Commission of Inquiry into Money Laundering in British Columbia

Public Hearing

Commissioner

The Honourable Justice
Austin Cullen

Held at:

Room 801 Federal Courthouse 701 West Georgia Street Vancouver, B.C.

Monday, February 24, 2020

APPEARANCES

Brock Martland, QC Patrick McGowan Steven Davis Cullen Commission

Jacqueline Hughes Chantelle Rajotte

B.C. (Ministry of Finance and GPEB)

Judith Hoffman Hanna Davis Canada

Ludmila Herbst, QC Law Society of B.C.

Jitesh Mistry Stephanie Smith Danielle Marchand **BCGEU**

Bill Smart, QC Shannon Ramsay

BCLC

Mark Swkarok Melanie Harmer **Great Canadian Gaming Corporation**

Robin N. McFee Maya Ollek James Lightbody

Christine Mainville

Robert Kroeker

Ron Usher John Mayr Society of Notaries Public of B.C.

Morgan Camley

BMW

Patrick Weafer

B.C. Real Estate Association

Megan Tweedie Emily Lapper **BCCLA**

JoAnne Stark

CBA/CDAS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introductions	1
Opening Remarks	2
Opening Statement by Ms. Hughes B.C. Ministry of Attorney General: GPEB, Ministry of Finance	6
Opening Statement by Ms. Hoffman Government of Canada	26
Opening Statement by Ms. Herbst Law Society of British Columbia	68
Opening Statement by Ms. Smith B.C. Government and Service Employees' Union	91
Opening Statement by Mr. Smart B.C. Lottery Corporation	108
Opening Statement by Mr. Skwarok Great Canadian Gaming Corporation	117

1 Vancouver, B.C. 2 February 24, 2020 3 4 THE REGISTRAR: All rise. The Cullen Commission 5 hearings have now commenced. 6 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr. Martland. 7 MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, it's Brock Martland, M-a-r-t-l-a-n-d, and I'm one of the Commission 8 9 counsel. With me are Patrick McGowan, M-c-g-o-w-10 a-n, and Steven Davis, D-a-v-i-s. 11 I'm going to ask, although it may be a 12 little unwieldy to try to do this, rather than 13 having everyone come up to the mike but simply 14 for the benefit of your knowing who's who in the 15 room, to ask the participants to -- if we can try and move around the room this way, and then the 16 17 second row, and counsel can identify themselves. 18 And then I have a few opening remarks. 19 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you. 20 MR. MCGOWAN: Patrick McGowan. 21 MR. DAVIS: Steven Davis. 22 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. 23 MS. TWEEDIE: Megan Tweedie. 24 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms. Tweedie. 25 MS. LAPPER: Emily Lapper. 26 THE COMMISSIONER: Ms. Lapper. 27 MS. HUGHES: Commissioner Cullen, Jacqueline Hughes, 28 appearing on behalf of the Gaming Policy 29 Enforcement Branch and the Ministry of Finance, 30 and with me is Ms. Chantelle Rajotte. 31 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms. Hughes. 32 MS. CAMLEY: Morgan Camley, counsel for BMW. 33 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. 34 MR. USHER: Good morning. Ron Usher, general counsel 35 for the Society of Notaries Public of B.C. 36 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Usher. 37 MS. HOFFMAN: Commissioner, Judith Hoffman for the 38 Government of Canada, and with me is Hanna Davis. 39 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms. Hoffman, Ms. Davis. 40 MS. STARK: Jo-Anne Stark, Canadian Bar Association. Thank you. 41 THE COMMISSIONER: 42 MR. WESTELL: Kevin Westell, Criminal Defence Advocacy 43 Society. 44 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Westell. 45 MR. MISTRY: Jitesh Mistry, M-i-s-t-r-y, general counsel for the B.C. Government Service 46 47 Employees' Union.

42

43

44

45

46

47

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. 2 MS. HERBST: Ludmila Herbst, counsel for the Law 3 Society of British Columbia. 4 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. 5 William Smart along with Shannon Ramsay, MR. SMART: 6 who's in the public gallery on the far left. We 7 appear for the B.C. Lottery Corporation. We'll try and secure another chair 8 THE COMMISSIONER: 9 for you, Mr. Smart. Thank you. 10 MR. MCFEE: Robin McFee, and with me is Maya Ollek, 11 O-l-l-e-k, and we appear for Jim Lightbody. Thank you, Mr. McFee. 12 THE COMMISSIONER: 13 MR. SKWAROK: My name is Mark Skwarok, S-k-w-a-r-o-k, 14 and with me is Ms. Melanie Harmer, on behalf of 15 Great Canadian Gaming Corporation. 16 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Skwarok, Ms. Harmer. 17 MR. WEAFER: Patrick Weafer, counsel for the B.C. Real 18 Estate Association. 19 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. All right, thank you. 20 I think that is a fairly full slate of 21 introductions. 22 Mr. Martland, I don't propose to make any 23 opening statement to initiate this proceeding, as 24 I did provide an overview of the nature and scope 25 of the Commission's mandate and about the Commission itself at the hearing which took place 26 27 on October 18th of 2019 in connection with 28 certain applications for participant status. 29 Those opening remarks have been transcribed and 30 they are posted on the Commission's website for 31 anyone who wishes to refer to them. But before we proceed, I understand that you 32 33 will be making a few remarks to put this 34 particular portion of the inquiry's hearings into 35 context and to explain what you expect to unfold 36 over the next few days. 37 MR. MARTLAND: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. 38 we're here to conduct a phase of our public 39 hearings in which the participants, which is to 40 say those granted standing as parties in the

> We'd actually reserved a week for this, not sure of how long this would all take. Our best sense right now is that we'll be able to conclude this phase of the hearings within three days. We should be done on Wednesday.

hearing process, are given the opportunity to

make their opening statements.

 What we've done, Mr. Commissioner, is to invite the participants to address you and to set out the topics and issues that they would like to highlight and ask the Commission to focus on. Some may also have comments or perspectives with respect to what lines of inquiry are or are not worth pursuing.

Our hope is that this will be a fruitful way to gain an understanding of the specific concerns that the participants have and also the positions taken by those participants.

I should add that not all participants have been granted standing on all topics, and so it may be the case that some participants are focusing their opening statements on particular issues that they were granted standing on as a result of that.

There's a few comments that I'd like to repeat, really repeating comments that have been made in other contexts for the benefit of people who are viewing this today, whether here in person or through the live stream on the webcast.

First, our inquiry is independent. The provincial government called this inquiry and set the terms of reference, but we are completely independent of the provincial, indeed of any, governments or government agencies.

Secondly, we have a mandate that is set out in our terms of reference. In the fall of last year, Mr. Commissioner, you conducted public meetings in five different communities around the province in order to obtain input from the public about money laundering and about the issues that British Columbians wish to see us address.

Offstage, the Commission team has been busy conducting our own investigations, research, interviewing and meeting with witnesses and experts, obtaining and reading documents and studying the myriad issues that arise under our terms of reference. And we do approach all of that work guided by the terms of reference. That is what gives us our mandate and really defines the collective task for everyone here.

Today our plan is to continue in that process, inviting the participants to formally and publicly address you with their perspective as to what they wish to see the Commission

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42 43

44

45

46 47 address and to outline their views about issues they feel are important.

And although I'm giving these few opening comments now, Commission counsel have determined not to give an opening statement. That's a deliberate decision, explained by the fact that we're immersed in our own preparatory work and investigations. But we simply don't have any fixed view of where the evidence will take us, and we have some concern that leaping ahead to any sort of opening statement would be premature in terms of taking any position on issues where we haven't led evidence or had it tested through hearings.

There's a few practical things I'd like to simply convey, Mr. Commissioner, both to you and the participants and people in attendance or viewing. And so one of them is what I'll call the batting order. We don't have a fixed schedule where we have specific start times for each and every participant. What we've done is to give an allocation of a maximum period of time for all the participants. Both the Province of B.C. and Canada have been given 90-minute allocations, and then 45 minutes for all other participants. And we simply don't know -- I don't expect everyone will run us right to the 44-minute mark. And so we have a sequence but not actually a schedule of fixed times with one or two exceptions.

The order of the participants addressing the Commission is listed on our website, and to simply run through that list quickly, I'll give you the batting order. We start with the Province of British Columbia and then Canada. sense would be those two participants would run us 'til midday today and perhaps somewhat into Then the Law Society; the B.C. the afternoon. Government Employees' Union; BCLC, which is the British Columbia Lottery Corporation; Great Canadian Gaming Corporation; James Lightbody; Robert Kroeker; Gateway Casinos; Canadian Gaming Association; the Society of Notaries Public; BMW; the Transparency International Canada Coalition; B.C. Real Estate Association; and the B.C. Civil Liberties Association; the Canadian Bar Association; and the Criminal Defence Advocacy

Society.

We may have some shuffling within that batting order to adjust for a few speakers who have to be here for specific times because of other court commitments and the like.

We will be convening these hearings from 9:30 to four o'clock, and taking a break for lunch between 12:30 and 1:30. We encourage and appreciate participants and counsel attending in good time before 1:30 to ensure everyone clears security in time. I am told that people who have been cleared through security, so long as they remain on this floor of the building, won't need to clear security a second time, for instance for a washroom break.

On that note, when we do take breaks, my understanding is that people can leave out of the courtroom through two sets of doors at the back as well as the side. I feel like I'm doing an airplane announcement and telling people the exit routes. But when people come back in, they need to return through the rear door where the security screening is set up.

One of the rules of the Federal Court facility is no coffee or other drinks or food. Only water is permitted here.

