproportionately high per-capita crime rates – far exceeding any of the provinces. Among the provinces, violent crime rates per capita are highest in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Newfoundland & Labrador, while they are lowest in Ontario, Quebec, and Prince Edward Island.
3. Public perceptions of the police are generally higher in the Atlantic Provinces than in the Western Provinces.
4. There are serious issues with efficiency in Ontario’s justice system. It has the worst record in Canada for the proportion of charges stayed or withdrawn (43.1 percent on average), compared with a mere 8.6 percent in neighbouring Quebec. At just 55.3 percent on average, Ontario is also a significant outlier for the percentage of accused persons found guilty.
5. British Columbia received a failing grade for its weighted clearance rate for violent crime (on average slightly over half of violent crimes were solved by police).
6. In terms of support for victims, restitution orders (where offenders are required to compensate their victims) are infrequent in Canada and ordered in less than 1.0 percent of cases in Quebec, Manitoba, and Nunavut.
7. Referrals to victim services per 1,000 crimes are highest in Ontario, Manitoba, and Alberta, while they are lowest in the territories, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island.
8. The number of accused persons on remand (in jail awaiting trial) per 1,000 crimes is highest in Manitoba and Ontario, while it is lowest in Newfoundland & Labrador, Prince Edward Island, and the Northwest Territories. Keeping large numbers of accused on remand is costly and suggests undue delays in case processing.
9. In terms of access to justice, legal aid expenditures on criminal matters per crime are highest in Ontario, Newfoundland & Labrador, and Nova Scotia, and lowest in New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and the Northwest Territories.
10. Disproportionate levels of Aboriginal incarceration relative to the population are a problem in every jurisdiction in Canada, but are particularly acute in Alberta, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and British Columbia.

In the report card narrative for each jurisdiction below, “strengths” generally consist of metrics with a grade of A+, A, or B+, while “areas for improvement” typically highlight metrics with a grade of C+, C, D, or F. Where metrics are not mentioned, it is often because they received an average grade of B so were not considered notable enough to discuss.



## Prince Edward Island: B+

RANKING: 1/13

### Criminal Justice Report Card

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	GRADE
Public Safety	B+
Support for Victims	B+
Costs and Resources	B+
Fairness and Access to Justice	B
Efficiency	A
<b>OVERALL GRADE</b>	<b>B+</b>

#### STRENGTHS

PEI may be a surprising top jurisdiction for its criminal justice system in Canada, yet that is what the data reveals. The province should not be discounted merely because of its small size and population as metrics are normalized (i.e., adjusted) for population. PEI has one of the lowest violent crime rates in Canada and a good weighted clearance rate for such crimes. The proportion of people found guilty for failure to appear in court is high. The rates of failure to comply with orders are low and the conviction rate for such violations is moderate. The police in PEI perform very highly in public perceptions, specifically in ensuring safety, satisfaction with public safety, supplying information, being approachable, being fair, and responding promptly. With 5.8 percent of cases involving restitution orders to victims, PEI has one of the highest rates for such orders, which reflects in its score for support for victims.

PEI has fewer police officers per capita than any other province or territory in Canada, which is a positive indicator for costs and resources. The criminal justice system in PEI is fairly efficient: an average of only 22.1 percent of charges in the province are stayed or withdrawn, it has the lowest average criminal case length at an average of just 63.2 days, and a low number of accused on remand per 1,000 crimes. The proportion of Aboriginal people in custodial admissions in PEI (a ratio of the percentage of Aboriginal custodial admissions divided by the percentage of the province that is Aboriginal) is disproportionate but lower than in other parts of Canada.

#### AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

There are some notable areas for improvement in PEI's criminal justice system despite its strong overall performance. PEI's weighted clearance rate for non-violent crimes is lower than average. While the province has low rates of probation breaches, its conviction rate for such violations is lower than in most other jurisdictions.

Another area for concern is that PEI has one of the lowest rates of referrals to victim services anywhere in Canada. Furthermore, the average daily cost per inmate is high. Access to justice is also an issue in PEI, with the province spending far less on legal aid per crime than almost any other province or territory.



## Newfoundland & Labrador: B

RANKING: 2/13

### Criminal Justice Report Card

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	GRADE
Public Safety	B
Support for Victims	B+
Costs and Resources	C+
Fairness and Access to Justice	B+
Efficiency	B
<b>OVERALL GRADE</b>	<b>B</b>

#### STRENGTHS

Newfoundland & Labrador achieved a solid overall ranking, scoring well in support for victims, and fairness and access to justice. Newfoundland & Labrador has fewer failures to appear and a higher percentage of convictions for such violations than other jurisdictions. While the province has fewer breaches of probation than elsewhere, its conviction rate for such violations could be improved. Unlawfully at large violations are less common in Newfoundland & Labrador than in other provinces and territories, and the province has a good conviction rate for such matters. The province does even better in comparison to other jurisdictions in dealing with failure to comply violations and associated conviction rates.

The police in Newfoundland & Labrador perform very highly in public perceptions of them, specifically in ensuring safety, satisfaction with public safety, supplying information, being approachable, and being fair. The number of police per capita is slightly lower than the average in other jurisdictions. In Newfoundland & Labrador, criminal legal aid funding per crime is among the highest in Canada.

In terms of criminal justice efficiency, Newfoundland & Labrador is fairly average but there are relatively few offenders on remand per 1,000 crimes.

#### AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Newfoundland & Labrador has a higher violent crime rate than the other Atlantic provinces, and the poorest clearance rate for such crimes in the region. Its clearance rate for non-violent crimes is also below average. With a mere 2.5 percent of cases involving restitution orders to victims, the province falls short of the average for such orders.

The cost of the criminal justice system in Newfoundland & Labrador is a major cause for concern. The province has the highest cost of public safety per capita among the Atlantic provinces, and the highest average daily cost per inmate of any province in Canada. In terms of criminal justice efficiency, the average criminal case length is higher than typical at 183 days. The police in Newfoundland & Labrador perform below average in public perceptions of enforcing the law and responding promptly.



## New Brunswick: B

RANKING: 3/13

### Criminal Justice Report Card

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	GRADE
Public Safety	B+
Support for Victims	C+
Costs and Resources	B+
Fairness and Access to Justice	B
Efficiency	B
<b>OVERALL GRADE</b>	<b>B</b>

#### STRENGTHS

New Brunswick continues the trend of strong performances in Atlantic Canada, with all four provinces ranking in the top 5. It receives particularly strong grades for public safety and costs and resources. The violent crime rate in New Brunswick is moderate and the province has a lower property crime rate than most other jurisdictions. The police in New Brunswick perform highly in public perceptions, particularly in enforcing the law, ensuring safety, satisfaction with public safety, supplying information, being approachable, being fair, and responding promptly. With respect to cost and resources, the cost of corrections per capita is lower in New Brunswick than in other jurisdictions and it has fewer police officers per capita than elsewhere.

In terms of criminal justice efficiency, the percentage of charges stayed or withdrawn in New Brunswick is lower than average at 20.0 percent and the average criminal case length is 148 days.

#### AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

New Brunswick's clearance rate for non-violent crime is lower than elsewhere in Canada. New Brunswick does poorly in supporting victims of crime; only 1.0 percent of cases involve restitution orders and there are fewer victim services referrals per 1,000 crimes than any other province. Access to justice is also a concern in New Brunswick, with criminal legal aid funding per crime among the lowest of anywhere in Canada. Finally, police officers in the province deal with fewer *Criminal Code* incidents per officer than in other jurisdictions, which indicates a lower level of productivity.



## Quebec: B

RANKING: 4/13

### Criminal Justice Report Card

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	GRADE
Public Safety	B
Support for Victims	C+
Costs and Resources	B
Fairness and Access to Justice	B+
Efficiency	C+
<b>OVERALL GRADE</b>	<b>B</b>

#### STRENGTHS

At number four, Quebec is the highest ranking province outside Atlantic Canada. Quebec has among the lowest violent crime rates in Canada and the lowest property crime rate in the country. It spends less per person on public safety than any other province or territory.

Quebec's weighted clearance rate for violent crime is better than average. The province has significantly fewer failure to appear violations than in any other province or territory (a mere 0.04 per 1,000 crimes on average), and a good conviction rate for such violations. It has fewer failures to comply with orders than average and a moderate conviction rate for such matters. The public perception of Quebec police is generally good, with law enforcement scoring well in enforcing the law, supplying information, fairness, and responding promptly.

With regard to efficiency, Quebec has by far the lowest proportion of charges stayed or withdrawn of any jurisdiction in Canada, with a mere 8.6 percent on average, in comparison to 43.1 percent in neighbouring Ontario.

#### AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The weighted clearance rate for non-violent crime in Quebec is lower than average. Quebec fares worse than average in breaches of probation and its conviction rate for such violations. The province has the worst record in Canada for persons being unlawfully at large (3.2 per 1,000 crimes on average). Public perceptions of Quebec police rate them poorly on being approachable.

Very few victims (0.3 percent on average) receive restitution orders in Quebec, making it Canada's second worst jurisdiction in terms of providing this form of victim support. The average daily cost per inmate in Quebec is slightly higher than average as is the number of police officers per capita.

Quebec's average criminal case length is reported at 271 days (the longest in Canada) but this figure does not include all courts or cases.<sup>1</sup> The province has high numbers of accused on remand compared with the average. Quebec also has a lower number of *Criminal Code* incidents per police officer than is typical.





## Nova Scotia: B

RANKING: 5/13

### Criminal Justice Report Card

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	GRADE
Public Safety	B
Support for Victims	B
Costs and Resources	C+
Fairness and Access to Justice	B+
Efficiency	C+
<b>OVERALL GRADE</b>	<b>B</b>

#### STRENGTHS

Nova Scotia scored average on many metrics. In terms of support for victims, the province has the highest proportion in the country of offenders given a restitution order (5.8 percent on average), which reflects a greater level of support for victims in potentially receiving funds to cover losses and damages caused by criminal incidents. For access to justice, criminal legal aid spending per crime is higher in the province than in many other provinces and territories.

#### AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

With regard to public safety, Nova Scotia has a higher than typical rate of unlawfully at large and failure to comply with order violations. There are low conviction rates for breach of probation and unlawfully at large violations, although the conviction rate for failure to comply is higher than in other jurisdictions. Public perceptions of the police in Nova Scotia are the worst overall in Atlantic Canada, with below average ratings for enforcing the law, ensuring safety, supplying information and being fair. Referrals to victim services per 1,000 crimes are lower in Nova Scotia than in most other provinces.

In terms of costs and resources of the criminal justice system, the average daily cost per inmate in Nova Scotia is higher than average and the number of police officers per capita is higher than elsewhere.

Criminal justice efficiency is a cause for concern in Nova Scotia, with 32.8 percent of charges stayed or withdrawn, an average criminal case length of 210 days, and fewer *Criminal Code* incidents per police officer than in most other jurisdictions in Canada.



**Alberta: C+**

**RANKING: 6/13**

**Criminal Justice Report Card**

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	GRADE
Public Safety	C+
Support for Victims	B
Costs and Resources	B+
Fairness and Access to Justice	C
Efficiency	C+
<b>OVERALL GRADE</b>	<b>C+</b>

**STRENGTHS**

Alberta is the highest ranking western province. With regard to costs and resources, the cost of corrections per capita and average daily inmate cost in Alberta are lower than typical. There are fewer police officers per capita in Alberta than in most other provinces and territories.

Alberta has among the lowest number of breaches of probation per 1,000 crimes of anywhere in Canada and high conviction rates for such violations. The number of referrals to victim services per 1,000 crimes in Alberta is higher than average. The number of *Criminal Code* incidents per police officer was also better than average.

**AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

Alberta has a higher than average violent crime rate and its weighted clearance rate for such crimes is lower than typical in Canada. While the province has a higher property crime rate than average, its weighted clearance rate for non-violent crimes is average. The number of failures to appear, unlawfully at large, and failures to comply with orders per 1,000 crimes are high in Alberta, and their associated conviction rates are poorer than in many other jurisdictions.

Public perceptions of the police in Alberta are poor for enforcing the law, ensuring safety, satisfaction with safety, being approachable, being fair, and responding promptly. Restitution orders that benefit victims were ordered in only 2.5 percent of cases in Alberta on average. Access to justice is a cause for concern in the province, which has relatively low levels of criminal legal aid funding per crime. Alberta had the most disproportionate level of Aboriginal incarceration of any jurisdiction in Canada.

Alberta has problems with its criminal justice efficiency. The percentage of charges stayed or withdrawn in Alberta was high at 35.3 percent and the average criminal case length was also greater than average at 183 days.

It is troubling that Alberta did not report data for the number of Aboriginal persons in prison in the province and the number of persons on remand per 1,000 crimes for two of the three years covered by this report card.