The participants and their lawyers may already have been told about this, but we have a sign-in sheet process and we ask everyone to please make a point to sign in every day they're in attendance. That's not us trying to be babysitters or school teachers taking attendance, but rather for the benefit of transcription, ensuring we've got a good record of who was in attendance on particular dates.

The transcripts will be made available for these hearings in a few weeks' time on our website.

In addition to taking a break over the lunch hour, I understand the plan is that we would take a brief recess roughly halfway through the morning as well as again through the afternoon blocks of time.

Our suggestion is that if anyone needs to leave the room during the hearings, whether that's members of the public or participants or lawyers, they may simply do so quietly, without

needing to wait for an intermission or a break. And whereas counsel would often seek leave to absent themselves, we suggest that need not be required in the context of this many lawyers in this setting.

There are some photographers that are here today for the start of these hearings. We had likewise previously allowed for some media photographers to attend our very first hearing dealing with standing. Because this is our first hearing in this spacious federal court facility, we wanted to provide a similar short opportunity at the outset, but after I've finished these few introductory comments, Mr. Commissioner, the plan is we would stand down for maybe two minutes and then request that everyone please put away cameras, and if any media photographers wish to leave at that point, that's an opportune time to do that.

And at that point, after photographers have left in a few minutes from now, I should say that's not the end of all filming so to speak. There are cameras that are mounted on the ceiling in this room that will display counsel and the Commissioner and indeed show into the area of counsel and the gallery. So I wanted people to know that, and those camera and the lights that go with them permit us to livestream the hearings on our website. The hearings, as I understand, will also be available on a number of media That's been organized through an arrangement that's been put in place by Global TV, and we're grateful for Global's assistance with that.

Any media who wish to follow up on the livestream or any aspect of this should speak with out communications director, Ruth Atherley, who is present today.

Another point is that these microphones -first, they don't have an on/off button. I think
the old mikes in this room did, but there's no
need to toggle on or off as one speaks at the
podium. The microphones may well be running
during court breaks or before court, and so that
even if it seems empty in the room, it could be
that one's remarks are picked up and sent out
through the web. There's a story about Dick

 Opening Statement by Ms. Hughes Ministry of Attorney General: Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch Ministry of Finance

Cheney and George Bush saying unfortunate things about a New York Times reporter without realizing that the mikes were running. I trust no one here will fall into that mistake.

The other comment is that the microphones don't amplify within this area for counsel. They do amplify for the back of the room. So we'll ask counsel to speak loudly if they can so that they're heard by everyone up front.

The other comment is that this -- we're going to ask all participants, Mr. Commissioner, to address you for these hearings, from this podium as opposed to other ones. We expect that might well be varied once we're into witnesses in the full hearings, but we'll ask people to come to this podium.

So with those comments made, Mr. Commissioner, subject to any other issues to address, I'll suggest we might stand down for two minutes and then we can convene and begin with opening statements from B.C.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you. We will stand down for a brief recess.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED)
(PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED)

OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. HUGHES (GPEB AND MINISTRY OF FINANCE, BRITISH COLUMBIA):

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Ms. Hughes.

MS. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. I am here on behalf of the Province and specifically the participant, the Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch that I'll refer to as GPEB, and also the Ministry of Finance.

Money laundering is not a victimless crime. As we have experienced over the past decade, money laundering has had, and, absent action, on the part of all stakeholders, will continue to have a significant impact on the lives of ordinary British Columbians. Money laundering has distorted B.C.'s economy, fuelled the overdose crisis, and driven up housing prices.

The accounts of millions of dollars flowing through B.C. casinos by way of hockey bags filled with \$20 bills are now well known, as is the

Opening Statement by Ms. Hughes Ministry of Attorney General: Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch Ministry of Finance

"Vancouver Model." The Lower Mainland has unfortunately earned an international reputation as a haven for money laundering. This did not happen overnight or without warning signs. The past cannot be undone, but what government can do going forward is learn from the past and take proactive steps to make British Columbia the most difficult jurisdiction in which to launder money.

British Columbians deserve to know how money laundering was allowed to proliferate, who the key players are, and the true scope of the problem. What role did bureaucracy and lack of communication or coordination between stakeholders play? Was there wilful blindness to what was going on in favour of income generated for public or private purses? Are there legislative barriers that prevent prosecution of money launderers? And most importantly, what is the true extent of money laundering in the province and what steps can we take to stop it?

The reviews by Dr. Peter German and the Expert Panel on Money Laundering in Real Estate provide a starting point and have highlighted for government and for all British Columbians that money laundering is a significant challenge facing our province today. The work done by these experts has shown that money laundering is not limited to any particular segment of our economy and that we must respond to this challenge with a coordinated and integrated approach that spans across the various sectors and industries.

Government recognizes the need for immediate action and has already taken significant steps to combat money laundering on multiple fronts, including by banning unsourced bulk cash transactions in casinos and creating a new landowner beneficial ownership registry. As these initial steps show, government is willing to make the difficult decisions necessary to disrupt money laundering in our province for the long-term benefit of all British Columbians.

Yet there is still much work left to be done. Implementing effective practices and procedures to combat money laundering is a pressing issue and one in respect of which government welcomes the Commission's work,

 Opening Statement by Ms. Hughes Ministry of Attorney General: Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch Ministry of Finance

findings, and eventual recommendations. The factors that allowed money laundering to flourish in B.C. over the past decade are complex and will take time to address, but government is committed to moving forward with the necessary comprehensive reforms required to ensure that past mistakes are not repeated.

The Commission's broad mandate and independence from government will ensure that it can do the difficult work necessary free of political, partisan or economic influences. In this regard, government appreciates the balance that the Commission will need to find in doing its work without interference in criminal investigations, and is confident that the Commission will pursue all lines of inquiry. As you noted, Mr. Commissioner, the Commission's full allegiance must be to the people of British Columbia and not to any other interest, priority or agenda.

Government strongly supports the Commission's work and welcomes the opportunity to engage with the Commission through its process. Government is committed to full participation in this inquiry, both through the Ministry of Finance and the GPEB as participants, and also by way of facilitating the Commission's access to documents and the attendance of government employee as witnesses from across all ministries.

Much can and will be learned from the past over the course of this inquiry, but the focus of our submissions today will be to highlight the steps government has already taken to combat money laundering, with a particular focus on the gambling and real estate sectors. And in doing so, we hope to highlight for the Commission areas in which it may wish to focus its work going forward.

THE COMMISSIONER: Ms. Hughes, you mentioned in your opening remarks the issue of the true extent of money laundering in the province and what steps can be taken to abate it or stop it. Does the Province have a position on quantification? That is, is there some means by which you think the Commission can usefully focus on the amount of money that, on an annual basis, is laundered through various economic sectors in British

Opening Statement by Ms. Hughes Ministry of Attorney General: Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch Ministry of Finance

Columbia?

- MS. HUGHES: Well, I believe, Mr. Commissioner, the work done by the Expert Panel on Money Laundering in Real Estate and also Dr. German's work provides a starting point, and government continues to assess that factor and looks to the Commission as well in its work to assist in the quantification issue. Certainly it appears, as we've seen, that the issue does transcend multiple different sectors, and the work done provides a starting point that we look to build off of.
- THE COMMISSIONER: I think we'll be hearing evidence that it's a pretty elusive issue and one that's difficult to bring down to the ground. But certainly anything that the Province can do to assist the Commission in grappling with that issue would be of great benefit, I think.
- MS. HUGHES: Certainly, Mr. Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

MS. HUGHES: Turning, then, to the gambling or the gaming sector, we've set out in paragraphs 10 and onwards of our submission, the regulatory and legislative framework that applies in the gaming sector. And of course, GPEB as a participant is an office of the provincial government under the Ministry of Attorney General that is charged with regulating all gambling in British Columbia.

Now, GPEB is directed by a general manager, who is typically also an assistant deputy minister, and that general manager has various duties and responsibilities set out in the legislative scheme, and we've articulated some of those in paragraph 13 of the submission.

As the branch of government responsible for B.C.'s provincial gambling policy, GPEB is also responsible for providing advice to the minister on gambling policy matters, for managing the distribution and gaming proceeds to communities and community organizations, and for delivering on the province's Responsible and Problem Gambling Program.

In order to perform these functions, GPEB is broken down into various divisions, three of which are particularly relevant to the Commission's work, those being the Licensing, Registration, and Certification Division, the

Compliance Division, and the Enforcement Division, each of which is led by an executive director.

We've set out in paragraphs 17 and 18 an overview of the Compliance and the Registration and Certification Division. And then in paragraph 19, we deal with the Enforcement Division, which was created in late 2018 as part of enhancing GPEB's enforcement capacity. And so the Enforcement Division is charged with enforcing provisions of the Gaming Control Act, the regulations, and the Criminal Code. And it works in this regard collaboratively with BCLC, gaming service providers, so the casinos, and law enforcement agencies.

Within the Enforcement Division there are now two units: the Investigations Unit and the Intelligence Unit. The Investigations Unit, as its name suggests, investigates instances of conduct, activity, or incidents incurring occurring in connection with gambling that could threaten the integrity of the industry, and that includes money laundering.

The Intelligence Unit has a mandate of providing timely and accurate intelligence to gaming stakeholders and decision makers with a mission of trying to enhance situational awareness of any threats to the integrity of gambling in the province. And in this regard, there are six GPEB investigators and a manager from the Enforcement Division that are embedded with and work as part of the Joint Illegal Gaming Investigation Team or JIGIT. And I'll come back --

THE COMMISSIONER: Is this a function that sort of parallels that of FINTRAC at the federal level?

- MS. HUGHES: I don't believe it necessarily parallels it. It's a combined unit, JIGIT is, to work together to share information and the like.
- THE COMMISSIONER: I was thinking more in terms of the intelligence gathering.
- MS. HUGHES: No. GPEB doesn't report to FINTRAC.
- THE COMMISSIONER: No, I know that.
- MS. HUGHES: Yeah.
- THE COMMISSIONER: But I just wondered if it was sort of a parallel kind of process.
 - MS. HUGHES: I don't know that I would describe it as

12
Opening Statement by Ms. Hughes
Ministry of Attorney General:
Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch
Ministry of Finance

a parallel process, but perhaps a complementary one.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.

MS. HUGHES: We then set out in the following section the relationship between GPEB and BCLC in terms of gaming regulation. And GPEB's mandate includes regulatory oversight of BCLC, which is a Crown corporation controlled by the Province and an agent of the Crown. And so under s. 7 of the Act, BCLC is the entity responsible for the conduct and management of commercial gaming on behalf of government. And this includes not just gaming at casinos but lotteries, bingo, and online gambling. And so virtually all of the commercial gaming in the province operates under BCLC's control.

So BCLC and the general manager have distinct roles under the Gaming Control Act. in turn, the Minister of Finance is BCLC's fiscal agent, and the net income generated from BCLC is delivered to the Province and then used, as I indicated earlier, to fund health care, education, charitable gaming, and community programs and other essential services. fiscal 2018-2019, commercial gambling returned \$1.4 billion in revenue to government, of which \$982 million was allocated to the consolidated revenue fund to support government programs and services; \$147.2 million was allocated to the health special account, which funds health care initiatives; and \$140 million was allocated to non-profit community groups from Community Gaming Grants.

Now, as the entity responsible for the conduct and management of gambling in the province, BCLC is the reporting entity to FINTRAC Under the *Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering)* and Terrorist Financing Act. And so in British Columbia it's BCLC that's obligated to report under the *PCMLTFA*.

Now, the information that forms part of unusual financial transactions or suspicious transaction reports, that information is provided to GPEB through reports made under s. 86 of the Gaming Control Act and also s. 34 of the Regulation. And so under that section, BCLC, registrants and licensees are required to notify

the general manager of any conduct or activity connected to a lottery scheme or horse racing that may involve the commission of an offence under the *Criminal Code* and requires gaming service providers to immediately report to the general manager any conduct or activity at or near a gaming facility that is or may be contrary to the *Criminal Code*, the Act, or the Regulation. So that's how we see the interplay in reporting between FINTRAC, BCLC and GPEB.

Now, in September of 2017, after learning of transactions that suggested B.C. casinos were being used to launder millions of dollars in proceeds of crime, the Attorney General appointed an independent expert, Dr. Peter German, to conduct a review of money laundering in the gambling industry, and GPEB supported Dr. German's work.

In December of 2017, Dr. German made two interim recommendations in the course of his ongoing review. And those recommendations were, first, that a mandatory requirement be imposed requiring gaming service providers, so casino operators, to complete a source of funds declaration for cash deposits or bearer bonds of \$10,000 or more and that that declaration must include a customer's identification and provide the source of their funds, including the specific financial institution and account from which the cash or bearer bond was sourced, and also that GPEB increase its on-site presence at large, high volume casino facilities in the Lower Mainland with a GPEB investigator being on shift and available on a 24/7 basis.

The next month, in January of 2018, a mandatory source of funds declaration was implemented requiring bank-level proof of cash for buy-ins of \$10,000 or more in a 24-hour period.

BCLC reports that this requirement has already resulted in changes to player behaviour, including a reduction in unsourced cash. And implementation of mandatory source of funds declarations has resulted in continued softness in table gaming revenue.

Following implementation of the mandatory source of funds declaration requirement, GPEB

14
Opening Statement by Ms. Hughes
Ministry of Attorney General:
Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch
Ministry of Finance

then conducted audits of three of the five largest Lower Mainland casinos to assess service provider compliance with the policy and identify any issues that might impact efficacy, and any concerns identified during these audits have been addressed.

With respect to the second interim recommendation, in order to increase its on-site regulatory presence in accordance with Dr. German's interim findings, GPEB has shifted existing investigative resources and hired 12 new investigators to be available during peak hours. So that's 16 hours a day at the five high-volume casinos in the Lower Mainland, namely River Rock, Parg, Grand Villa, Hard Rock and Starlight. Investigators are scheduled during peak times based on a risk assessment of indicators of suspicious activity. So while they're not there 24/7 as Dr. German recommended, they are now on site during peak hours and those peak hours have been chosen strategically based on a risk assessment.

In June of 2018, Dr. German's final report was released publicly and identified systemic weaknesses that allowed the proliferation of money laundering through predominantly the Lower Mainland casinos. Specifically, Dr. German concluded in his first report that for many years the Lower Mainland casinos unwittingly served as laundromats for the proceeds of organized crime and that this problem grew over the years to the point of overtaking the ability of the existing legislative and regulatory framework to effectively respond and curtail it.

Now, in his report, Dr. German made 48 recommendations for preventing money laundering. Government has accepted in principle all of Dr. German's recommendations and is working towards implementing them. And that implementation is being led by government but in coordination with BCLC and other stakeholders. To date, 17 of Dr. German's recommendations from the first report have been addressed. And in this regard, one of the means by which government intends to enhance the effectiveness of gambling regulation is by implementing a more independent regulatory office and a more standards-based regulatory model.

And so in furtherance of the new regulatory scheme, GPEB is going to be transitioned to the new Independent Gambling Control Office, the IGCO. And that office will have the mandate, authority and independence to ensure the overall integrity of gambling in B.C. And so it will focus exclusively on regulatory policy matters related to gambling and horse racing and responsible gambling programs. And the IGCO will have the authority to set and enforce new provincial regulatory anti-money laundering requirements for both BCLC and for the commercial gambling industry. An amendment to the Gaming Control Act will also clarify the regulators' role in mitigating the risks of money laundering in casinos.

And so the new entity, the IGCO, will be overseen by a general manager who will be appointed by cabinet for a fixed term and will be required to report publicly to the Legislative Assembly on its operations.

And so, in a move towards putting into place the new regulatory structure, in November of 2018, certain amendments to the *Gaming Control Act* were brought into force. First, s. 28(2) of the Act was amended to empower the general manager to make directives to BCLC without approval from the Minister. Prior to this amendment, GPEB's general manager was required to receive ministerial approval before issuing a directive applicable to BCLC. And so eliminating that requirement provides GPEB with greater independence from government and provides some clarity in its role as BCLC's regulator.

Second, s. 92 of the Act was amended to extend the authority to refuse entry to a gambling facility if the presence of a person is deemed to be undesirable, and this includes persons who may be associated with criminal organizations or money laundering. Prior to the amendment, only BCLC had the authority to refuse entry.

And then finally, s. 97(2.1) of the Act was amended to include BCLC within the list of organizations or entities who may commit an offence if they do not provide certain information requested by GPEB for the purposes of

Ministry of Finance

an investigation or fail to report incidents to GPEB. And this amendment is intended to promote compliance with statutory requirements and provide effective sanctioning powers. And prior to the amendment, BCLC was not subject to these offence provisions.

And so government is optimistic that these amendments and the transition to the IGCO will address concerns raised by Dr. German about regulatory policy being made separately from decisions about revenue generation.

The work necessary to bring this regulatory model into effect is already under way and government presently intends to introduce legislation in the spring of 2021 to bring the IGCO into force, of course subject to recommendations and findings made by this Commission.

Another area in which government is looking to provide further coordination and clarity is in terms of the relationship between the various stakeholders: GPEB, BCLC, and law enforcement. And so historically, pursuant to a memorandum of understanding from March 2004, GPEB and the RCMP had established the Integrated Illegal Gaming Enforcement team, or IIGET, and IIGET's mandate was to maintain the integrity of public gaming in the province by enhancing the level of enforcement specifically targeting illegal gaming.

Now, IIGET was initially intended to continue for a five-year period ending in 2008, and in 2007 a review identified various limitations, including staffing issues and a focus on gambling outside of casinos as opposed to illegal activity inside casinos. So following that review, IIGET's mandate was extended by a year to March of 2009. Now, in January of 2009, a review prepared for IIGET's consultative board noted that Canadian casinos were vulnerable to money laundering because they deal in cash and handle millions of dollars on a daily basis, and also that Asian organized crime figures were believed to be involved in illegal gaming activities, including loan sharking and money laundering. Despite these findings, the IIGET memorandum of understanding expired and IIGET was 17
Opening Statement by Ms. Hughes
Ministry of Attorney General:
Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch
Ministry of Finance

disbanded on March 31st, 2009.

Seven years later, in 2016, government joined forces with the Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit, or CFSEU, to form the Joint Illegal Gaming Investigation Team, or JIGIT, which I mentioned earlier. And that is a coordinated investigation unit designed to crack down on illegal gambling and money laundering both inside and outside of casinos. And so while JIGIT is a unit within the RCMP, there are seven GPEB staff embedded within JIGIT in its investigative and intelligence capacities, and those staff provide in-depth gambling expertise to JIGIT and other law enforcement agencies in the province.

And so JIGIT's primary focus is to disrupt organized crime and gang involvement in illegal gambling and to prevent criminals from using B.C. gambling facilities to launder the proceeds of crime.

Another key component of government's approach going forward is to continue a renewed cooperative approach with GPEB, BCLC and law enforcement. And so first, in January of 2018, GPEB, BCLC and JIGIT formed the Gaming Intelligence Group, and the objective of that group is to enhance the current anti-money laundering regime in B.C. casinos by opening lines of communication to more broadly share information around suspicious transactions, high risk patrons, and threats of criminality. Gaming Intelligence Group holds weekly teleconferences to share information about real time incidents, including examining suspicious transactions in areas of concern. The group also holds monthly meetings that focus on identifying overall trends and how current processes should be modified and improved.