## Ontario: C+

RANKING: 7/13

### Criminal Justice Report Card

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	GRADE
Public Safety	B
Support for Victims	B
Costs and Resources	B
Fairness and Access to Justice	C+
Efficiency	C
<b>OVERALL GRADE</b>	<b>C+</b>

#### STRENGTHS

For Canada’s most populous province, it is disappointing that Ontario achieved a mid-tier ranking in this report. However, its criminal justice system does have some strengths. Ontario has the lowest violent crime rate per capita in Canada and the second lowest property crime rate after Quebec. Public perceptions of the police in Ontario are good for enforcing the law, ensuring safety, satisfaction with safety, and responding promptly. Restitution orders for victims are ordered in more cases than is average in other provinces and territories, and the number of referrals to victim services is higher than in any other jurisdiction in the country.

The cost of public safety per person in Ontario is lower than average. With respect to access to justice, the province has the highest legal aid expenditure on criminal matters per crime than in any other jurisdiction.

#### AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Ontario has serious problems with the efficiency and fairness of its criminal justice system. Public perceptions of the police in Ontario are poor for supplying information, being approachable, and being fair. The province is an outlier with respect to the percentage of accused found guilty, with only 53.3 percent on average of accused persons found guilty at trial, a significantly lower proportion than in any other jurisdiction. Ontario also has the highest number of criminal charges stayed or withdrawn of any province or territory (43.1 percent), in comparison with a mere 8.6 percent of charges stayed or withdrawn in neighbouring Quebec. Ontario also ranks worse than average with respect to the number of accused on remand per 1,000 crimes, and the proportion of Aboriginal offenders incarcerated in comparison with the province’s Aboriginal population.

Ontario’s weighted violent crime clearance rate is lower than average. The province has higher rates of administration of justice violations (e.g., failure to appear, breach of probation, unlawfully at large, and failure to comply with orders) and poorer conviction rates for them than most other provinces and territories. Public perception of the police in Ontario is lower than average, particularly for supplying information and being fair. The average daily cost per inmate in Ontario is higher than is typical in other jurisdictions. The number of police officers is higher than average, yet the number of *Criminal Code* incidents per police officer is lower in Ontario than in any other jurisdiction in Canada.



## British Columbia: C+

RANKING:8/13

### Criminal Justice Report Card

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	GRADE
Public Safety	C+
Support for Victims	C
Costs and Resources	B
Fairness and Access to Justice	C+
Efficiency	B
<b>OVERALL GRADE</b>	<b>C+</b>

#### STRENGTHS

British Columbia is another large and prosperous province with a mediocre criminal justice system. The public safety cost per person and corrections cost per capita in British Columbia is better than average. The province has lower than average rates of accused persons failing to comply with court orders and does moderately well in terms of conviction rates for such non-compliance. While British Columbia has lower rates of accused persons failing to appear in court, breaching probation, and being unlawfully at large than in many other jurisdictions, the percentage of persons found guilty for such offences is lower than average.

#### AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

There are very serious problems with British Columbia's criminal justice system. While the violent crime rate in the province is moderate, it has higher property crime rates than in most other jurisdictions. It also has a very high rate of Federal Statute violations. British Columbia received a failing grade for its weighted violent crime clearance rate, with only half of such crimes resolved – the worst record of any jurisdiction in Canada. Its non-violent crime clearance rate was also the worst in the country. Public perceptions of the police in British Columbia are below average, specifically in enforcing the law, ensuring public safety, satisfaction with public safety, providing information, being approachable, being fair, and responding promptly.

British Columbia is not performing adequately in its support for victims of crime. Only 1.4 percent of cases, on average, saw offenders being ordered to pay restitution. Further, the rate of victim services referrals is lower than in many other jurisdictions. With respect to costs and resources, the average daily cost per inmate was higher than in other parts of Canada and there were more police officers per capita than average. Legal aid expenditures per crime in British Columbia are lower than in many other jurisdictions. The percentage of charges stayed and withdrawn in British Columbia (28.7 percent on average) is higher than the average elsewhere in Canada, as is the average criminal case length (peaking at 213 days in 2012, but falling). There is a disproportionate rate of Aboriginal incarceration in British Columbia relative to the province's Aboriginal population.



## Saskatchewan: C+

RANKING: 9/13

### Criminal Justice Report Card

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	GRADE
Public Safety	C
Support for Victims	C+
Costs and Resources	C
Fairness and Access to Justice	C+
Efficiency	B
<b>OVERALL GRADE</b>	<b>C+</b>

#### STRENGTHS

Saskatchewan’s justice system has serious deficiencies overall. Among its few strengths, Saskatchewan has higher average weighted violent and non-violent crime clearance rates than any other province, despite its high crime rates. Restitution orders are made more often than is typical in other jurisdictions. The average daily cost per inmate in Saskatchewan is lower than average. With respect to criminal justice efficiency, Saskatchewan has a better than average criminal case length (143 days) and number of *Criminal Code* incidents per police officer.

#### AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Saskatchewan has the highest violent crime rate, Federal Statutes violations, traffic crimes and property crime rate of any province in Canada. It also has the highest number of failures to appear per 1,000 crimes of any jurisdiction in the country, and lower than average conviction rates for such violations. It also has a high proportion of breaches of probation, but a moderate conviction rate for such matters. Saskatchewan has a higher than average failure to comply with order rates and lower than average corresponding conviction rates. Public perceptions of the police in Saskatchewan are lower than average for enforcing the law, supplying information, fairness, and responding promptly.

Saskatchewan’s criminal justice system is costly; it has the second highest average public safety cost per capita and cost of corrections per capita among the provinces. The number of police officers per capita is among the highest compared to other provinces.

There are concerns about fairness and access to justice in Saskatchewan’s criminal justice system. Criminal legal aid expenditures in Saskatchewan are lower than average per crime. There is a disproportionate rate of Aboriginal incarceration relative to the province’s Aboriginal population. With respect to criminal justice efficiency, Saskatchewan has a higher than average percentage of criminal charges stayed or withdrawn (31.4 percent). There is a good deal of room for improvement in Saskatchewan.



**Nunavut: C+**

**RANKING: 10/13**

**Criminal Justice Report Card**

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	GRADE
Public Safety	C
Support for Victims	F
Costs and Resources	F
Fairness and Access to Justice	A+
Efficiency	A
<b>OVERALL GRADE</b>	<b>C+</b>

**STRENGTHS**

Nunavut’s weighted violent crime clearance rate is exceptional at 92.9 percent on average, the best in Canada and all the more impressive given the massive rates of such crimes. Its weighted non-violent crime clearance rate also leads the country at 64.6 percent on average.

In terms of the efficiency of its criminal justice system, the average criminal case length in Nunavut is lower than average at 107 days, and police officers in Nunavut had a higher than average number of *Criminal Code* incidents per officer.

Nunavut is the only jurisdiction in Canada that does not have a significantly disproportionate ratio of incarceration of Aboriginal offenders relative to their percentage of the population, which is likely because the Aboriginal population is so high.

**AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

Nunavut has staggeringly high violent crime rates – by far the highest in Canada. Its property crime rate is the second highest in the country, behind only the Northwest Territories. In Nunavut, conviction rates for failures to appear and breaches of probation are lower than average. Fewer restitution orders than average are issued in Nunavut, with less than 1.0 percent of offenders given restitution orders.

The cost and resources used in Nunavut’s criminal justice system are very high. No doubt at least in part due to its significant crime rates, geography, isolation, and vastness, the cost of public safety per person in Nunavut, the cost of corrections per capita, and the average daily inmate cost vastly outstrip those of every other jurisdiction in Canada. Nunavut also has many more police officers per capita than average.

Nunavut does not report data on legal aid expenditures on criminal matters per crime and, as with the other territories, was not included in a survey on public perceptions of the police.



## Northwest Territories: C

RANKING: 11/13

### Criminal Justice Report Card

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	GRADE
Public Safety	C+
Support for Victims	F
Costs and Resources	F
Fairness and Access to Justice	B+
Efficiency	A
<b>OVERALL GRADE</b>	<b>C</b>

#### STRENGTHS

The Northwest Territories has an impressive weighted clearance rate for both violent crime (80.5 percent) and non-violent crime (58.7 percent) – the second highest rates in Canada, after Nunavut. It has relatively few administration of justice violations. In terms of efficiency, the Northwest Territories has one of the shortest average criminal case lengths (99 days) and fewer accused on remand (per 1,000 crimes) than is typical in Canada. The Northwest Territories has the highest number of *Criminal Code* incidents per police officer of any other jurisdiction in the country.

#### AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The Northwest Territories has extraordinary per-capita violent crime rates that are second only to Nunavut, and its per-capita property crime rates eclipse every other jurisdiction in Canada. The Northwest Territories received a failing grade for its support for victims. It has a low level of referrals to victim services per 1,000 crimes and restitution orders were made in only 2.2 percent of cases on average.

The criminal justice system in the Northwest Territories received a failing grade for its cost and use of resources. No doubt at least in part because of its vast size, sparse population, and significant crime rates, the cost of public safety per person in the territory and cost of corrections per capita is second only to Nunavut. The daily average inmate cost is also well above the national average. The Northwest Territories has the greatest number of police officers per capita of any jurisdiction in Canada.

In terms of fairness and access to justice, the Northwest Territories had the lowest legal aid expenditure on criminal matters per crime in Canada. With respect to criminal justice efficiency, a higher than average percentage of criminal charges were stayed or withdrawn in the Northwest Territories (30.8 percent on average).



## Manitoba: C

RANKING: 12/13

### Criminal Justice Report Card

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	GRADE
Public Safety	C+
Support for Victims	C
Costs and Resources	D
Fairness and Access to Justice	C+
Efficiency	C
<b>OVERALL GRADE</b>	<b>C</b>

#### STRENGTHS

Manitoba has a higher than average weighted violent and non-violent crime clearance rate. It has a mixed record on administration of justice offences, doing better than average in the number of failures to appear and unlawfully at large per 1,000 crimes as well as its percentage found guilty for breaches of probation violations. Manitoba has better than average referral rates for victim services per 1,000 crimes and numbers of *Criminal Code* incidents per police officer.

#### AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Manitoba's criminal justice system ranked the worst overall among the provinces. Manitoba has the second highest per-capita violent crime rate and fourth highest per-capita property crime rate among the provinces. As noted above, Manitoba has a mixed record with respect to administration of justice offences. The province does worse than average in terms of the number of breaches of probation and failure to comply with orders per 1,000 crimes as well as the percentage found guilty for failure to comply with order violations.

Public perception of the police in Manitoba is among the lowest in Canada, with dismal ratings for enforcing the law, ensuring safety, satisfaction with safety, supplying information, being approachable, being fair, and responding promptly. With respect to support for victims of crime, Manitoba has by far the lowest proportion of offenders given restitution orders of anywhere in the country.

Manitoba received a failing grade for having the highest cost of public safety per person and the highest cost of corrections per capita of any province in Canada. Manitoba also has the highest number of police officers per capita among the provinces. In terms of efficiency, Manitoba has a high proportion of criminal cases where charges are stayed or withdrawn (30.5 percent) and a higher than average criminal case length (223 days), among the longest delays in Canada. Manitoba has an extremely high number of accused persons on remand per 1,000 crimes – by far the highest of any jurisdiction in the country and meriting a failing grade. There are concerns about access to justice and fairness in Manitoba's criminal justice system with below average legal aid expenditures on criminal matters per crime and disproportionate levels of Aboriginal incarceration.





## Yukon: C

RANKING: 13/13

### Criminal Justice Report Card

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	GRADE
Public Safety	C
Support for Victims	F
Costs and Resources	F
Fairness and Access to Justice	B+
Efficiency	B+
<b>OVERALL GRADE</b>	<b>C</b>

#### STRENGTHS

The Yukon has higher weighted clearance rates for violent crimes and non-violent crimes than most other jurisdictions in Canada, but behind Nunavut and the Northwest Territories. The Yukon has lower failure to appear and unlawfully at large rates than average. In terms of efficiency, while the average criminal case length in the Yukon is better than typical for Canada at 148 days, it is much longer than in the other territories. Likewise, the number of *Criminal Code* incidents per police officer in the Yukon is higher than average, but less than in the other territories.

#### AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The Yukon scored last overall in comparison to every other province and territory. The Yukon has higher per-capita violent and property crime rates than all of the provinces, but fewer than Nunavut and the Northwest Territories. The Yukon has higher breaches of probation than is typical, but higher than average conviction rates for such violations. In its support for victims of crime, the Yukon has one of the lowest proportions of offenders given restitution orders (2.1 percent) and lower than average referral rates to victim services per 1,000 crimes.

The cost of public safety per person, the cost of corrections per capita, and the average daily inmate cost in the Yukon are higher than in any province. The Yukon has the second highest number of police officers per capita in Canada.