And then most recently, in 2019, members of GPEB's Intelligence Unit were integrated with law enforcement within JIGIT to form the Gaming Intelligence Unit. And that unit's mandate is to provide a quality, dedicated, integrated and coordinated multi-jurisdictional intelligence approach to illegal gaming in British Columbia. And here the emphasis is on transnational organized crime networks and money laundering.

Opening Statement by Ms. Hughes Ministry of Attorney General: Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch Ministry of Finance

And so the hope is that the Gaming Intelligence Unit will enhance all levels of enforcement, disruption and deterrence by specifically targeting high threat criminal activities.

The GIU will manage the available information that's deemed to have a significant threat to the integrity of gambling and develop actionable intelligence about criminal involvement in gambling, which includes money laundering, that can then be used by all levels of law enforcement and the provincial regulator.

So these steps show that government's commitment to removing money laundering from B.C.'s casinos is under way, though of course more is needed, and government looks forward to the Commission's guidance in that regard.

Turning, then, to the real estate sector. In September of 2018, the province launched a two-pronged review aimed at shutting down avenues of money laundering in real estate sectors. first component was led by the Ministry of Finance and was to identify systemic risks that leave the real estate and financial services sectors open to money laundering. And so the Ministry of Finance appointed Professor Maureen Maloney to chair the Expert Panel on Money Laundering in Real Estate. That panel examined how regulation related primarily to the corporate and financial sectors can be used to combat money laundering and market abuse related to the real estate market. The panel reviewed B.C.'s financial regulatory system, examined international AML best practices, and made recommendations to improve the B.C. financial regulatory framework and integrate B.C.'s regime into core federal AML legislation and practice.

The second component was led by the Attorney General and was to investigate specific cases of problematic activity in real estate and other vulnerable sectors to attempt to uncover the ways that money launderers have operated in the province. And this was Dr. German's second report. His second review examined whether there is evidence of money laundering in real estate, horse racing and luxury car sectors.

The Expert Panel and Dr. German's second report were delivered to government in March of

Ministry of Finance

2019, and in particular shed light on why housing prices in B.C. and in particular the Lower Mainland have become disconnected from local income. The Expert Panel estimated that \$7.4 billion dollars were laundered in B.C. in 2018 and found that a significant part of the money laundering flow is invested in real estate, estimated to be up to \$5.3 billion in 2018, which is almost five percent of the total volume of transactions in the province.

The Expert Panel estimated that the effect of money laundering is to make house prices in B.C. between 3.7 and 7.5 percent higher than they would be in the absence of money laundering. British Columbians were understandably troubled by these figures.

The Expert Panel then went on to make 29 recommendations for an effective system to combat money laundering and control market abuse in real estate. The recommendations include provincial regulatory improvements, improvements to national AML legislation and practice, and improved data sharing and institutional coordination.

In particular, the panel identified disclosure of beneficial ownership as the single most important measure that can be taken to combat money laundering. In turn, we set out in paragraph 59 Dr. German's findings from his second report.

And as we say in paragraph 61, the impact of money laundering in B.C. can be seen in every corner of our province, driving up the cost of goods, affecting business competitiveness, eroding trust in our economy and institutions, and facilitating criminal activities such as drug trafficking that is responsible for many opioid-related deaths in this province. Money laundering corrodes the rule of law, encourages criminal activity, and distorts markets, contributing to unaffordability.

Money laundering has no place in our society, and the Province is committed to developing and implementing a long-term provincial AML strategy. In this regard, some of the recent steps that the Province has taken to combat money laundering in real estate are outlined in the following paragraphs. The

Opening Statement by Ms. Hughes Ministry of Attorney General: Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch Ministry of Finance

> primary ones that I will touch on are the Land Owner Transparency Registry, the creation of the B.C. Financial Services Authority, and the beginning stages, the consultative stages of replacing the *Mortgage Brokers Act*.

So dealing first with the Land Owner Transparency Registry, the reason why this is important is that money laundering often relies on the ability to disguise the ownership of property in order to make it difficult to link the property back to the proceeds of a specific crime or that fact that the property is being used for a criminal purpose. So opaque ownership structures have allowed criminals to remain anonymous and have provided a veil with which to conceal money-laundering activity in real estate.

And so in recognition of the need for immediate and comprehensive, forward-looking action, the Province passed the Land Owner Transparency Act last spring, and that act establishes a publicly accessible registry of beneficial ownership in real estate. It will be the first of its kind in Canada and will provide valuable information about the true ownership of real estate in B.C.

Next, the creation of a single regulator for This was one of the central real estate. recommendations from Dan Perrin's Real Estate Regulatory Structure Review, which report was released in September of 2018. And that report was commissioned by the Ministry of Finance as a result of concerns about the effectiveness of real estate regulation in B.C., and found that the current structure has resulted in systemic barriers to effective regulation. And so Mr. Perrin concluded that the Office of the Superintendent of Real Estate and the Real Estate Council of B.C. ought to be merged into the Financial Institutions Commission as the single And this same recommendation was regulator. echoed in the Maloney report.

And so the Province's establishment of the BCFSA last fall reflects the government's commitment to building a modern, efficient and effective regulatory framework. The Financial Services Authority Act established the BCSFA as a new Crown entity that replaces FICOM. And so on

Opening Statement by Ms. Hughes Ministry of Attorney General: Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch Ministry of Finance

November 1st, 2019, FICOM was dissolved and the BCFSA took on all of FICOM's regulatory responsibilities.

Going forward, the Ministry of Finance is targeting the fall of 2020 to bring forward new legislation to include real estate in the BCFSA's mandate, hopefully by the spring of 2021. The intent is that the Office of the Superintendent of Real Estate and the Real Estate Council of B.C. will be integrated within the BCFSA, and as the single regulator, the BCFSA will take responsibility over real estate licensing, conduct, investigations and discipline.

The third point I intend to touch on today is the Mortgage Brokers Act, which was enacted back in 1972 as consumer protection legislation. Although it has been amended several times since its enactment, the fact of the matter is that it has simply not kept pace with the evolving national and international standards in consumer protection or with changes in the financial services market and emerging issues such as money laundering in real estate. And so the Expert Panel on Money Laundering described the Mortgage Brokers Act as antiquated and recommended replacing it with a more modern statute.

And so given that financial sector stability and consumer protection remain core priorities for government, government is moving towards implementing that recommendation, but starting with consultation. And so last month the Ministry of Finance released a consultation paper to elicit discussion and feedback from stakeholders on a replacement for the current Mortgage Brokers Act.

And so what the Ministry is proposing to do is develop legislation that sets out current best practices, and we've set out in paragraph 73 somewhat of a laundry list of some of the issues and topics that ought to be addressed in the new legislation.

In the following paragraphs, what we've set out are a few additional steps that government is taking to address money laundering in the real estate sector. And that includes the establishment of FREDA, the Finance, Real Estate and Data Analytics Unit. It includes a

Opening Statement by Ms. Hughes Ministry of Attorney General: Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch Ministry of Finance

federal/provincial ad hoc working group on real estate and also, as set out in paragraph 79, the establishment of Canada's first online register for presale condo sales to track assignments, updating the property transfer tax return to uncover beneficial owners behind corporations and trusts, enacting legislation to allow information sharing with federal tax officials regarding the home owner grant, which is hoped to help improve tax enforcement, and strengthening property transfer tax auditors' ability to take action on tax evasion.

- THE COMMISSIONER: Some jurisdictions use tools which may be controversial in this jurisdiction, like unexplained wealth orders. Does the Province have a position on that? Is that something that the Province is looking at?
- MS. HUGHES: I don't believe the Province has a firm position on that to date, but certainly as something that is being used in other jurisdictions, and the Province is looking at all various means of addressing the issue and is looking at what other jurisdictions are doing.

 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
- MS. HUGHES: This brings me to paragraph 80 of the submission, Mr. Commissioner, and the other vulnerable sectors that have been identified in addition to gambling and real estate. And as we saw in Dr. German's first report, money laundering is not limited to casinos, and he recommended certain other areas of research be undertaken, including luxury car and horse race sectors along with real estate, which we've covered.

And so in furtherance of the outcome of Dr. German's second review, government is also taking steps towards two other initiatives, first a corporate transparency, and second, some work with post-secondary institutions.

So dealing first with the corporate beneficial ownership transparency, the Expert Panel on Money Laundering in Real Estate -- that was the Maloney panel -- highlighted the importance of corporate beneficial ownership disclosure to the disruption of money laundering. The Expert Panel found that in addition to public beneficial ownership disclosure for land, public

Opening Statement by Ms. Hughes Ministry of Attorney General: Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch Ministry of Finance

beneficial ownership disclosure for legal persons, such as corporations, trusts and partnerships, will add valuable information that is vital to law enforcement, tax authorities, and federal and provincial regulators in undertaking investigations.

And so government has already taken significant steps to increase corporate transparency. Last spring the *Business Corporations Act* was amended to require private companies to maintain records of beneficial owners, which they refer to as significant individuals. And as of May 1st, 2020, all B.C. private companies will be required to keep transparency registers with accurate and up-to-date information about the true owners of their shares.

And so the Province is currently engaging with the public on next steps for increasing beneficial ownership transparency. And in furtherance of this last month, the Ministry of Finance released a consultation paper on a public beneficial ownership registry.

Government is currently seeking public input on issues related to the proposed beneficial owner registry, and we've set out some of those issues in paragraph 84. And again, this is also an area in which government welcomes further work from the Commission and recommendations in that regard.

And then finally, dealing with post-secondary institutions, Dr. German identified post-secondary institutions as a sector that was vulnerable to money laundering. And we've set out in paragraph 85 a summary of how that can occur. For example, students have been known to register in person and, after paying their fees, then withdraw from the institution and receive an institutional cheque in reimbursement for their fees. Or they've registered from abroad and then withdraw before the deadline and utilize an agent to collect their refund cheque.

And so in order to address this potential issue, government is actively engaging and working with post-secondary institutions to ensure that they don't become greater targets for money laundering. Last spring the Minister of

 Opening Statement by Ms. Hughes Ministry of Attorney General: Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch Ministry of Finance

Advanced Education, Skills and Training wrote to all public and private post-secondary institutions to alert them to Dr. German's finding and asked them to immediately review their financial policies to ensure that payments with large amounts of cash, i.e. thousands of dollars, from single students are not accepted.

And then of course if the institution had a current policy regarding the acceptance of cash, the Minister requested the institution share that policy with government, including any proposed changes, so as to help inform any future guidance or direction that the Ministry may provide on the issue.

Finally, in recognition of the fact that money laundering is a complex problem, government recognizes that an effective regulatory enforcement response must have the flexibility to respond across all sectors. And so in furtherance of this, in June of 2019, the Province re-established the Anti-Money Laundering Deputy Ministers' Committee with an expanded mandate and updated membership and roles.

So the objective of the AML Deputy Ministers' Committee is to lead the development of a provincial multi-sectoral strategic response to anti-money laundering. This expanded mandate aims to ensure a coordinated government multi-sectoral approach to AML issues to respond to the German reports and the Maloney report and to attend to the implementation of recommendations arising out of those reports and of this Commission's work.

The AML Deputy Ministers' Committee is responsible to the Attorney General, the Minister of Finance, and the Solicitor General, and is supported by an Anti-Money Laundering Secretariat, the Ministry of Finance's policy and legislation division, and the Public Safety and Solicitor General's Policing and Scrutiny Branch. And then we've set out in paragraphs 90 and 91 the various roles and responsibilities of the AML Secretariat and the AML Deputy Minister's Committee.

And so, Mr. Commissioner, as is evident from the wide variety of areas that I have touched on in this opening, money laundering is a complex

Opening Statement by Ms. Hughes Ministry of Attorney General: Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch Ministry of Finance

problem that requires a multi-faceted response. Without intervention, the criminal economy remains a very real threat that will continue to impact British Columbian families. Evidence of this threat is manifested in an opioid crisis that has and continues on a daily basis to claim the lives of far too many British Columbians, and a real estate market where hard-working, lawabiding families are priced out of home ownership in favour of straw buyers or criminals.

Government is committed --

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry. On that last point, I expect we may hear evidence as we progress that there are a number of different economic forces at work that drive up the price of houses in Vancouver and several centres throughout British Columbia, that it's not just money laundering. Has the Province attempted an analysis of that, or is that something that would be useful for us to pursue in the course of this Commission?

MS. HUGHES: The Province has the findings from Maureen Maloney's work and the Expert Panel, but it would certainly be, in the Province's submission, an area that could benefit from further work from the Commission.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you.

MS. HUGHES: And so government is committed to building a robust anti-money laundering regime, and in this regard it encourages the Commission to be fearless and ambitious in its work. The consequences of not examining how money laundering was permitted to proliferate and failing to address this crisis are serious and ongoing.

Increased sharing of information and a coordinated response from federal and provincial stakeholders will be a key component of addressing money laundering in the province. Government is optimistic that the Commission's work will illustrate where coordination is needed most and how we can effectively facilitate multijurisdictional entities working together.

Government looks forward to participating in the Commission's process and welcomes the Commission's findings and recommendations. While -- and as I have demonstrated throughout this opening -- some initial actions have already been

 Opening Statement by Ms. Hoffman Government of Canada

taken, government comes to this inquiry with an open mind and a willingness to take additional steps as necessary to ensure that money laundering does not continue to undermine our economy and negatively impact the lives of British Columbians.

By learning more about what happened in the past in terms of decisions and regulatory or enforcement gaps that may have facilitated money laundering, we will be better able to put in place a more effective regulatory and enforcement regime for the future.

Government thanks the Commissioner and Commission counsel for the dedicated efforts in furtherance of the Commission's mandate, and also wishes to express its appreciation and thanks to all of the participants for contributing their perspectives and assisting the Commission over the course of this inquiry.

This inquiry has an ambitious mandate but one that is of significant importance to everyone in our province. Government is confident that the Commission's work will provide the information necessary to identify and close key loopholes, draft improved laws, and improve enforcement activities to assist in removing dirty money from our province.

Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

THE COMMISSION: Thank you, Ms. Hughes. I think what we'll do is take a brief adjournment now, 15 minutes.

THE REGISTRAR: The hearing will recess for 15 minutes. Please remain standing while the Commissioner exits the room.

(PROCEEDINGS RECESSED FOR MORNING RECESS)
(PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED)

38
39 THE REGISTRAR: All rise.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Ms. Hoffman.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. HOFFMAN (GOVERNMENT OF CANADA):

MS. HOFFMAN: The Government of Canada would like to thank the Commission of Inquiry into Money Laundering in British Columbia and its members

for your efforts to distinguish the nature and extent of money laundering in British Columbia, its causes and how best to address them. We applaud the Government of British Columbia for demonstrating leadership to address these complex issues in the province.

Canada strongly supports the Commission's mandate and is committed to participating in the inquiry to the fullest extent possible. Canada has provided and will continue to provide documents to the Commission within our legislative authority, while ensuring the protection of privacy and ongoing police investigations. Canada will also continue to facilitate the attendance of government witnesses at the inquiry, many of whom have considerable expertise in the prevention, detection and disruption of money laundering and terrorist financing activities.

- THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms. Hoffman. I should note perhaps for some of those present that this is of course a provincial commission of inquiry, and money laundering obviously has many federal dimensions. But we very much appreciate Canada's agreement to cooperate with the Province in enabling us to acquire information from federal agencies and entities without the need to become embroiled in jurisdictional struggles or fracases. So I take it from what you're saying that Canada is committed to assisting the Commission in acquiring its information from those federal entities in so far as it implicates money laundering in the Province of British Columbia.
- MS. HOFFMAN: That's correct, Mr. Commissioner. We have been and we will continue to provide information to explain the federal regime.

 Obviously, as I will get into in the submissions, they work in tandem, and your Commission needs to understand how the federal regime operates.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MS. HOFFMAN: Canada is proud to be well known around the world for its stable and open economy, accessible and efficient and advanced financial system, and strong democratic institutions. Unfortunately, those seeking to launder proceeds of crime or raise, transfer and use funds for

terrorism purposes have tried, and will continue to try, to exploit these strengths for their own illicit gains. Canada recognizes that money laundering and terrorist financing pose a significant threat to domestic and global safety and security and can compromise the integrity and stability of the financial sector and the broader economy.

These are not victimless crimes. Rather, the social, economic, and political consequences of money laundering and terrorist financing are sweeping and indiscriminate. By laundering money, serious and other organized criminals are able to profit from some of the most damaging crimes, and operate to expand their criminal empires. Money laundering can fuel other criminal activities such as drug trafficking, human trafficking, and violent gang crime, as well as the overdose crisis that has harmed communities across the country. Money laundering can distort market prices and harm the legitimate Canadian economy by making housing less affordable, and money laundering can deny governments tax revenue necessary for vital social programs.

While British Columbia has received much attention regarding this problem, money laundering is a national concern and the potential damage that money laundering can cause to business and civil society demands a clear, strategic, and timely response from all jurisdictions.

Throughout Canada, there is widespread recognition that more must be done to combat this threat. Alongside the federal government, provincial and territorial governments have an important role to play with respect to regulatory and enforcement responsibilities, for example, in safeguarding against the misuse of corporations, real estate, casinos, money service businesses, and the legal profession, and conducting investigations and prosecutions.

The Minister of Finance, the Honourable Bill Morneau, acknowledged the need for ongoing focus and further efforts at the June 2019 Special Joint Ministerial Meeting that was convened to bring together federal, provincial, and

 territorial Ministers of Finance and Ministers responsible for AML. And we've included a quote from that meeting at paragraph 7 of our submissions.

At the same time, Canada recognizes the need to ensure that robust AML/ATF measures respect the privacy rights afforded to Canadians under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms with attentiveness to the regulatory burden placed on financial institutions and businesses operating within or transacting with Canada. We acknowledge that there are no easy solutions or quick fixes to the complex issues of money laundering and terrorist financing.

We know that tackling money laundering and terrorist financing in Canada requires effective and efficient coordination across all levels of government in Canada, as well as the public and private sectors. It requires governments and institutions to be vigilant and agile in responding to new and emerging vulnerabilities and more sophisticated methods to launder money and finance terrorism.

Overall, an effective Canadian response needs to be balanced, flexible, and well co-ordinated. The Government of Canada is steadfast in its resolve to continue to tackle money laundering and terrorist financing, to keep Canadians safe and to protect the integrity of our economy. We look forward to supporting the Commission in this timely and challenging task and to participating in developing solutions informed by past lessons and shared expertise.

An effective AML/ATF regime is essential to protect the safety and security of Canadians, and promote the integrity of the financial system. Given the ever-evolving nature of the tactics and methods used to launder money and finance terrorism, the Government continues to reinforce the federal Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing Regime -- and I'll refer to that as "the Regime" throughout my submissions.

Canada's Regime is comprised of federal departments and agencies, including regulators, supervisors, law enforcement, and intelligence agencies, as well as legislation, regulations, and reporting entities.