Access to justice and fairness are problems in the Yukon's criminal justice system. This territory has among the lowest per-crime expenditures on legal aid for criminal matters in Canada, and a higher proportion of Aboriginal persons incarcerated than in the other territories. In terms of criminal justice efficiency, the Yukon has a higher than average percentage of criminal charges stayed or withdrawn (29.9 percent).

# Conclusion

This report card on Canada's criminal justice system has shone a light into the mechanics of a core institution of our system of governance. It has revealed excellent results in certain jurisdictions on some key metrics, but some appalling failures in other instances such as excessive delays in time to trial, inadequate support for victims of crime, large proportions of cases stayed or withdrawn, very high crimes rates in some jurisdictions, soaring costs of policing and corrections, and disproportionate rates of Aboriginal incarceration. The data reveals that the criminal justice system in many parts of our country is slow, inefficient, costly, not serving victims of crime, and perceived to be unfair. Urgent reform is needed to improve the situation in these provinces and territories. Every jurisdiction has room for improvement in achieving some or all of the core objectives of the criminal justice system.

The degree of variability across the provinces and territories on every metric in this report card is notable, confirming the need for the regular collection of data at this level. Indeed, data at the national level is virtually meaningless as an indicator of the situation on the ground across the country. While there are some generally observable regional trends, some jurisdictions still do significantly better or worse than one another even within their respective regions.

It is our hope that this inaugural criminal justice system report card will generate tough questions for the many actors responsible for administering the justice system in each of these jurisdictions, enhance the collection of key data on its performance, and motivate necessary reforms.

We hope this report card will become an annual exercise to track changes – both positive and negative – in each of these jurisdictions on key metrics. Improvements to this report card may evolve in response to constructive criticism of it and, hopefully, a greater availability of timely data covering a wider range of metrics.

Canada is facing a significant justice deficit, which this report card has laid bare in stark detail. The problems are serious and the opportunities for improvement are there. Much can be learned from what is working well, and not working well, in various jurisdictions. Canadians deserve greater accountability and transparency from our criminal justice system. They also deserve an open and constructive response from the actors administering it, including the police, Crown prosecutors, courts, governments, corrections authorities, victim services officials, and other professionals. As has been said, it is not a legal system that we need, but a justice system.

*The authors would like to acknowledge editorial assistance and feedback from David Watson as well as feedback from the anonymous peer-reviewers in addition to Scott Newark, Ian Lee, Christian Leuprecht, and Geoff Cowper, Q.C. The authors also appreciate research assistance from Sarah Péloquin-Ladany, Heather Conway, Caleb Chaplin and Peter Doherty.*

# Appendices

## Data and methods

This criminal justice system report card is comparative. It is based on objective, available data from individual provinces and territories. The calculation of grades was a quantitative statistical exercise, not a subjective or qualitative one.

We examined how each province and territory performed on a variety of metrics in relation to each other and we assigned grades using a standard normal transformation. We did not assign quotas for how many grades of each category would be assigned, but the nature of the approach means that some provinces and territories must earn grades at B or above and some others must earn grades of C+ or below.<sup>2</sup> As discussed below, standard deviations were used to assign these grades. Currently there are no Canadian standards for these metrics so we simply compared the jurisdictions against each other. We hope that this report card generates some discussion around what appropriate benchmarks should be, much like what has been done with health service wait times. For example, some provinces have set their own targets for certain metrics that could be valuable as a starting point.

As in any data reporting initiative, we made assumptions about how best to treat the data to give an accurate reflection of each province's performance. Drawing on the analogy of a student's report card, we treated each province and territory as an individual and examined their performance on a wide range of indicators (akin to a test or assignment), which we aggregated to a domain, i.e., one of the core objectives of the criminal justice system (like a subject grade), and then aggregated the subject grades to an overall grade.

In all cases we used up to three years of the most recently available data for each metric. For some measures, there has been no recent data update, but rather than exclude the measure because it is older, we thought it would be worthwhile to draw attention to this and recommend that this data be collected again in the near future. In other cases, the data has only been collected once or twice, so we used what was available. We believed that it was better to report limited data than impose exclusion criteria that would leave some measures unreported entirely if the data were incomplete. We hope this creates an incentive for better reporting in the future.

In analyzing the data, there are a number of technical points to highlight:

- While individual metrics are normalized (e.g. per capita, per 1,000 crimes, etc.), for overall outcomes we averaged across provinces, but did not weight the data by province size. Doing this would have had the effect of compressing the data towards the scores of Ontario, and smaller provinces would have had very little impact on the overall average.<sup>3</sup>
- Standard deviations are calculated for the three-year averages for the 10 provinces, in order to calculate grades for each metric.
- The results for the territories are vastly different than for the provinces, so to avoid significantly skewing the data, these results are not used in the calculations of the means and standard deviations for each metric.

- However, scores and grades were calculated for the territories using the means and standard deviations computed for the provinces.
- Scores are capped at +3 and -3 standard deviations so that extreme values for individual metrics will not skew the overall results. This only affected scores for the territories.
- The procedure followed was to average each measure for each province across the years available. These figures were then averaged across the 10 provinces. Then the standard deviation of the 10 provinces was calculated. The difference is divided by the standard deviation. It was multiplied by -1 if a higher score is a worse outcome.
- Letter grades were then assigned as follows:

Score -1.50 or lower = F  
 Between -1.50 and -1.00 = D  
 Between -1.00 and -0.50 = C  
 Between -0.50 and 0.00 = C+  
 Between 0.00 and 0.50 = B  
 Between 0.50 and 1.00 = B+  
 Between 1.00 and 1.50 = A  
 Greater than 1.50 = A+

- In cases where there are optimums, scores are calculated (i.e., where a maximum or minimum outcome is not better, but rather an outcome close to the mean of all jurisdictions) in absolute distance from the mean and grades assigned as follows:

Between 0 and 0.25 of mean = A+  
 Between 0.25 and 0.50 of mean = A  
 Between 0.50 and 0.75 of mean = B+  
 Between 0.75 and 1.00 of mean = B  
 Between 1.00 and 1.25 of mean = C+  
 Between 1.25 and 1.50 of mean = C  
 Between 1.50 and 1.75 of mean = D  
 Greater than 1.75 = F

- Scores and grades are provided for each individual metric.
- Within each domain (or core objective of the criminal justice system), the scores for each available metric are averaged to give an overall score.
- As noted above, not all provinces and territories have scores for all metrics. We calculated averages based on the data that are available.
- The overall grade is the average of the domain scores and grades assigned using the rubric above.
- All calculations were done using Microsoft Excel.

## Data sources and limitations

The table below shows each metric used, the years of data available, the source for that data, and any calculations used. In many cases the data available were counts or totals and to account for different population sizes these had to be normalized, typically by the population of that province or territory, or the number of crimes reported in the province or territory for that year.

### METRICS, YEARS, AND SOURCES

MEASURE	SOURCE	YEARS	NOTES
<b>PUBLIC SAFETY</b>			
Violent Crime Rate	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520051">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520051</a>	2013-2015	
Property Crime Rate	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520051">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520051</a>	2013-2015	
Other Crime Rate	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520051">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520051</a>	2013-2015	
Federal Statute Violations	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520051">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520051</a>	2013-2015	
Traffic Crimes	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520051">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520051</a>	2013-2015	
Weighted Clearance Rate (violent)	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520052">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520052</a>	2013-2015	
Weighted Clearance Rate (non-violent)	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520052">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520052</a>	2013-2015	
Failure to Appear <sup>1</sup> per 1000 Crimes	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056</a>	2012-2014	(number/crimes that year)*1000
Failure to Appear % Guilty	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056</a>	2012-2014	
Breach of Probation per 1000 Crimes	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056</a>	2012-2014	(number/crimes that year)*1000
Breach of Probation % Guilty	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056</a>	2012-2014	
Unlawfully at Large per 1000 Crimes	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056</a>	2012-2014	(number/crimes that year)*1000
Unlawfully at Large % Guilty	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056</a>	2012-2014	
Failure to Comply with Order per 1000 Crimes	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056</a>	2012-2014	(number/crimes that year)*1000
Failure to Comply with Order % Guilty	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520056</a>	2012-2014	
Police Enforcing the Law	(2009) <a href="http://statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11647/tbl/tbl08-eng.htm">http://statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11647/tbl/tbl08-eng.htm</a> (2014) <a href="http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-652-x/2015007/t/tbl04-eng.htm">http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-652-x/2015007/t/tbl04-eng.htm</a>	2009, 2014	
Police Ensuring Safety	(2009) <a href="http://statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11647/tbl/tbl08-eng.htm">http://statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11647/tbl/tbl08-eng.htm</a> (2014) <a href="http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-652-x/2015007/t/tbl04-eng.htm">http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-652-x/2015007/t/tbl04-eng.htm</a>	2009, 2014	
Satisfied with Safety	(2009) <a href="http://statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11647/tbl/tbl08-eng.htm">http://statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11647/tbl/tbl08-eng.htm</a> (2014) <a href="http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-652-x/2015007/t/tbl04-eng.htm">http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-652-x/2015007/t/tbl04-eng.htm</a>	2009, 2014	

<b>SUPPORT FOR VICTIMS</b>			
Police Supplying Information	(2009) <a href="http://statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11647/tbl/tbl08-eng.htm">http://statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11647/tbl/tbl08-eng.htm</a> (2014) <a href="http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-652-x/2015007/t/tbl04-eng.htm">http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-652-x/2015007/t/tbl04-eng.htm</a>	2009, 2014	
Police Being Approachable	(2009) <a href="http://statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11647/tbl/tbl08-eng.htm">http://statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11647/tbl/tbl08-eng.htm</a> (2014) <a href="http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-652-x/2015007/t/tbl04-eng.htm">http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-652-x/2015007/t/tbl04-eng.htm</a>	2009, 2014	
Proportion of Offenders Given Restitution Orders	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/pick-choisir?lang=eng&amp;p2=33&amp;id=2520056">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/pick-choisir?lang=eng&amp;p2=33&amp;id=2520056</a>	2012-2014	
Number of Referrals to Victims Services per 1000 crimes	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;retrLang=eng&amp;id=2560019&amp;tabMode=dataTable&amp;srchLan=-1&amp;p1=-1&amp;p2=9">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;retrLang=eng&amp;id=2560019&amp;tabMode=dataTable&amp;srchLan=-1&amp;p1=-1&amp;p2=9</a>	2008, 2010, 2012	(number/crimes that year)*1000
<b>COSTS AND RESOURCES</b>			
Cost of Public Safety per Person	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/pick-choisir?lang=eng&amp;p2=33&amp;id=3850040">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/pick-choisir?lang=eng&amp;p2=33&amp;id=3850040</a>	2012-2014	Total cost / population
Cost of Corrections per Capita (\$000s)	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;retrLang=eng&amp;id=2510018&amp;pasSer=&amp;pattern=&amp;stByVal=1&amp;p1=1&amp;p2=35&amp;tabMode=dataTable&amp;csid=">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;retrLang=eng&amp;id=2510018&amp;pasSer=&amp;pattern=&amp;stByVal=1&amp;p1=1&amp;p2=35&amp;tabMode=dataTable&amp;csid=</a>	2013-2015	Total cost / population
Average Daily Inmate Cost	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;retrLang=eng&amp;id=2510018&amp;pasSer=&amp;pattern=&amp;stByVal=1&amp;p1=1&amp;p2=35&amp;tabMode=dataTable&amp;csid=">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;retrLang=eng&amp;id=2510018&amp;pasSer=&amp;pattern=&amp;stByVal=1&amp;p1=1&amp;p2=35&amp;tabMode=dataTable&amp;csid=</a>	2013-2015	
Number of Police per 100,000 population	Number of police officers: <a href="http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/legal05a-eng.htm">http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/legal05a-eng.htm</a> Divided by population: <a href="http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/demo02a-eng.htm">http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/demo02a-eng.htm</a>	2013-2015	(Number of police / population) * 100,000
<b>FAIRNESS AND ACCESS</b>			
Police Being Fair	<a href="http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11647/tbl/tbl08-eng.htm">http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11647/tbl/tbl08-eng.htm</a>	2009, 2014	
Legal Aid Expenditure on Criminal Matters per crime	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2580007">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2580007</a>	2012-2014	Total Expenditure/ number of crimes
Percent of Criminal Trials Outcome Guilty	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520053">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520053</a>	2012-2014	
Proportion of Aboriginal Persons in Custodial Admissions to Proportion of Aboriginal Persons in Population	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;retrLang=eng&amp;id=2510022&amp;pasSer=&amp;pattern=&amp;stByVal=1&amp;p1=1&amp;p2=35&amp;tabMode=dataTable&amp;csid=">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;retrLang=eng&amp;id=2510022&amp;pasSer=&amp;pattern=&amp;stByVal=1&amp;p1=1&amp;p2=35&amp;tabMode=dataTable&amp;csid=</a>  Source of Aboriginal population: <a href="https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-011-x/2011001/tbl/tbl02-eng.cfm">https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-011-x/2011001/tbl/tbl02-eng.cfm</a>	2012-2014	This is measured as a ratio of the percentage of Aboriginal custodial admissions divided by the percentage of each province that is Aboriginal
<b>EFFICIENCY</b>			
Police Responding Promptly	<a href="http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11647/tbl/tbl08-eng.htm">http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11647/tbl/tbl08-eng.htm</a>	2009, 2014	
Percentage of Cases Stayed or Withdrawn	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520053">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520053</a>	2012-2014	
Average Criminal Case Elapsed Time	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520054">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2520054</a>	2010-2014	
Number of accused on remand, per 1000 crimes	<a href="http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2015001/article/14163/tbl/tbl03-eng.htm">http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2015001/article/14163/tbl/tbl03-eng.htm</a>	2012-2014	(number/crimes that year)*1000
Criminal Code Incidents per Police Officer	<a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2540002">http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;id=2540002</a>	2012-2014	

1 Failure to appear, breach of probation, unlawfully at large and failure to comply are based on the number of cases (the alternative would be the number of charges, since each case might have multiple charges. Note that this is based on the number of cases and not the number of charges as there may be many charges per case. Data is derived from Cansim 252-0053.