The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness have complementary responsibilities with respect to the Regime. The Regime is accountable to Parliament through the Minister of Finance, who is also responsible for the strategic direction of FINTRAC, which is Canada's AML regulator and financial intelligence unit (FIU). The Minister of Public Safety also plays an important leadership role at the national level. His mandate includes developing new policies and legislation to reduce organized crime and gang activity in Canada, including money laundering.

The Regime involves 13 federal departments and agencies, eight of which receive dedicated funding totalling approximately 70 million annually. In addition, individual Regime partners contribute resources in excess of dedicated funding received. Budget 2019 included new funding of 178 million over five years, which started in 2019, and 38 million in ongoing funding, to modernize the AML Regime by strengthening data resources, financial intelligence, information sharing, and investigative capacity.

In addition to federal organizations, provincial and municipal law enforcement bodies and provincial regulators are also involved in combatting these illicit activities. These are areas of shared jurisdiction, federal only jurisdiction, and areas where provinces and territories are solely responsible for the regulation of key sectors implicated in the Regime such as the establishment of corporations, partnerships and trusts, the accounting and legal professions, as well as the money service businesses, casinos, and securities sectors. Provincial and territorial law enforcement agencies also play a role in investigations and prosecutions of money laundering and have civil forfeiture regimes that can complement criminal asset recovery.

Within the private sector, there are almost 24,000 Canadian institutions, businesses and professions with reporting and record-keeping obligations under the *Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering)* and *Terrorist Financing Act*, or the

 PCMLTFA. They are known as reporting entities and they play a critical frontline role in efforts to prevent and detect money laundering and terrorist financing.

The Regime operates based on three interdependent pillars -- policy and coordination, prevention and detection, and investigation and disruption -- that work together to support efforts to combat organized crime, terrorism, and other major crimes, such as tax evasion, corruption, human trafficking, cybercrime, drug trafficking, and fraud.

So to speak now about the first pillar, policy and coordination. The Regime's policy and legislative framework is overseen by the Department of Finance, which leads domestic and international policy coordination on money laundering and terrorist financing. Department of Finance coordinates the national assessment of money laundering and terrorist financing risks, and policy advice to the Government on domestic and international policy to combat these threats. This policy coordination role includes developing domestic legislation and regulations to combat financial crimes and leading Canada's delegation to the Financial Action Task Force, or FATF, and other fora, both regional and international, related to AML/ATF.

So then, in the next section of the submissions we deal with the legislation and regulations, beginning with the *Criminal Code* sections, and I'm going to skip over those. I'm sure the Commissioner is well aware of those -- THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MS. HOFFMAN: -- and move to paragraph 24 of our submissions, where we describe in greater detail the *PCMLTFA*.

This legislation and its regulations require certain financial institutions and non-financial businesses and professions, which collectively we refer to as "reporting entities," to identify their clients and keep records in order to establish a paper trail that, with proper judicial authorization, can be accessed by law enforcement for criminal investigations or prosecutions. Reporting entities with

obligations under the Act include banks and credit unions, life insurance companies and brokers, trust and loan companies, securities dealers and money services businesses, accountants and British Columbia notaries, real estate agents, developers, casinos, dealers in precious metals and stones, and the agents of the Crown that accept deposit liabilities.

The Act and its regulations contain mandatory reporting requirements for certain types of transactions such as suspicious financial transactions, large cash transactions, and cross-border electronic funds transfers. It also creates obligations for reporting entities to establish and administer an internal AML/ATF compliance program, including identifying money laundering and terrorist financing risks and putting in place measures to mitigate those risks.

This legislation also establishes FINTRAC as Canada's financial intelligence unit and authorizes it to receive and analyze information related to suspected money laundering or terrorist financing activity. When FINTRAC, on the basis of its analysis, determines that there are reasonable grounds to suspect that the information is relevant to an investigation or prosecution of a money laundering or a terrorist financing offence, it must disclose certain identifying information to law enforcement, intelligence agencies, and other disclosure recipients. FINTRAC is not a criminal law enforcement investigative agency. disclosures are intended to provide law enforcement with leads for investigation or prosecution purposes.

- THE COMMISSIONER: As I understand it, FINTRAC is seated in the Ministry of Finance for a reason, and that reason has to do with ensuring that citizens' privacy interests are respected. Is that essentially the reasoning behind that?
- MS. HOFFMAN: Well, I wouldn't say that would be the only reasons, but it is important to recognize that FINTRAC itself is not an investigative body.

THE COMMISSIONER: Right.

MS. HOFFMAN: Correct, the information in the Act sets out ways in which they can collect that

information and the uses to which that information can be put.

THE COMMISSIONER: Right. In her opening statement, Ms. Hughes referred to the need for some agility in dealing with intelligence regarding potential criminal or money laundering activities. FINTRAC has an enormous mandate, as I understand it. As you pointed out, it has some 24,000 entities reporting to it. And again, I think we'll hear evidence that it may receive up to 25 million reports annually.

Can you talk a little bit about the ability of FINTRAC to respond to the provincial situation, the provincial needs on a more agile basis?

- MS. HOFFMAN: Well, certainly I think in the course of the Commission asking to speak to certain FINTRAC witnesses, that would be the best forum in which that issue can be addressed. We can certainly note your concern in that regard and that that's a topic that you're interested in. And I think as we move forward, you will see that in Canada's submissions.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Right. I'm certainly not pressing you for an answer today. I just am sort of interested in perhaps turning Canada's attention to that.
- MS. HOFFMAN: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner. The information that is disclosed under the PCMLTFA can be used to support domestic and international partners in the investigation and prosecution of money laundering and terrorist financing related offences. The legislation also allows for FINTRAC to conduct research into trends and developments in the area of money laundering and terrorist financing and to take measures to inform reporting entities, law enforcement authorities, and the public on the nature and extent of money laundering and terrorist financing domestically and internationally, as well as the obligations for reporting entities under the Act.

Public Safety Canada is the lead policy department responsible for combatting transnational organized crime and terrorism. Along with the Department of Finance, Public Safety co-chairs the Regime governance committees

to coordinate the implementation of AML/ATF policies across Regime partners. Public Safety is responsible for the implementation of Canada's Counter-Terrorism Strategy and the National Agenda to Combat Organized Crime. The RCMP and CSIS and Canada Border Services Agency all report to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness.

Public Safety is leading the development of the newly created Anti-Money Laundering Action, Coordination and Enforcement Team, or the ACE Team. This was announced in Budget 2019 and brings together experts from across intelligence and law enforcement agencies to strengthen coordination and cooperation, and identify and address significant money laundering threats.

They are responsible for advising on amendments to the *Criminal Code* as well as the *Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act* and the *Extradition Act*, the two main statutes in relation to Canada's ability to cooperate internationally on money laundering and terrorist financing cases.

Global Affairs Canada implements elements of Canada's efforts to combat terrorism financing, proliferation financing, and to combat the laundering of proceeds of certain crimes. Affairs is responsible for Canada's economic sanctions legislation and is the lead department for the United Nations crime conventions that Canada has ratified, some of which contain legal obligations relating to money laundering, terrorist financing, and other related public safety issues. In addition, Global Affairs' Counter-Terrorism Capacity Building Program and Anti-Crime Capacity Building Program provide technical assistance for capacity building to address the needs of states that lack the laws, policies, plans, training, or operational expertise to prevent and mitigate acts of terrorism and combat organized crime and corruption.

So all federal partners share responsibility for the ultimate outcomes of the Regime, which is governed by various inter-departmental committees. The Regime's governance structure was enhanced in 2019 to improve cohesion across

partners and these committees work together to ensure an efficient Regime with a focus on both policy and operations, anchored in shared intelligence on current money laundering and terrorist financing modalities, as well as the wider structure and activities of criminal and terrorist networks operating and transacting within the Canadian financial system.

And we set out the details of this structure.

And we set out the details of this structure in paragraphs 33 to 38 of our submissions, and I won't go through those, but they're there for your reference.

So moving on to public sector engagement. From their frontline role in defending Canada's financial system from money laundering and terrorist financing threats, the Regime places priority on engaging with the private sector and other stakeholders to support the Regime's overall effectiveness. The Advisory Committee on Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing is a public-private advisory committee with the role of encouraging collaboration and transparency with the private sector.

This advisory committee is responsible for facilitating information sharing and consultation, providing a high-level discussion forum to address emerging issues, and providing advice for Canada's overall AML/ATF policy. And the next paragraph of our submission describes the membership of this advisory committee in detail.

So moving on to the second pillar of Canada's AML Regime, which is prevention and detection. This provides strong measures to prevent individuals from placing illicit proceeds or terrorist-related funds into the financial system, while having correspondingly robust measures to detect the placement and movement of such funds.

At the centre of this prevention and detection approach are the aforementioned reporting entities, which serve as the gatekeepers of the financial system in implementing the various measures under the PCMLTFA.

FINTRAC is Canada's principal AML/ATF regulator and administers a comprehensive, risk-

based compliance program to assist and ensure that thousands of Canadian businesses fulfill their obligations under the *PCMLTFA*.

Compliance with the legislation ensures that FINTRAC receives the information that it needs to generate actionable financial intelligence for Canada's police, law enforcement, and national security agencies. Promoting compliance with frontline reporting entities incorporates a level of deterrence by ensuring that relevant questions are asked and appropriate records are kept to deter criminals from using the legitimate financial system to launder their illicit money.

FINTRAC provides businesses with comprehensive, clear, and direct guidance to help them better understand and comply with their obligations under the *PCMLTFA*. As part of its broader transparency initiative in 2018-2019, the Centre published its Compliance Framework, which captures the guiding principles that shape FINTRAC's compliance program. It provides a comprehensive description, in an easy to navigate format, on the services and tools that are available to assist businesses in complying with their obligations.

This enhanced support and transparency initiative reinforces FINTRAC's assessment approach to ensuring compliance. With this approach, the emphasis is on the overall effectiveness of a business's compliance program, including the impact of non-compliance on achieving the objectives of the Act and the Centre's ability to carry out its mandate. The initiative also focuses on the three pillars of FINTRAC's compliance program: assistance, assessment and enforcement.

Over the past year, FINTRAC's outreach efforts have focused on increasing awareness and understanding, as well as eliciting feedback, on the new regulatory amendments developed by the Department of Finance.

FINTRAC has also engaged extensively with real estate regulatory bodies, associations, and businesses across the country to strengthen compliance in the sector. For example, the Centre signed a new memorandum of understanding with the Real Estate Council of British Columbia.

The first of its kind for real estate regulators in Canada, the memorandum of understanding applies a framework within which FINTRAC and the Real Estate Council of British Columbia can share compliance-related information in order to strengthen compliance in the real estate sector in B.C. It also helps to enhance the knowledge and expertise of each organization regarding new and evolving trends in the real estate sector in British Columbia and across Canada.

The Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions, or OSFI, supervises and regulates more than 400 federally regulated financial institutions and 1,200 pension plans. OSFI regulates by developing rules, interpreting legislation and regulations, and providing regulatory approvals for certain types of transactions. All of this must balance the goals of safety and soundness with the need for institutions to operate within a competitive marketplace.

In line with its prudential regulatory mandate, OSFI assesses these institutions' financial condition, material risks and the quality of its governance, risk management, and compliance processes. When weaknesses are identified, OSFI intervenes early and works with executive management and boards to adopt corrective measures. OSFI regularly issues guidance outlining sound business and financial practices and posts these guidelines publically on its website.

Although OSFI plays an important oversight role, it does not manage the operations of institutions. Their respective executive management and boards of directors are responsible for their success or failure. OSFI's supervision approach is risk-based to reflect the nature, size, complexity, and risk profile of an institution. Financial institutions must be allowed to take reasonable risks and compete effectively both at home and abroad, while at the same time safeguarding the risks of depositors, policyholders and creditors. OSFI's goal is to balance competitiveness with financial stability, and international standards with Canadian market realities.

OSFI is an independent government agency that reports and is accountable to Parliament through the Minister of Finance, and is funded through assessments and pension plans.

Until recently, OSFI and FINTRAC conducted concurrent or joint assessments of FRFI AML/ATF compliance. In an effort to enhance coordination of supervision in this context, OSFI and FINTRAC have established an approach to supervision that aligns with the agencies' respective mandates and authorities. Following a transition period, FINTRAC will exercise primary responsibility for conducting independent AML/ATF compliance examinations of financial institutions against the PCMLTFA and the associated regulations. will apply its prudential lens by leveraging FINTRAC's work in assessing the strength of these financial institutions' regulatory compliance and risk management practices.

This approach will deliver a strong and effective AML/ATF Regime, while reducing duplication through better alignment with FINTRAC and OFSI's respective mandates and authorities. Additionally, OSFI and FINTRAC will meet quarterly to exchange relevant information.

It is also important to note the role of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, or ISED. This is the federal department responsible for the regulation and oversight of Canada's marketplace framework, which includes corporate governance and federal incorporation under the Canada Business Corporations Act. ISED has played a leadership role in recent years to advance a national approach to strengthen beneficial ownership transparency.

Provincial and federal corporate laws, registries, and securities regulations also contribute to preventing and detecting money laundering and terrorist financing in Canada. The concealment of corporate ownership information can be part of international networks used to facilitate tax evasion, money laundering, and other financial crimes. Consequently, effective prevention and detection measures should also allow appropriate authorities to identify who owns companies in Canada.

ISED also contributes to the Regime through

 its responsibility for the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act, or PIPEDA, and the related guidance and regulations. This is particularly important in discussions surrounding enhanced information sharing, both between public and private sector and amongst private sector entities, to ensure the privacy rights of Canadians continue to be appropriately protected.

So as previously noted, FINTRAC is both Canada's principal AML/ATF regulator and Canada's financial intelligence unit and is accordingly central to Canada's broader AML/ATF Regime. Working with other regulators and law enforcement agencies, it plays a vital role in keeping criminals out of Canada's financial system and supporting efforts to detect and disrupt financial crimes.

I've already explained to the Commissioner FINTRAC's independent nature. It operates at arm's length from police and other departments, and this independence is essential to protecting Canadians' privacy rights, given the information that FINTRAC receives.

FINTRAC receives and analyzes and assesses reports and information from a variety of sources in order to assist in the detection, prevention, and deterrence of money laundering and terrorist financing. Under the PCMLTFA, police, including the RCMP and other government institutions and agencies, can provide voluntary information records to FINTRAC about suspicions of money laundering and terrorist financing. voluntary records are among the various sources of information, including financial transactions sent by reporting entities, that FINTRAC uses to perform its analytical work. When FINTRAC's analysis meets specific legal thresholds set out in the Act, FINTRAC must disclose financial intelligence to the appropriate law enforcement and/or national security agencies named in the Act.

FINTRAC was organized in a way to respond to the threat posed by actors engaging in money laundering and terrorist financing by providing police, law enforcement, and national security officials with the information they need to

deprive criminals of the proceeds of their criminal activities, while ensuring that appropriate safeguards are put into place. FINTRAC's mandate and powers are explicitly designed to protect the privacy of personal information. The protection of privacy is crucial to maintaining confidence in the Regime.

Financial transactions that reporting entities must report are sent to FINTRAC, not directly to police or law enforcement. Only if FINTRAC has reasonable grounds to suspect the information would be relevant to investigating or prosecuting a money laundering or terrorist financing offence will certain information be disclosed to police, law enforcement agencies, or other recipients of these disclosures. FINTRAC's structure protects privacy and accomplishes the law enforcement need in an effective and efficient manner.

FINTRAC cannot disclose all of its information to law enforcement agencies, only specific types of identifying information that are set out in the *PCMLTFA* and its regulations. There are severe penalties for unauthorized disclosure of information by FINTRAC's employees. FINTRAC is subject to the *Privacy Act* and the Privacy Commissioner of Canada conducts regular reviews of the measures taken by FINTRAC to protect the information it receives or collects and reports this to Parliament.

The final pillar of the Regime deals with the disruption of money laundering and terrorist financing. Regime partners, such as CSIS, the CBSA, and the RCMP undertake investigations in relation to money laundering, terrorist financing, other profit-oriented crimes, and threats to the security of Canada in accordance with their individual mandates. The Canada Revenue Agency also plays an important role in investigating and prosecuting tax evasion and in detecting charities that are at risk, to ensure that they are not being used to finance terrorism.

At the forefront of Canada's efforts to disrupt the illicit flow of proceeds of crime and terrorist financing through Canada is the RCMP. As the national police force, the provincial

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

police force in all provinces except Ontario and Quebec, and the local police force pursuant to a contract with many municipalities or districts across Canada, the RCMP has a fundamental role in the overall efficacy and success of the Regime.

Due to its dual role of federal and contract policing, RCMP members work with either federal or provincial statutes and legislation. In many situations, the role of the Province is of equal importance in impacting the ability of RCMP members to conduct successful money laundering investigations.

The RCMP investigates money laundering and terrorist financing cases, lays charges, makes arrests, and seizes funds or assets suspected of being offence-related property and/or proceeds of crime or used to support terrorist criminal activity. Throughout the course of an investigation, the RCMP may work with partners -- including the Public Prosecution Service of Canada, CRA, CBSA, police of jurisdiction, or international law enforcement agencies -- to pursue the investigation. Following investigations, the RCMP may refer cases to the PPSC for prosecution, to the CRA for the purpose of investigating tax fraud, or to civil forfeiture offices to potentially seize and forfeit assets under their own authorities.

RCMP operations are premised on collaboration with domestic and international law enforcement agencies and public and private stakeholders. In recognition of the need for collaboration, the RCMP continues to develop initiatives with key stakeholders to enhance its efforts to identify trends, the scope of money laundering, vulnerabilities, information sharing, and mutual operations that can enhance its whole of government response to money laundering. Internationally, the RCMP has liaison officers and analysts deployed to strategic missions to support the RCMP mandate to fight transnational crime and share information between Canadian law enforcement agencies and the law enforcement agency of the host country and assist with capacity building when appropriate.

I'd like to move now to speak of Federal Serious and Organized Crime, or FSOC. Under

their federal mandate, the RCMP is tasked with enforcing federal laws, including those related to commercial crime, counterfeiting, drug trafficking, cybercrime, border integrity, transnational and serious organized crime, and other related matters. It also provides counterterrorism and domestic security and participates in various international policing efforts.

Within the ambit of transnational and serious organized crime, proceeds of crime and money laundering investigations are a key activity of federal police. This includes following the money on all tiered Federal Policing investigations to identify, seize, and ultimately submit applications to forfeit the major assets and criminal profits of these crime groups, in addition to uncovering their financial facilitators and criminalized professionals who enable their criminal enterprises to operate effectively.

In addition to carrying out asset-tracing and proceeds of crime investigations for all substantive transnational organized crime files, Federal Policing will also lead on files within its jurisdiction that target a professional money launderer, international money controller network, or other major facilitator such as a complicit money service business.

In British Columbia, the Federal Policing mandate -- as it relates to money laundering and proceeds of crime -- is a priority for FSOC, of which the Financial Integrity Program is a part. FSOC has teams located in the Lower Mainland, the Island, and Southeast District. The Financial Integrity Program is made up of a number of distinct operational groups, including specialized market enforcement and money laundering teams.