## LIMITATIONS

As noted earlier, not all data were available for all years for all provinces and territories. We hope that in future years, the data become more complete.

We also believe that the justice system has many important features that are not captured here, simply because the data are not available, or at least not available at the provincial and territorial level. Many provinces do not report civil court data, there is limited information on recidivism and unreported crimes, and the perceptions of individuals towards key justice institutions are not regularly captured. We hope that this report card sparks a wider discussion on justice statistics, what should be measured, and by whom.

The approach taken here is comparative, and with this comes an assumption that an average performance warrants a grade of C+ or B. It may be that there are areas where Canada does especially well compared to other countries, and all of the provinces and territories deserve higher scores if compared on that basis. By contrast, there may be areas where Canada does especially poorly and all provinces and territories deserve lower grades if assessed globally or based on peer countries. However, determining which metrics these might be and what a “good” or “bad” score would look like is extremely subjective and as such we choose to report the data without imposing such subjective judgments. This report card has the advantage of highlighting over- and under-performing metrics by jurisdiction within Canada, which is a valuable exercise.

# Report card tables

## Summary

PUBLIC SAFETY			SUPPORT FOR VICTIMS			COST AND RESOURCES		
	OVERALL	GRADE		OVERALL	GRADE		OVERALL	GRADE
NL	0.326	<b>B</b>	NL	0.678	<b>B+</b>	NL	-0.490	<b>C+</b>
PE	0.629	<b>B+</b>	PE	0.832	<b>B+</b>	PE	0.507	<b>B+</b>
NS	0.042	<b>B</b>	NS	0.132	<b>B</b>	NS	-0.119	<b>C+</b>
NB	0.570	<b>B+</b>	NB	-0.275	<b>C+</b>	NB	0.504	<b>B+</b>
PQ	0.277	<b>B</b>	PQ	-0.206	<b>C+</b>	PQ	0.221	<b>B</b>
ON	0.031	<b>B</b>	ON	0.438	<b>B</b>	ON	0.132	<b>B</b>
MN	-0.319	<b>C+</b>	MN	-0.787	<b>C</b>	MN	-1.311	<b>D</b>
SK	-0.874	<b>C</b>	SK	-0.044	<b>C+</b>	SK	-0.701	<b>C</b>
AB	-0.234	<b>C+</b>	AB	0.022	<b>B</b>	AB	0.980	<b>B+</b>
BC	-0.446	<b>C+</b>	BC	-0.791	<b>C</b>	BC	0.277	<b>B</b>
YK	-0.788	<b>C</b>	YU	-1.617	<b>F</b>	YK	-3.000	<b>F</b>
NW	-0.159	<b>C+</b>	NW	-1.590	<b>F</b>	NW	-3.000	<b>F</b>
NU	-0.540	<b>C</b>	NU	-1.889	<b>F</b>	NU	-3.000	<b>F</b>

FAIRNESS AND ACCESS			EFFICIENCY			OVERALL			
	OVERALL	GRADE		OVERALL	GRADE		SCORE	GRADE	RANK
NL	0.547	<b>B+</b>	NL	0.248	<b>B</b>	NL	0.262	<b>B</b>	2
PE	0.368	<b>B</b>	PE	1.037	<b>A</b>	PE	0.675	<b>B+</b>	1
NS	0.552	<b>B+</b>	NS	-0.184	<b>C+</b>	NS	0.085	<b>B</b>	4
NB	0.172	<b>B</b>	NB	0.331	<b>B</b>	NB	0.260	<b>B</b>	3
PQ	0.669	<b>B+</b>	PQ	-0.161	<b>C+</b>	PQ	0.160	<b>B</b>	5
ON	-0.342	<b>C+</b>	ON	-0.626	<b>C</b>	ON	-0.073	<b>C+</b>	7
MN	-0.002	<b>C+</b>	MN	-0.791	<b>C</b>	MN	-0.642	<b>C</b>	12
SK	-0.248	<b>C+</b>	SK	0.203	<b>B</b>	SK	-0.333	<b>C+</b>	9
AB	-0.700	<b>C</b>	AB	-0.169	<b>C+</b>	AB	-0.020	<b>C+</b>	6
BC	-0.112	<b>C+</b>	BC	0.112	<b>B</b>	BC	-0.192	<b>C+</b>	8
YK	0.642	<b>B+</b>	YK	0.872	<b>B+</b>	YK	-0.778	<b>C</b>	13
NW	0.710	<b>B+</b>	NW	1.306	<b>A</b>	NW	-0.547	<b>C</b>	11
NU	1.908	<b>A+</b>	NU	1.461	<b>A</b>	NU	-0.412	<b>C+</b>	10

NL	Newfoundland and Labrador	SK	Saskatchewan
PE	Prince Edward Island	AB	Alberta
NS	Nova Scotia	BC	British Columbia
NB	New Brunswick	YK	Yukon
PQ	Quebec	NW	Northwest Territories
ON	Ontario	NU	Nunavut
MN	Manitoba		



## Public Safety

Crime Rates (violent) per 100,000 pop							
	2013	2014	2015	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	1388.4	1256.92	1365.02	1,336.78	74.31	-0.195	<b>C+</b>
PE	949.53	844.27	736.1	843.30	-419.17	1.100	<b>A</b>
NS	1232.46	1256.81	1172.53	1,220.60	-41.87	0.110	<b>B</b>
NB	1243.06	1175.23	1185.75	1,201.35	-61.12	0.160	<b>B</b>
PQ	979.57	940.09	957.13	958.93	-303.54	0.797	<b>B+</b>
ON	832.88	785.93	785.62	801.48	-460.99	1.210	<b>A</b>
MN	1850.01	1722.02	1790.43	1,787.49	525.02	-1.378	<b>D</b>
SK	1991.19	1972.23	2019.96	1,994.46	731.99	-1.921	<b>F</b>
AB	1281.54	1254.68	1291.71	1,275.98	13.51	-0.035	<b>C+</b>
BC	1248.87	1147.14	1217	1,204.34	-58.13	0.153	<b>B</b>
YK	4186.23	4495.81	4095.86	4,259.30	2,996.83	-3.000	<b>F</b>
NW	7435.51	6914.51	7593.9	7,314.64	6,052.17	-3.000	<b>F</b>
NU	8742.77	8128.48	7947.13	8,272.79	7,010.32	-3.000	<b>F</b>

Crime Rates (property) per 100,000 pop							
	2013	2014	2015	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	3552.73	3282.18	3439.28	3,424.73	-287.09	0.242	<b>B</b>
PE	4269.09	3308.66	2872.03	3,483.26	-228.56	0.192	<b>B</b>
NS	3474.37	3319.34	2945.49	3,246.40	-465.42	0.392	<b>B</b>
NB	2852.39	2592.84	2979.29	2,808.17	-903.65	0.761	<b>B+</b>
PQ	2339.41	2098.18	2011	2,149.53	-1,562.29	1.315	<b>A</b>
ON	2358.04	2271.14	2283.31	2,304.16	-1,407.66	1.185	<b>A</b>
MN	4304.69	4324.42	4705.74	4,444.95	733.13	-0.617	<b>C</b>
SK	5697.56	5652.76	6219.54	5,856.62	2,144.80	-1.805	<b>F</b>
AB	4285.77	4336.24	5161.95	4,594.65	882.83	-0.743	<b>C</b>
BC	4560.66	4877.83	4978.69	4,805.73	1,093.91	-0.921	<b>C</b>
YK	9566.55	9234.93	9629.15	9,476.88	5,765.06	-3.000	<b>F</b>
NW	24054.33	23037.74	23396.39	23,496.15	19,784.33	-3.000	<b>F</b>
NU	13035.13	14003.82	15057.29	14,032.08	10,320.26	-3.000	<b>F</b>

## Public Safety

Crime Rates (other) per 100,000 pop							
	2013	2014	2015	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	1007.16	1051.66	989.09	1015.97	-185.6353333	0.239025788	<b>B</b>
PE	652.5	569.92	533.3	585.24	-616.3653333	0.793637756	<b>B+</b>
NS	936.49	906.1	851.64	898.0766667	-303.5286667	0.390826344	<b>B</b>
NB	746.97	719.87	768.04	744.96	-456.6453333	0.587980793	<b>B+</b>
PQ	541.82	450.62	418.52	470.32	-731.2853333	0.941609821	<b>B+</b>
ON	484.3	476.38	478.01	479.5633333	-722.042	0.929708019	<b>B+</b>
MN	1837.45	1712.64	1665.17	1738.42	536.8146667	-0.691207575	<b>C</b>
SK	3027.24	2928.23	2938.95	2964.806667	1763.201333	-2.270314494	<b>F</b>
AB	1514.94	1520.74	1503.63	1513.103333	311.498	-0.401087732	<b>C+</b>
BC	1612.03	1556.26	1648.49	1605.593333	403.988	-0.52017872	<b>C</b>
YK	10046.94	9897.27	9880.3	9941.503333	8739.898	-3	<b>F</b>
NW	14041.56	13747.16	13325.62	13704.78	12503.17467	-3	<b>F</b>
NU	10831.1	9059.67	9491.05	9793.94	8592.334667	-3	<b>F</b>

Federal Statute Violations per 100,000 pop							
	2013	2014	2015	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	330.48	269.34	237.61	279.1433333	-111.2566667	0.615770469	<b>B+</b>
PE	250.96	223.72	204.85	226.51	-163.89	0.907079325	<b>B+</b>
NS	393.32	380.95	329.59	367.9533333	-22.44666667	0.124235202	<b>B</b>
NB	298.39	285.06	271.27	284.9066667	-105.4933333	0.583872241	<b>B+</b>
PQ	319.48	315.42	298.66	311.1866667	-79.21333333	0.438420751	<b>B</b>
ON	276.8	258.57	234.39	256.5866667	-133.8133333	0.740614486	<b>B+</b>
MN	411.27	366.65	342.75	373.5566667	-16.84333333	0.093222524	<b>B</b>
SK	859.31	695.46	698.99	751.2533333	360.8533333	-1.997209092	<b>F</b>
AB	360.25	378.24	360.71	366.4	-24	0.132832411	<b>B</b>
BC	753.92	685.28	620.31	686.5033333	296.1033333	-1.638838317	<b>F</b>
YK	793.32	1008.38	903.07	901.59	511.19	-2.829275003	<b>F</b>
NW	1627.02	1330.15	1345.04	1434.07	1043.67	-3	<b>F</b>
NU	1134.47	773.22	874.89	927.5266667	537.1266667	-3	<b>F</b>

## Public Safety

Traffic Violations per 100,000 pop							
	2013	2014	2015	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	390.9	347.4	325.15	354.4833333	-57.559	0.310405644	<b>B</b>
PE	408.41	348.24	330.49	362.38	-49.66233333	0.267820299	<b>B</b>
NS	378.05	364.39	341.57	361.3366667	-50.70566667	0.273446813	<b>B</b>
NB	335.31	300.04	313.45	316.2666667	-95.77566667	0.516501459	<b>B+</b>
PQ	518.85	510.03	491.11	506.6633333	94.621	-0.510274544	<b>C</b>
ON	231.67	211.36	209.32	217.45	-194.5923333	1.049402501	<b>A</b>
MN	318.41	278.07	282.44	292.9733333	-119.069	0.642118342	<b>B+</b>
SK	954.96	871.97	829.19	885.3733333	473.331	-2.552591496	<b>F</b>
AB	499.86	471.72	439.89	470.49	58.44766667	-0.315198068	<b>C+</b>
BC	373.52	350.81	334.69	353.0066667	-59.03566667	0.31836905	<b>B</b>
YK	1463.12	1670.72	1397.35	1510.396667	1098.354333	-3	<b>F</b>
NW	1269.26	1527.97	1481.13	1426.12	1014.077667	-3	<b>F</b>
NU	886.13	648.5	636.53	723.72	311.6776667	-1.680823275	<b>F</b>

Weighted Clearance Rate (violent)							
	2013	2014	2015	AVERAGE	DIFFERENCE	SCORE	GRADE
NL	62.38	58.97	54.82	58.72333333	-5.383666667	-0.979796232	<b>C</b>
PE	67.68	73.16	70.98	70.60666667	6.499666667	1.182901784	<b>A</b>
NS	66.95	67.67	65.89	66.83666667	2.729666667	0.496783564	<b>B</b>
NB	67.95	66.61	64.46	66.34	2.233	0.4063931	<b>B</b>
PQ	65.03	70.12	66.63	67.26	3.153	0.573827785	<b>B+</b>
ON	63.52	63.43	63.12	63.35666667	-0.750333333	-0.136556332	<b>C+</b>
MN	67.34	67.21	67.1	67.21666667	3.109666667	0.565941369	<b>B+</b>
SK	69.73	65.23	67.36	67.44	3.333	0.606586745	<b>B+</b>
AB	62.7	63.03	58.5	61.41	-2.697	-0.490838419	<b>C+</b>
BC	51.83	53.81	50	51.88	-12.227	-2.225243364	<b>F</b>
YK	74.11	69.59	64.45	69.38333333	5.276333333	0.960262185	<b>B+</b>
NW	82.52	78.53	80.37	80.47333333	16.36633333	2.978578117	<b>A+</b>
NU	95.81	91.58	91.18	92.85666667	28.74966667	3	<b>A+</b>

<b>Weighted Clearance Rate (non-violent)</b>							
	2013	2014	2015	AVERAGE	DIFFERENCE	SCORE	GRADE
NL	27.65	28.2	24.96	26.93666667	-3.809333333	-0.710602357	<b>C</b>
PE	26.17	26.77	23.71	25.55	-5.196	-0.969274548	<b>C</b>
NS	32.98	31.05	32.38	32.13666667	1.390666667	0.259418361	<b>B</b>
NB	31.17	30.89	26.24	29.43333333	-1.312666667	-0.24486805	<b>C+</b>
PQ	29.59	29.81	30.14	29.84666667	-0.899333333	-0.16776384	<b>C+</b>
ON	34.61	34.01	33.48	34.03333333	3.287333333	0.6132272	<b>B+</b>
MN	36.27	35.99	32.88	35.04666667	4.300666667	0.802256878	<b>B+</b>
SK	42.08	41.03	38.34	40.48333333	9.737333333	1.816425975	<b>A+</b>
AB	34.37	33.74	29.37	32.49333333	1.747333333	0.325951834	<b>B</b>
BC	23.48	20.81	20.21	21.5	-9.246	-1.724771454	<b>F</b>
YK	49.38	47.18	44.95	47.17	16.424	3	<b>A+</b>
NW	58.26	60.31	57.49	58.68666667	27.94066667	3	<b>A+</b>
NU	66.6	64.46	62.83	64.63	33.884	3	<b>A+</b>

<b>Failure to Appear per 1000 Crimes</b>							
	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFFERENCE	SCORE	GRADE
NL	1.286073313	1.178043817	1.354508793	1.272875308	-1.161641982	0.537352271	<b>B+</b>
PE	1.780665035	2.107974043	1.894490332	1.927709803	-0.506807486	0.234438973	<b>B</b>
NS	2.296595108	2.442872207	2.23774765	2.325738322	-0.108778968	0.050318968	<b>B</b>
NB	2.087632709	2.404698438	2.748879554	2.4137369	-0.020780389	0.009612591	<b>B</b>
PQ	0.039922868	0.028586068	0.048809809	0.039106248	-2.395411041	1.108069081	<b>A</b>
ON	3.653002713	3.965642016	3.99066966	3.869771463	1.435254174	-0.663919781	<b>C</b>
MN	0.722143909	0.810853539	0.535900389	0.689632612	-1.744884677	0.807148639	<b>B+</b>
SK	7.501524905	7.660375857	7.790431002	7.650777255	5.216259965	-2.412937191	<b>F</b>
AB	3.120060509	3.33639702	2.876995357	3.111150962	0.676633673	-0.31299716	<b>C+</b>
BC	1.300559703	0.949718187	0.88374417	1.04467402	-1.389843269	0.642913608	<b>B+</b>
YU	0.53483096	1.268742875	0.687049242	0.830207692	-1.604309597	0.742121427	<b>B+</b>
NW	1.39315915	1.00095088	1.931308054	1.441806028	-0.992711261	0.45920831	<b>B</b>
NU	0.755229968	1.471224578	0.803499688	1.009984744	-1.424532545	0.658960171	<b>B+</b>

Failure to Appear (% guilty)							
	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFFERENCE	SCORE	GRADE
NL	76	86	70	77.33333333	16.8	1.325174241	<b>A</b>
PE	82	67	69	72.66666667	12.13333333	0.957070285	<b>B+</b>
NS	64	72	69	68.33333333	7.8	0.615259469	<b>B+</b>
NB	71	68	72	70.33333333	9.8	0.773018307	<b>B+</b>
PQ	79	44	79	67.33333333	6.8	0.53638005	<b>B+</b>
ON	47	46	38	43.66666667	-16.86666667	-1.330432869	<b>D</b>
MN	63	72	49	61.33333333	0.8	0.063103535	<b>B</b>
SK	53	50	47	50	-10.53333333	-0.830863215	<b>C</b>
AB	49	56	53	52.66666667	-7.866666667	-0.620518097	<b>C</b>
BC	36	43	46	41.66666667	-18.86666667	-1.488191707	<b>D</b>
YU	0	36	50	28.66666667	-31.86666667	-2.513624156	<b>F</b>
NW	79	70	59	69.33333333	8.8	0.694138888	<b>B+</b>
NU	40	65	44	49.66666667	-10.86666667	-0.857156354	<b>C</b>

Breach of Probation per 1000 crimes							
	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFFERENCE	SCORE	GRADE
NL	12.79799784	11.525726	11.68263834	12.00212073	-4.570589822	1.080034073	<b>A</b>
PE	12.04567524	13.2333926	17.19614301	14.15840362	-2.414306931	0.570502681	<b>B+</b>
NS	15.14421412	15.4652602	15.23614269	15.28187234	-1.290838211	0.305026114	<b>B</b>
NB	14.80539519	14.81075629	14.92671156	14.84762101	-1.725089538	0.407640054	<b>B</b>
PQ	15.62695138	18.81280903	19.85861926	18.09945989	1.526749339	-0.360772104	<b>C+</b>
ON	19.97465564	21.68553609	20.93199784	20.86406319	4.291352641	-1.014050101	<b>D</b>
MN	20.19328337	27.32180888	27.80615227	25.10708151	8.534370958	-2.016678763	<b>F</b>
SK	18.67349615	20.16332412	19.59872816	19.47851614	2.905805592	-0.686644213	<b>C</b>
AB	12.22554322	12.46833058	11.57680907	12.09022762	-4.482482927	1.059214343	<b>A</b>
BC	13.80487033	14.19578764	13.39256037	13.79773945	-2.7749711	0.655727916	<b>B+</b>
YU	16.57975975	17.99308078	19.12287058	17.89857037	1.325859818	-0.313301748	<b>C+</b>
NW	12.39431244	11.06050722	9.44775021	10.96752329	-5.605187257	1.324510284	<b>A</b>
NU	19.63597916	24.40501947	19.10543701	21.04881188	4.476101332	-1.057706366	<b>D</b>

Breach of Probation (% guilty)							
	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFFERENCE	SCORE	GRADE
NL	83	78	77	79.33333333	-1.033333333	-0.369671016	<b>C+</b>
PE	70	81	81	77.33333333	-3.033333333	-1.085163304	<b>D</b>
NS	77	75	76	76	-4.366666667	-1.562158163	<b>F</b>
NB	85	85	85	85	4.633333333	1.657557135	<b>A+</b>
PQ	80	80	80	80	-0.366666667	-0.131173586	<b>C+</b>
ON	79	80	78	79	-1.366666667	-0.48891973	<b>C+</b>
MN	84	81	82	82.33333333	1.966666667	0.703567417	<b>B+</b>
SK	82	81	82	81.66666667	1.3	0.465069987	<b>B</b>
AB	83	85	83	83.66666667	3.3	1.180562276	<b>A</b>
BC	78	80	80	79.33333333	-1.033333333	-0.369671016	<b>C+</b>
YU	86	81	77	81.33333333	0.966666667	0.345821273	<b>B</b>
NW	80	76	77	77.66666667	-2.7	-0.965914589	<b>C</b>
NU	74	78	81	77.66666667	-2.7	-0.965914589	<b>C</b>

## Public Safety

Unlawfully at Large per 1000 crimes							
	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFFERENCE	SCORE	GRADE
NL	0.690088119	0.668619464	0.812705276	0.723804286	-0.490255958	0.629306899	<b>B+</b>
PE	1.047450021	0.468438676	0.728650128	0.748179608	-0.465880636	0.598018022	<b>B+</b>
NS	1.680841347	1.710010545	1.498317991	1.629723295	0.415663051	-0.53355726	<b>C</b>
NB	0.887843796	1.120370863	0.827619651	0.945278103	-0.268782141	0.345016624	<b>B</b>
PQ	2.517992347	3.109528961	3.890839026	3.172786778	1.958726534	-2.51427872	<b>F</b>
ON	1.317657402	1.222823285	1.139016482	1.226499056	0.012438812	-0.015966824	<b>C+</b>
MN	0.784551407	0.682303588	0.616791014	0.694548669	-0.519511574	0.666860265	<b>B+</b>
SK	0.979856572	1.037694086	1.031957201	1.01650262	-0.197557624	0.25359075	<b>B</b>
AB	1.577717672	1.395156515	1.524532229	1.499135472	0.285075228	-0.365930908	<b>C+</b>
BC	0.579264279	0.446926206	0.426243169	0.484144551	-0.729915693	0.936941151	<b>B+</b>
YU	1.203369659	0.576701307	0.229016414	0.669695793	-0.544364451	0.698762144	<b>B+</b>
NW	0.336279795	0.600570528	0.41758012	0.451476814	-0.76258343	0.978874414	<b>B+</b>
NU	0.302091987	0.865426222	0.446388715	0.537968975	-0.676091269	0.867850545	<b>B+</b>

Unlawfully at Large (% guilty)							
	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFFERENCE	SCORE	GRADE
NL	82	86	88	85.33333333	0.166666667	0.019735988	<b>B</b>
PE	100	100	100	100	14.83333333	1.756502923	<b>A+</b>
NS	69	79	86	78	-7.166666667	-0.84864748	<b>C</b>
NB	100	95	93	96	10.83333333	1.282839213	<b>A</b>
PQ	88	85	90	87.66666667	2.5	0.296039818	<b>B</b>
ON	75	71	71	72.33333333	-12.83333333	-1.519671068	<b>F</b>
MN	83	84	87	84.66666667	-0.5	-0.059207964	<b>C+</b>
SK	90	87	86	87.66666667	2.5	0.296039818	<b>B</b>
AB	79	74	77	76.66666667	-8.5	-1.006535383	<b>D</b>
BC	85	82	83	83.33333333	-1.833333333	-0.217095867	<b>C+</b>
YU	78	80	100	86	0.833333333	0.098679939	<b>B</b>
NW	86	100	100	95.33333333	10.16666667	1.203895262	<b>A</b>
NU	75	90	100	88.33333333	3.166666667	0.37498377	<b>B</b>

## Public Safety

Failure to Comply per 1000 crimes							
	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFFERENCE	SCORE	GRADE
NL	11.19824811	11.90779426	12.42761818	11.84455352	-6.850530114	0.802838689	<b>B+</b>
PE	3.03760506	6.675251136	7.140771251	5.617875816	-13.07720781	1.532565831	<b>A+</b>
NS	21.93414749	23.6958604	22.35801782	22.66267524	3.967591606	-0.464976577	<b>C+</b>
NB	13.86955984	16.69625847	18.23719016	16.26766949	-2.427414141	0.284477545	<b>B</b>
PQ	11.94834421	13.96270614	12.57201212	12.82768749	-5.867396139	0.687621621	<b>B+</b>
ON	22.12413029	22.95654945	22.31362072	22.46476682	3.769683189	-0.441782966	<b>C+</b>
MN	26.96895461	32.01882633	30.38454094	29.79077396	11.09569033	-1.300344547	<b>D</b>
SK	22.37606893	25.19993688	25.91735135	24.49778572	5.802702089	-0.680039889	<b>C</b>
AB	30.78671951	30.97177002	29.99508557	30.58452503	11.8894414	-1.393367139	<b>D</b>
BC	10.59942233	10.38809398	10.19005336	10.39252322	-8.302560407	0.973007432	<b>B+</b>
YU	18.45166811	15.45559502	17.17623106	17.0278314	-1.667252234	0.195391389	<b>B</b>
NW	13.49923177	10.4599367	9.082367605	11.01384536	-7.681238274	0.900192418	<b>B+</b>
NU	16.01087531	18.00086543	16.06999375	16.6939115	-2.001172134	0.234524684	<b>B</b>

Failure to Comply (% guilty)							
	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFFERENCE	SCORE	GRADE
NL	76	74	79	76.33333333	5.433333333	1.223226506	<b>A</b>
PE	79	72	65	72	1.1	0.247647084	<b>B</b>
NS	77	75	77	76.33333333	5.433333333	1.223226506	<b>A</b>
NB	72	75	73	73.33333333	2.433333333	0.547825368	<b>B+</b>
PQ	71	69	69	69.66666667	-1.233333333	-0.277664913	<b>C+</b>
ON	65	64	62	63.66666667	-7.233333333	-1.62846719	<b>F</b>
MN	70	72	73	71.66666667	0.766666667	0.172602513	<b>B</b>
SK	64	64	63	63.66666667	-7.233333333	-1.62846719	<b>F</b>
AB	67	71	71	69.66666667	-1.233333333	-0.277664913	<b>C+</b>
BC	72	72	74	72.66666667	1.766666667	0.397736226	<b>B</b>
YU	71	70	69	70	-0.9	-0.202620342	<b>C+</b>
NW	84	77	79	80	9.1	2.048716787	<b>A+</b>
NU	68	73	76	72.33333333	1.433333333	0.322691655	<b>B</b>

## Public Safety

Police Enforcing Law							Police Ensuring Safety						
	2009	2014	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE		2009	2014	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	60	56	58.000	-1.250	-0.259	<b>C+</b>	NL	66	67	66.500	1.600	0.339	<b>B+</b>
PE	59	65	62.000	2.750	0.570	<b>B+</b>	PE	68	72	70.000	5.100	1.081	<b>A</b>
NS	58	58	58.000	-1.250	-0.259	<b>C+</b>	NS	61	68	64.500	-0.400	-0.085	<b>C+</b>
NB	60	66	63.000	3.750	0.777	<b>B+</b>	NB	65	72	68.500	3.600	0.763	<b>B+</b>
PQ	64	71	67.500	8.250	1.709	<b>A+</b>	PQ	67	76	71.500	6.600	1.399	<b>A</b>
ON	62	65	63.500	4.250	0.881	<b>B+</b>	ON	65	70	67.500	2.600	0.551	<b>B+</b>
MN	50	55	52.500	-6.750	-1.399	<b>D</b>	MN	51	64	57.500	-7.400	-1.568	<b>F</b>
SK	50	55	52.500	-6.750	-1.399	<b>D</b>	SK	55	63	59.000	-5.900	-1.250	<b>D</b>
AB	57	61	59.000	-0.250	-0.052	<b>C+</b>	AB	59	67	63.000	-1.900	-0.403	<b>C+</b>
BC	52	61	56.500	-2.750	-0.570	<b>C</b>	BC	55	67	61.000	-3.900	-0.826	<b>C</b>
YK	Data not available for these territories.						YK	Data not available for these territories.					
NW													
NU													

Satisfied with Safety (2009)				
	% AGREE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	96	2.700	1.012	<b>A</b>
PE	97	3.700	1.386	<b>A</b>
NS	94	0.700	0.262	<b>B</b>
NB	95	1.700	0.637	<b>B+</b>
PQ	91	-2.300	-0.862	<b>C</b>
ON	95	1.700	0.637	<b>B+</b>
MN	90	-3.300	-1.237	<b>D</b>
SK	94	0.700	0.262	<b>B</b>
AB	92	-1.300	-0.487	<b>C+</b>
BC	89	-4.300	-1.611	<b>F</b>
YU	Data not available for these territories.			
NW				
NU				

PUBLIC SAFETY		
	OVERALL	GRADE
NL	0.326	<b>B</b>
PE	0.629	<b>B+</b>
NS	0.042	<b>B</b>
NB	0.570	<b>B+</b>
PQ	0.277	<b>B</b>
ON	0.031	<b>B</b>
MN	-0.319	<b>C+</b>
SK	-0.874	<b>C</b>
AB	-0.234	<b>C+</b>
BC	-0.446	<b>C+</b>
YK	-0.788	<b>C</b>
NW	-0.159	<b>C+</b>
NU	-0.540	<b>C</b>



## Support for Victims

Police Supplying Information						
	2009	2014	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	59	65	62.000	5.800	1.409	<b>A</b>
PE	58	65	61.500	5.300	1.287	<b>A</b>
NS	49	60	54.500	-1.700	-0.413	<b>C+</b>
NB	54	63	58.500	2.300	0.559	<b>B+</b>
PQ	54	66	60.000	3.800	0.923	<b>B+</b>
ON	49	61	55.000	-1.200	-0.291	<b>C+</b>
MB	45	57	51.000	-5.200	-1.263	<b>D</b>
SK	46	58	52.000	-4.200	-1.020	<b>D</b>
AB	51	61	56.000	-0.200	-0.049	<b>C+</b>
BC	44	59	51.500	-4.700	-1.141	<b>D</b>
YU	Data not available for these territories.					
NW						
NU						

Police Being Approachable						
	2009	2014	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	73	80	76.500	5.850	1.348	<b>A</b>
PE	75	81	78.000	7.350	1.694	<b>A+</b>
NS	70	75	72.500	1.850	0.426	<b>B</b>
NB	71	76	73.500	2.850	0.657	<b>B+</b>
PQ	61	71	66.000	-4.650	-1.071	<b>D</b>
ON	67	73	70.000	-0.650	-0.150	<b>C+</b>
MB	60	71	65.500	-5.150	-1.187	<b>D</b>
SK	67	72	69.500	-1.150	-0.265	<b>C+</b>
AB	64	71	67.500	-3.150	-0.726	<b>C</b>
BC	62	73	67.500	-3.150	-0.726	<b>C</b>
YU	Data not available for these territories.					
NW						
NU						

Proportion of Offenders given Restitution Orders							
	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	0.028129089	0.019426906	0.02857892	0.025378305	-0.002176958	-0.102421817	<b>C+</b>
PE	0.078125	0.044424297	0.048180924	0.056910074	0.029354811	1.381089315	<b>A</b>
NS	0.059008161	0.060369503	0.055383788	0.058253817	0.030698555	1.444309944	<b>A</b>
NB	0.010131391	0.01119403	0.009689575	0.010338332	-0.017216931	-0.810024588	<b>C</b>
PQ	0.003716838	0.00162651	0.00303477	0.002792706	-0.024762557	-1.165032273	<b>D</b>
ON	0.039598557	0.03926253	0.040068517	0.039643201	0.012087939	0.56871505	<b>B+</b>
MN	7.85978E-05	7.65931E-05	7.49681E-05	7.67197E-05	-0.027478543	-1.292814377	<b>D</b>
SK	0.045311799	0.044936788	0.040185173	0.04347792	0.015922657	0.749131443	<b>B+</b>
AB	0.026958452	0.023747458	0.023441339	0.02471575	-0.002839513	-0.133593811	<b>C+</b>
BC	0.013679745	0.013931945	0.014285714	0.013965802	-0.013589461	-0.639358886	<b>C</b>
YK	0.019174041	0.019448947	0.024279211	0.0209674	-0.006587863	-0.309946713	<b>C+</b>
NW	0.022505626	0.021998167	0.021806854	0.022103549	-0.005451714	-0.256492997	<b>C+</b>
NU	0.008409786	0.010853835	0.008908686	0.009390769	-0.018164494	-0.854605668	<b>C</b>

## Support for Victims

Number of Referrals to Victim Services per 1000 Crimes							
	2008	2010	2012	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	160.6438182	196.7862133	187.2333752	181.5544689	3.074247785	0.059618019	<b>B</b>
PE	131.9738802	118.9213585	124.332251	125.0758299	-53.40439123	-1.035656268	<b>D</b>
NS	151.0344301	136.9619407	103.8126779	130.6030162	-47.87720488	-0.928469105	<b>C</b>
NB	81.69014085	116.6758923	104.0216922	100.7959084	-77.68431266	-1.506509924	<b>F</b>
PQ	121.2532957	185.8738546	303.8902006	203.6724503	25.19222921	0.488545782	<b>B</b>
ON	303.622695	234.4293042	248.9988737	262.350291	83.8700699	1.626468566	<b>A+</b>
MN	149.3860732	241.1388583	236.8899667	209.1382994	30.6580783	0.594543449	<b>B+</b>
SK	163.6065061	211.226388	216.4358917	197.0895953	18.60937416	0.360886334	<b>B</b>
AB	202.9093909	184.3904474	302.3520714	229.8839699	51.40374879	0.996858375	<b>B+</b>
BC	99.73237713	170.3455859	163.8371821	144.6383817	-33.84183937	-0.656285228	<b>C</b>
YU	9.117568648	45.21662202	28.79429892	27.70949653	-150.7707246	-2.923854057	<b>F</b>
NW	9.117568648	45.21662202	28.79429892	27.70949653	-150.7707246	-2.923854057	<b>F</b>
NU	9.117568648	45.21662202	28.79429892	27.70949653	-150.7707246	-2.923854057	<b>F</b>

SUPPORT FOR VICTIMS		
	OVERALL	GRADE
NL	0.678	<b>B+</b>
PE	0.832	<b>B+</b>
NS	0.132	<b>B</b>
NB	-0.275	<b>C+</b>
PQ	-0.206	<b>C+</b>
ON	0.438	<b>B</b>
MN	-0.787	<b>C</b>
SK	-0.044	<b>C+</b>
AB	0.022	<b>B</b>
BC	-0.791	<b>C</b>
YU	-1.617	<b>F</b>
NW	-1.590	<b>F</b>
NU	-1.889	<b>F</b>

## Cost and Resources

Cost of Public Safety per Capita							
	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	502.9665537	492.2433803	497.1753985	497.4617775	113.9036276	-0.906725186	<b>C</b>
PE	323.5622134	323.0129549	328.1310884	324.9020856	-58.65606438	0.466929211	<b>B</b>
NS	360.9095768	373.3044871	384.01643	372.7434979	-10.81465199	0.086089597	<b>B</b>
NB	313.1540559	307.0265406	351.4989773	323.8931913	-59.66495865	0.474960472	<b>B</b>
PQ	250.8425117	260.2412984	252.7185504	254.6007868	-128.9573631	1.026559835	<b>A</b>
ON	283.1451739	294.2233702	297.980662	291.7830687	-91.77508124	0.730571795	<b>B+</b>
MN	608.557064	608.5008357	580.3237489	599.1272162	215.5690663	-1.716028769	<b>F</b>
SK	568.3615736	547.7980957	595.3385877	570.499419	186.9412691	-1.488138356	<b>D</b>
AB	330.4504	334.3981669	320.7420642	328.5302104	-55.02793957	0.438047671	<b>B</b>
BC	276.4992379	270.1508415	269.4706586	272.040246	-111.517904	0.887733731	<b>B+</b>
YK	1769.617873	1814.98185	1999.452205	1861.350643	1477.792493	-3	<b>F</b>
NW	2497.76576	2577.495951	2682.071384	2585.777699	2202.219549	-3	<b>F</b>
NU	3743.269314	4035.671953	3881.372147	3886.771138	3503.212988	-3	<b>F</b>

Cost of Corrections per Capita							
	2013	2014	2015	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	64.29645168	61.73324452	65.80712391	63.94560671	-4.535758574	0.143189533	<b>B</b>
PE	65.56475722	66.5217421	68.25136612	66.77928848	-1.702076797	0.053732927	<b>B</b>
NS	52.9318189	54.35423712	51.37751856	52.8878582	-15.59350708	0.492272013	<b>B</b>
NB	43.76054577	43.66280504	47.86841756	45.09725612	-23.38410916	0.738213823	<b>B+</b>
PQ	52.42660294	53.4889281	56.54061184	54.15204763	-14.32931765	0.452362769	<b>B</b>
ON	55.3669789	55.34522917	57.25248512	55.98823106	-12.49313422	0.394396225	<b>B</b>
MN	137.9747986	148.61124	147.467914	144.6846509	76.2032856	-2.405664395	<b>F</b>
SK	95.9885089	105.7383531	109.8817925	103.8695515	35.38818624	-1.117170985	<b>D</b>
AB	44.31399589	50.90967496	42.86595973	46.02987686	-22.45148842	0.708771884	<b>B+</b>
BC	48.62977006	51.66063453	53.84745147	51.37928535	-17.10207993	0.539896206	<b>B+</b>
YK	354.4714553	355.3546973	351.4973262	353.7744929	285.2931277	-3	<b>F</b>
NW	692.1603066	699.8830892	671.38322	687.8088719	619.3275066	-3	<b>F</b>
NU	810.2669752	947.2734727	969.9728997	909.1711159	840.6897506	-3	<b>F</b>

## Cost and Resources

Average Daily Inmate Cost							
	2013	2014	2015	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	281	264	263	269.3333333	78.18333333	-2.119290962	<b>F</b>
PE	192	184	214	196.6666667	5.516666667	-0.149538544	<b>C+</b>
NS	208	203	191	200.6666667	9.516666667	-0.257965282	<b>C+</b>
NB	182	183	207	190.6666667	-0.483333333	0.013101564	<b>B</b>
PQ	187	186	201	191.3333333	0.183333333	-0.004969559	<b>C+</b>
ON	184	198	218	200	8.85	-0.239894159	<b>C+</b>
MN	172	194	193	186.3333333	-4.816666667	0.130563864	<b>B</b>
SK	146	159	166	157	-34.15	0.925693281	<b>B+</b>
AB	123		122	122.5	-68.65	1.860873902	<b>A+</b>
BC	179	199	213	197	5.85	-0.158574105	<b>C+</b>
YK	268	356	378	334	142.85	-3	<b>F</b>
NW	297	280	396	324.3333333	133.1833333	-3	<b>F</b>
NU	446	566	598	536.6666667	345.5166667	-3	<b>F</b>

Number of Police per 100,000 pop							
	2013	2014	2015	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	173.6104537	169.8366342	168.4350133	170.6273671	-15.30935306	0.920833247	<b>B+</b>
PE	159.4446926	161.3311184	154.3715847	158.3824653	-27.55425488	1.657344624	<b>A+</b>
NS	200.969319	199.8582746	196.7126193	199.180071	13.24335084	-0.796566498	<b>C</b>
NB	177.8636511	171.1070493	169.5185038	172.8297347	-13.10698539	0.788364333	<b>B+</b>
PQ	196.2479386	197.1350773	193.7533278	195.7121146	9.775394453	-0.587974435	<b>C</b>
ON	194.518029	191.1579575	190.0000725	191.8920197	5.955299539	-0.358201799	<b>C+</b>
MN	212.6591882	206.3893333	201.1751972	206.7412395	20.8045194	-1.251358766	<b>D</b>
SK	208.4525427	203.8368239	201.6584333	204.6492666	18.7125465	-1.125529922	<b>D</b>
AB	172.1651458	169.5905468	170.4992255	170.7516394	-15.18508076	0.913358466	<b>B+</b>
BC	193.2516844	187.2475602	185.3046059	188.6012835	2.664563353	-0.160269249	<b>C+</b>
YK	362.99637	369.7617091	347.5935829	360.1172207	174.1805005	-3	<b>F</b>
NW	437.9462147	440.1347913	455.7823129	444.6211063	258.6843862	-3	<b>F</b>
NU	361.2349721	325.2699194	355.0135501	347.1728139	161.2360937	-3	<b>F</b>

COST AND RESOURCES		
	OVERALL	GRADE
NL	-0.490498342	C+
PE	0.507117054	B+
NS	-0.119042543	C+
NB	0.503660048	B+
PQ	0.221494652	B
ON	0.131718015	B
MN	-1.310622016	D
SK	-0.701286495	C
AB	0.980262981	B+
BC	0.277196645	B
YK	-3	F
NW	-3	F
NU	-3	F

## Fairness and Access

### Legal Aid Expenditure on Criminal Matters per Crime

	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	215.1820226	254.6803377	252.6497526	240.837371	64.21940895	1.052700281	<b>A</b>
PE	85.89090169	99.66032836	119.790081	101.780437	-74.83752499	-1.22675504	<b>D</b>
NS	208.1746972	231.7158245	242.8053493	227.5652903	50.94732831	0.835141085	<b>B+</b>
NB	95.88712994	105.9160357	105.4919476	102.4317044	-74.18625757	-1.216079305	<b>D</b>
PQ	164.6561678	213.9889532	229.0051626	202.5500945	25.93213251	0.425085868	<b>B</b>
ON	255.5721672	280.4682746	278.1297322	271.390058	94.772096	1.553527411	<b>A+</b>
MN	144.2237285	189.8386127	180.0827534	171.3816982	-5.236263793	-0.085834119	<b>C+</b>
SK	126.3051185	130.6144703	136.6835772	131.2010553	-45.4169067	-0.744485059	<b>C</b>
AB	131.1309785	142.0100223	148.1308471	140.4239493	-36.19401273	-0.593301122	<b>C</b>
BC	119.7211158	130.0731677	118.3336285	122.709304	-53.90865799	-0.883683926	<b>C</b>
YK	159.2459182	136.5628695	144.1658327	146.6582068	-29.95975521	-0.491107646	<b>C+</b>
NW		102.397275	95.62584743	99.01156123	-77.60640077	-1.27214313	<b>D</b>
NU	Data not available for Nunavut.						

Note - divided by number of crimes for each province

### Percent Guilty

	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFFERENCE	SCORE	ABS SCORE	GRADE	SCORE FOR SUMMARY
NL	77	76	74	75.66666667	6.533333333	0.906182451	0.906182451	<b>B</b>	0.25
PE	78	77	78	77.66666667	8.533333333	1.183585242	1.183585242	<b>C+</b>	-0.25
NS	64	65	65	64.66666667	-4.466666667	-0.6195329	0.6195329	<b>B+</b>	0.75
NB	77	76	76	76.33333333	7.2	0.998650048	0.998650048	<b>B</b>	0.25
PQ	76	76	73	75	5.866666667	0.813714854	0.813714854	<b>B</b>	0.25
ON	56	55	55	55.33333333	-13.8	-1.914079259	1.914079259	<b>F</b>	-1.75
MN	68	68	70	68.66666667	-0.466666667	-0.064727318	0.064727318	<b>A+</b>	1.75
SK	67	67	67	67	-2.133333333	-0.295896311	0.295896311	<b>A</b>	1.25
AB	62	63	61	62	-7.133333333	-0.989403289	0.989403289	<b>B</b>	0.25
BC	67	70	70	69	-0.133333333	-0.018493519	0.018493519	<b>A+</b>	1.75
YK	69	66	67	67.33333333	-1.8	-0.249662512	0.249662512	<b>A+</b>	1.75
NW	70	69	66	68.33333333	-0.8	-0.110961116	0.110961116	<b>A+</b>	1.75
NU	67	70	72	69.66666667	0.533333333	0.073974078	0.073974078	<b>A+</b>	1.75

Note - this is an 'optimum'.

## Fairness and Access

### Proportion of Aboriginal Persons in Total Custodial Admissions

	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	3.171985499	3.504456513	4.25165836	3.642700124	-0.38555921	0.274172093	<b>B</b>
PE	2.03379224	1.845314506	2.652519894	2.17720888	-1.851050454	1.316286487	<b>A</b>
NS	3.168823158	3.121389018	2.729841478	3.006684551	-1.021574783	0.726444316	<b>B+</b>
NB	2.762328513	3.16598216	3.473735833	3.134015502	-0.894243832	0.635898967	<b>B+</b>
PQ	2.373335414	2.488209382	2.659742972	2.507095923	-1.521163412	1.081703007	<b>A</b>
ON	5.208156442	5.195167286	5.332179001	5.245167576	1.216908242	-0.865346415	<b>C</b>
MN	4.371371226	4.411087728	4.334536502	4.372331819	0.344072484	-0.244670782	<b>C+</b>
SK	4.82747705	4.903349341	4.805195078	4.84534049	0.817081156	-0.5810284	<b>C</b>
AB	6.764345292			6.764345292	2.736085958	-1.945637389	<b>F</b>
BC	5.520092646	5.583273937	2.659742972	4.587703185	0.559443851	-0.397821885	<b>C+</b>
YK	3.03620378	3.168713373	3.069771521	3.091562891	-0.936696443	0.666087122	<b>B+</b>
NW	1.740200289	1.714659454	1.664039236	1.70629966	-2.321959674	1.65115118	<b>A+</b>
NU	1.114694747	1.125096609	1.128255169	1.122682175	-2.905577159	2.066162995	<b>A+</b>

Note AB figure is from 2012 - the last year they report. This is measured as a ratio of the percentage of Aboriginal custodial admissions divided by the percentage of each province that is Aboriginal

### Police Being Fair

	2009	2014	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	64	70	67.000	3.000	0.612	<b>B+</b>
PE	68	76	72.000	8.000	1.631	<b>A+</b>
NS	60	67	63.500	-0.500	-0.102	<b>C+</b>
NB	66	72	69.000	5.000	1.019	<b>A</b>
PQ	62	75	68.500	4.500	0.917	<b>B+</b>
ON	58	67	62.500	-1.500	-0.306	<b>C+</b>
MN	51	63	57.000	-7.000	-1.427	<b>D</b>
SK	56	63	59.500	-4.500	-0.917	<b>C</b>
AB	57	66	61.500	-2.500	-0.510	<b>C</b>
BC	54	65	59.500	-4.500	-0.917	<b>C</b>
YK	Data not available for these territories.					
NW						
NU						

### FAIRNESS AND ACCESS

	OVERALL	GRADE
NL	0.547	B+
PE	0.368	B
NS	0.552	B+
NB	0.172	B
PQ	0.669	B+
ON	-0.342	C+
MN	-0.002	C+
SK	-0.248	C+
AB	-0.700	C
BC	-0.112	C+
YK	0.642	B+
NW	0.710	B+
NU	1.908	A+

## Efficiency

Police Responding Promptly						
	2009	2014	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	52	59	55.500	-2.650	-0.392	<b>C+</b>
PE	60	73	66.500	8.350	1.235	<b>A</b>
NS	57	65	61.000	2.850	0.421	<b>B</b>
NB	57	68	62.500	4.350	0.643	<b>B+</b>
PQ	57	75	66.000	7.850	1.161	<b>A</b>
ON	56	70	63.000	4.850	0.717	<b>B+</b>
MN	40	54	47.000	-11.150	-1.649	<b>F</b>
SK	43	55	49.000	-9.150	-1.353	<b>D</b>
AB	48	64	56.000	-2.150	-0.318	<b>C+</b>
BC	45	65	55.000	-3.150	-0.466	<b>C+</b>
YK	Data not available for these territories.					
NW						
NU						

Percent of Criminal Charges Stayed or Withdrawn							
	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFFERENCE FROM MEAN	SCORE	GRADE
NL	0.220711648	0.230740945	0.250097087	0.233849894	-0.042114898	0.442155997	<b>B</b>
PE	0.220399429	0.224162011	0.219512195	0.221357879	-0.054606913	0.573307196	<b>B+</b>
NS	0.328632444	0.326755123	0.327644754	0.32767744	0.051712649	-0.542920888	<b>C</b>
NB	0.194258606	0.204265159	0.20269718	0.200406982	-0.07555781	0.793266523	<b>B+</b>
PQ	0.088980003	0.092139201	0.077143403	0.086087536	-0.189877256	1.993483814	<b>A+</b>
ON	0.426421151	0.428929563	0.438389723	0.431246812	0.155282021	-1.630275273	<b>F</b>
MN	0.311944296	0.30927943	0.2939448	0.305056175	0.029091384	-0.305424694	<b>C+</b>
SK	0.317365269	0.315293722	0.310371752	0.314343581	0.03837879	-0.402931334	<b>C+</b>
AB	0.353847247	0.348476434	0.356209846	0.352844509	0.076879718	-0.807144976	<b>C</b>
BC	0.299885812	0.278967127	0.281478382	0.286777107	0.010812315	-0.113516365	<b>C+</b>
YK	0.28008089	0.312567132	0.305583756	0.299410593	0.023445801	-0.246152838	<b>C+</b>
NW	0.290611814	0.305449937	0.329010239	0.30835733	0.032392538	-0.340082865	<b>C+</b>
NU	0.292457671	0.263719512	0.242880172	0.266352452	-0.00961234	0.100918059	<b>B</b>

This is derived from: Table 252-0053 Adult criminal courts, number of cases and charges by type of decision for that year. Takes the number of cases stayed or withdrawn divide by the total number of decisions.

## Efficiency

### Average Criminal Case Length (days)

	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFFERENCE WITH MEAN	SCORE	GRADE
NL	177.3644679	171.8877551	201.0442718	183.432165	4.84234472	-0.087319968	<b>C+</b>
PE	58.7211127	61.92388268	69.09756098	63.24751878	-115.3423015	2.079919257	<b>A+</b>
NS	207.0667258	210.9136845	213.1128864	210.3644322	31.77461196	-0.572978226	<b>C</b>
NB	135.5082715	149.1615493	159.6673478	148.1123895	-30.47743071	0.549586702	<b>B+</b>
PQ	262.7156668	267.9405005	283.6724986	271.4428886	92.85306837	-1.674380367	<b>F</b>
ON	164.0386701	161.3359766	165.9206475	163.7650981	-14.82472216	0.267327986	<b>B</b>
MN	222.8811998	223.3178676	221.7942859	222.6644511	44.07463085	-0.794779299	<b>C</b>
SK	140.9575492	143.5268281	143.9401163	142.8081645	-35.78165572	0.645235563	<b>B+</b>
AB	180.8394006	183.4017878	186.2290491	183.4900791	4.900258905	-0.08836431	<b>C+</b>
BC	212.525383	197.3415686	179.8460948	196.5710155	17.98119523	-0.324247338	<b>C+</b>
YK	141.0571284	151.0182599	152.7553299	148.2769061	-30.31291414	0.546620044	<b>B+</b>
NW	86.27111932	103.6134347	107.9119454	99.26549981	-79.32432043	1.430422139	<b>A</b>
NU	112.4948665	102.8928753	106.9279957	107.4385792	-71.15124106	1.283040433	<b>A</b>

This is derived from:

Table 252-0054 Adult criminal courts, cases by length of elapsed time, annual (number)(1,2,3)

Takes the proportion of all cases that are 1 day x 1 plus the proportion of cases that are between 2 and 60 days x 31 plus the proportion of cases between 61 and 120 days x 91 plus the proportion of cases between 121 and 240 days x 181 plus the proportion of cases between 241 and 365 days x 303 plus the number of days plus proportion of cases greater than one year x 553

### Number of Accused on Remand, per 1000 crimes

	2012	2013	2014	AVERAGE	DIFF	SCORE	GRADE
NL	18.56964393	21.45950089	24.34729556	21.45881346	-44.04406161	1.261501401	<b>A</b>
PE	18.64461037	22.13372745	31.47768552	24.08534111	-41.41753396	1.186272909	<b>A</b>
NS	52.33906968	57.40749685	60.18568244	56.64408299	-8.858792079	0.253731791	<b>B</b>
NB	50.31914702	61.21050568	60.71181295	57.41382188	-8.089053186	0.23168508	<b>B</b>
PQ	86.92063957	98.42818486	106.5308936	97.29323935	31.79036428	-0.910533398	<b>C</b>
ON	103.6127752	105.9057329	99.36171217	102.9600734	37.45719835	-1.072841751	<b>D</b>
MN	110.7554787	132.0208	132.6909586	125.1557458	59.65287071	-1.708565859	<b>F</b>
SK	51.40231198	56.71040365	58.04336323	55.38535962	-10.11751545	0.289783899	<b>B</b>
AB	79.26085688			79.26085688	13.75798181	-0.394053425	<b>C+</b>
BC	35.44094813	36.13339568	34.53990479	35.3714162	-30.13145887	0.863019353	<b>B+</b>
YK	62.04039132	60.43829696	54.39139835	58.95669554	-6.546179526	0.187494394	<b>B</b>
NW	27.67102312	26.02472288	23.95865937	25.88480179	-39.61807328	1.134733108	<b>A</b>
NU	Data not available for this territory.						



## Efficiency

### Criminal Code Incidents per Police Officer

	2012	2013	2014			SCORE	GRADE
NL	34.4	34.3	33	33.9	0.176666667	0.017393187	<b>B</b>
PE	38.7	36.8	29.1	34.86666667	1.143333333	0.112563457	<b>B</b>
NS	31.1	28.1	27.3	28.83333333	-4.89	-0.481430297	<b>C+</b>
NB	30.6	27.2	26.2	28	-5.723333333	-0.563473633	<b>C</b>
PQ	21.9	19.7	17.7	19.76666667	-13.95666667	-1.374061794	<b>D</b>
ON	20.7	18.9	18.6	19.4	-14.32333333	-1.410160862	<b>D</b>
MN	41.5	37.6	37.4	38.83333333	5.11	0.503089737	<b>B+</b>
SK	54.2	51.4	51.5	52.36666667	18.64333333	1.835473517	<b>A+</b>
AB	41.7	41.1	41.6	41.46666667	7.743333333	0.76234668	<b>B+</b>
BC	40.4	38.4	40.6	39.8	6.076666667	0.598260007	<b>B+</b>
YK	62.8	65.7	64.7	64.4	30.67666667	3	<b>A+</b>
NW	104.6	104.1	99.8	102.8333333	69.11	3	<b>A+</b>
NU	105.9	90.3	94.1	96.76666667	63.04333333	3	<b>A+</b>

EFFICIENCY		
	OVERALL	GRADE
NL	0.248	B
PE	1.037	A
NS	-0.184	C+
NB	0.331	B
PQ	-0.161	C+
ON	-0.626	C
MN	-0.791	C
SK	0.203	B
AB	-0.169	C+
BC	0.112	B
YK	0.872	B+
NW	1.306	A
NU	1.461	A

# Author Biographies



## Benjamin Perrin

Benjamin Perrin is an Associate Professor at the University of British Columbia, Peter A. Allard School of Law, and a Munk Senior Fellow in Criminal Justice at the Macdonald-Laurier Institute. He previously served as Special Adviser, Legal Affairs & Policy, in the Office of the Prime Minister and was a Law Clerk at the Supreme Court of Canada. He is a member of the Law Society of British Columbia. Professor Perrin is the author of *Victim Law: The Law of Victims of Crime in Canada* (Carswell, 2017 forthcoming), and *Invisible Chains: Canada's Underground World of Human Trafficking* (Penguin, 2011). Follow him on Twitter @proffbenperrin



## Richard Audas

Richard Audas, Ph.D. is an Associate Professor of Health Statistics and Economics at the Memorial University, Faculty of Medicine. Prof. Audas contributes expertise related to statistics and economics as well as experience in applying quantitative methodologies to developing report cards related to the educational system in Atlantic Canada, and to municipal report cards for Atlantic Canada and Canada's major metropolitan centers. Professor Audas' work has focused on the role of key public institutions and the impact they have on the lives of Canadians. He is currently working as the Project Leader on the Big Data theme with New Zealand's 'A Better Start' National Science Challenge at the University of Otago.

# Endnotes

- 1 According to Statistics Canada, “In Quebec, provincial court data are available beginning in 1994/1995. Information from superior courts, as well as municipal courts is not available. The information from Quebec’s provincial courts is reported using the Adult Criminal Court Survey National Data Requirements (NDR), rather than the Integrated Criminal Court Survey (ICCS). The data are converted to the ICCS format, to the extent possible, during data processing activities. This reporting limitation results in a lack of data on conditional sentences, Controlled Drugs and Substances Act (CDSA) offences and has an impact on measures of case elapsed time” (*Table 252-0053: Adult criminal courts, number of cases and charges by type of decision annual (number)*), (data modified September 25, 2015), note 11.
- 2 A province or territory that scored exactly average would be between a ‘B’ and a ‘C+’. We look at enough places past the decimal point in each case so that no grade falls at the midpoint between two grades.
- 3 Consider this simple example: Suppose we are looking at average case length. Assume that we have two provinces in a country and Province A has 90 percent of the population and Province B has 10 percent. The average length of a case in Province A is 100 days and in Province B it is 200 days. If we calculate the average of the two provinces, the average case length would be 150 days. However, if we weighted the results, since Province A has 90 percent of the cases, we should calculate it as  $0.9 \times 100 + 0.1 \times 200 = 110$  days. Since our objective is not to calculate a national average, but rather to compare provinces, we do not use weighting when we calculate averages.

# About the Macdonald-Laurier Institute



## What Do We Do?

When you change how people think, you change what they want and how they act. That is why thought leadership is essential in every field. At MLI, we strip away the complexity that makes policy issues unintelligible and present them in a way that leads to action, to better quality policy decisions, to more effective government, and to a more focused pursuit of the national interest of all Canadians. MLI is the only non-partisan, independent national public policy think tank based in Ottawa that focuses on the full range of issues that fall under the jurisdiction of the federal government.

## What Is in a Name?

The Macdonald-Laurier Institute exists not merely to burnish the splendid legacy of two towering figures in Canadian history – Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Wilfrid Laurier – but to renew that legacy. A Tory and a Grit, an English speaker and a French speaker – these two men represent the very best of Canada’s fine political tradition. As prime minister, each championed the values that led to Canada assuming her place as one of the world’s leading democracies.

We will continue to vigorously uphold these values, the cornerstones of our nation.



## Working for a Better Canada


Good policy doesn’t just happen; it requires good ideas, hard work, and being in the right place at the right time. In other words, it requires MLI. We pride ourselves on independence, and accept no funding from the government for our research. If you value our work and if you believe in the possibility of a better Canada, consider making a tax-deductible donation. The Macdonald-Laurier Institute is a registered charity.

## Our Issues

**The Institute undertakes an impressive programme of thought leadership on public policy. Some of the issues we have tackled recently include:**

- Aboriginal people and the management of our natural resources;
- Getting the most out of our petroleum resources;
- Ensuring students have the skills employers need;
- Controlling government debt at all levels;
- The vulnerability of Canada’s critical infrastructure;
- Ottawa’s regulation of foreign investment; and
- How to fix Canadian health care.

# Macdonald-Laurier Institute Publications




Winner of the Sir Antony Fisher International Memorial Award BEST THINK TANK BOOK IN 2011, as awarded by the Atlas Economic Research Foundation.


Do you want to be first to hear about new policy initiatives? Get the inside scoop on upcoming events? Visit our website [www.MacdonaldLaurier.ca](http://www.MacdonaldLaurier.ca) and sign up for our newsletter.

**The Canadian Century**  
By Brian Lee Crowley,  
Jason Clemens, and Niels Veldhuis

## RESEARCH PAPERS




**How Markets Can Put Patients First**  
Audrey Laporte




**Estimating the True Size of Government**  
Munir A. Sheikh




**A Defence of Mandatory Minimum Sentences**  
Lincoln Caylor and  
Gannon G. Beaulne




**The Rule and Role of Law**  
Dwight Newman




**Finding the Balance on Digital Privacy**  
Solveig Singleton



**The Carbon Tax Win-Win: Too Good to be True**  
Robert P. Murphy



**Risk, Prevention and Opportunity: Northern Gateway and the Marine Environment**  
Robert Hage



**Great Gatsby v. Zero Dollar Linda**  
Munir A. Sheikh



True North in  
Canadian public policy

---

**CONTACT US:** Macdonald-Laurier Institute  
8 York Street, Suite 200  
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1N 5S6

**TELEPHONE:** (613) 482-8327

**WEBSITE:** [www.MacdonaldLaurier.ca](http://www.MacdonaldLaurier.ca)

**CONNECT  
WITH US:**



Scan this QR code to  
get your copy of our  
iphone app or to visit  
our mobile website



@MLInstitute



[www.facebook.com/  
MacdonaldLaurierInstitute](http://www.facebook.com/MacdonaldLaurierInstitute)



[www.youtube.com/  
MLInstitute](http://www.youtube.com/MLInstitute)

---

## What people are saying about the Macdonald- Laurier Institute

---

*In five short years, the institute has established itself as a steady source of high-quality research and thoughtful policy analysis here in our nation's capital. Inspired by Canada's deep-rooted intellectual tradition of ordered liberty – as exemplified by Macdonald and Laurier – the institute is making unique contributions to federal public policy and discourse. Please accept my best wishes for a memorable anniversary celebration and continued success.*

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE STEPHEN HARPER

---

*The Macdonald-Laurier Institute is an important source of fact and opinion for so many, including me. Everything they tackle is accomplished in great depth and furthers the public policy debate in Canada. Happy Anniversary, this is but the beginning.*

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE PAUL MARTIN

---

*In its mere five years of existence, the Macdonald-Laurier Institute, under the erudite Brian Lee Crowley's vibrant leadership, has, through its various publications and public events, forged a reputation for brilliance and originality in areas of vital concern to Canadians: from all aspects of the economy to health care reform, aboriginal affairs, justice, and national security.*

BARBARA KAY, NATIONAL POST COLUMNIST

---

*Intelligent and informed debate contributes to a stronger, healthier and more competitive Canadian society. In five short years the Macdonald-Laurier Institute has emerged as a significant and respected voice in the shaping of public policy. On a wide range of issues important to our country's future, Brian Lee Crowley and his team are making a difference.*

JOHN MANLEY, CEO COUNCIL