In particular, the Integrated Market Enforcement Team, or IMET, has a mandate to detect, deter, and investigate Criminal Code capital market fraud offences that are of regional or national significance that pose a threat to investor confidence, economic stability in Canada, and the integrity of Canada's capital markets. In pursuit of these objectives, IMET partners with key stakeholders including: the

FBI, CRA, the B.C. Securities Commission, Civil Forfeiture Office, Real Estate Council of British Columbia, and Bank Investigators, among others.

In addition, the Financial Integrity Program houses two specialized money-laundering teams tasked with intelligence-led detection, disruption and enforcement of organized crime groups involved in money laundering both within the province, nationally, and internationally. The money laundering teams are responsible for investigations and project development respectively, with a focus on four key priorities, which are listed there for you, but essentially to disrupt the criminals using laundered funds; disrupt criminals involved in utilizing underground banking systems; third, to increase formalized engagement with partners and stakeholders in furtherance of their anti-money laundering mandate; and fourth, increasing strategic intelligence to assist in identifying current and future risks, threats and opportunities.

The Investigations team conducts large-scale money laundering investigations, including transnational money laundering investigations, and assists on large FSOC priority files with a money-laundering component.

The Project Development team contributes to discrete national and international projects, such as specialized probes into mail or tax fraud schemes, criminal use of cryptocurrencies, and trade-based money laundering, to name a few. The team's role is to probe and refer to an investigative team if the probe reveals substantive information and intelligence to warrant a full investigation.

I'll now move to speak about the Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit. Under provincial and municipal contracts, the RCMP also provides frontline policing in all areas outside of Ontario and Quebec that do not have an established local police force, including British Columbia.

At the provincial level, the Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit-B.C., which is the province's anti-gang agency, also plays an important role in the AML/ATF Regime.

Now, Ms. Hughes went through with you the fact that CFSEU-BC houses the Joint Illegal Gaming Investigation Team, or JIGIT, which was formed in 2016. So I will perhaps leave with you paragraph 81 through to 83, which describes sort of the role and mandate of JIGIT, and move to speak about the results that JIGIT has achieved since its inception.

So typically, JIGIT's money laundering and loan sharking investigations have focused on top tier organized criminals' exploitation of casinos and banks. JIGIT's investigations have also targeted individuals operating money service businesses that were not compliant with their reporting obligations under the *PCMLTFA*.

To date, JIGIT has executed many search warrants on illegal gaming houses throughout British Columbia. These investigations have resulted in charges, convictions, and disruption of criminal enterprises that have led to seizures of various drugs, cash, gaming tables, and the deportation of one individual.

In addition, JIGIT's investigation into money laundering, proceeds of crime, and illegal gaming houses have resulted in successful civil forfeitures totalling an amount in excess of \$700,000 since its inception.

As a result, JIGIT has developed considerable subject matter expertise and strives to perform a public education function with respect to the identification and reporting of illegal gambling in B.C. in collaboration with its provincial partners.

JIGIT has also invested considerable time and effort in information sharing initiatives in order to increase detection, disruption, and enforcement capacity.

For example, JIGIT has developed the B.C. Money Laundering Working Group, to engage municipal, provincial, and federal law enforcement resources in British Columbia to share information about money laundering trends, intelligence and investigations. This information sharing initiative is achieved through monthly conference calls with police officers and analysis at all policing levels. In addition to increasing awareness of money-

 laundering activity, the group expects to develop a cadre of money-laundering subject matter experts.

And again, Ms. Hughes took you through some of the details of this group, and so I will leave paragraphs 90 to 94 with you for your reference.

So in March of 2019, JIGIT engaged with the provincial government on the development of a provincial licencing regime for money service businesses in British Columbia. As part of that initiative, JIGIT researched and worked with the Autorité des Marchés financiers in Quebec, who have a robust provincial licensing program for all individuals involved in money service businesses.

This collaboration ultimately evolved into a formal working group with representatives from CFSEU-BC, the B.C. Ministry of Finance, the B.C. Attorney General's Office, the B.C. Police Services, Richmond City Council, and the AMF in Quebec. JIGIT is coordinating this initiative with a view to improving provincial regulatory oversight and developing legislation to better govern money service businesses in British Columbia.

For JIGIT, these collaborative relationships with both public and private stakeholders are critical to the short- and long-term success of law enforcement and regulation in the gaming industry.

Moving on to speak of other intelligence and enforcement partners, in addition to the RCMP, CSIS is at the forefront of Canada's national security system.

Generally speaking, CSIS has a mandate to collect, analyze, and report to the Government of Canada information and intelligence concerning threats to Canada's national security, and to take measures to reduce those threats. Under the PCMLTFA, CSIS is also a FINTRAC disclosure recipient and may receive financial intelligence relevant to threats to the security of Canada when certain legislative thresholds are met.

Information collected by CSIS may also be disclosed to other Regime partners, within its mandate to provide advice to assist in the performance of their activities within the

Regime. For example, CSIS provides voluntary information records to FINTRAC on activities suspected to be a threat to the security of Canada.

The CBSA is responsible for ensuring the security and prosperity of Canada by managing the access of people and goods to and from Canada.

Within the AML/ATF Regime, CBSA is responsible for the administration and enforcement of Part 2 of the *PCMLTFA*, which requires individuals or entities to report on the cross-border movement of currency or monetary instruments valued at \$10,000 or greater.

Border Services Officers enforce the physical cross-border reporting obligation, including the examination of baggage, and can question and search individuals for unreported or falsely reported currency and monetary instruments. The CBSA can seize currency and monetary instruments if they are greater than the reporting threshold and are not reported. Seized non-reported currency and monetary instruments are forfeited with no terms of release when they are suspected to be the proceeds of crime or funds for terrorist financing activities.

The CBSA transmits information from cross-border currency reports and cross-border seizure reports to FINTRAC. Separately, the CBSA may also provide voluntary information records to FINTRAC, as appropriate, and is a disclosure recipient of information that FINTRAC must disclose when certain legislative thresholds are met.

Finally, the CBSA also plays a pivotal role in the identification of suspected cases of trade-based money laundering and the disruption of related criminal activities. Trade-based money laundering describes the process of disguising proceeds of crime from predicate offences -- such as human trafficking, human smuggling, tobacco smuggling, firearms trafficking, and illicit drug trafficking or terrorist financing activities -- as legitimate trade transactions by misrepresenting import and export declarations for goods entering or leaving Canada.

THE COMMISSIONER: There is, I think, a suggestion

that trade-based money laundering is a particularly significant area of money laundering in recent years, and it may be that that's an area that the Commission will want to inquire into fairly closely.

 MS. HOFFMAN: In fact, we have already been in touch with your counsel about organizing -THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MS. HOFFMAN: -- people to speak to you about that matter.

So moving on to speak of the CRA, which also plays an important role in the investigation and enforcement of Canada's AML/ATF Regime.

And their role is twofold: first, to minimize the impact money laundering and terrorist financing have on the Agency's ability to collect and protect taxes and duties; and to protect the integrity of Canada's charitable registration system from the risk of terrorist financing abuse.

Since 2010, the CRA can use the powers available under the Regime to investigate money laundering offences when the designated offence is tax evasion under the *Income Tax Act* or *Excise Tax Act*.

The CRA also provides voluntary information records to FINTRAC and is a disclosure recipient of information from FINTRAC in cases where the information is suspected to be relevant to the investigation or prosecution of a money laundering or terrorist financing offence, relevant to tax evasion, or relevant to the determination that a charity has ceased to meet the registration requirements of the *Income Tax Act*.

More recently, CRA has played a role in policy discussions that relate to tax evasion, such as work to improve the transparency of beneficial ownership information and the reporting requirements for trust companies.

When charges are laid against individuals or entities following an investigation into money laundering, terrorist financing or other activities related to the proceeds of crime, responsibility for prosecution shifts to the Public Prosecution Service of Canada and provincial prosecutors.

And in paragraphs 112 and 113, we describe the mandate and role of the Public Prosecution Service.

The restraint and confiscation of proceeds of crime is also an important law enforcement component of the Regime. And Public Services and Procurement Canada manages lawfully seized and restrained property on behalf of the Government of Canada, through the Seized Property Management This directorate is co-located with Directorate. various RCMP units across Canada and provides consultative advice and asset stewardship and disposition services for seized assets through a national network of service representatives, secure warehouses and private sector suppliers. In addition, it offers case management, data gathering, and reporting services to key partners.

PSPC's Forensic Accounting Management Group provides forensic accounting expertise to law enforcement at all levels of government to support investigations involving financial crimes. The services include reviewing FINTRAC disclosures provided by law enforcement partners with a mandate to analyze the data and identify potential money laundering indicators, reviewing financial information to provide an expert opinion on money laundering indicators, and preparing expert forensic accounting reports, as well as providing expert testimony on the financial aspects of criminal investigations and prosecutions.

In the next paragraph I also describe the role of two other federal stakeholders, which are the Communications Security Establishment, which collects and analyzes foreign signals intelligence, and they are also a disclosure recipient of FINTRAC intelligence; and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, which provides input to the Regime in the areas of mortgage fraud and coverage of the real estate sector.

I'd like now to speak of Canada's international leadership in anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing in this context.

The growing global nature of crimes related to money laundering and terrorist financing requires international cooperation to learn and

share trends, risks, typologies, and best practices. Maintaining current international best practices assists Canada in fulfilling its international commitments to participate in the fight against transnational crime. In addition, international cooperation facilitates investigations and prosecutions domestically and abroad. Canada's efforts also serve to safeguard its financial system against its use as a vehicle for money laundering and terrorist financing.

And the International Monetary Fund has commented on the global nature of these crimes in an increasingly interconnected world.

In addition to domestic AML/ATF efforts, Canada has taken a strong leadership role in global efforts to disrupt transnational organized crime, including money laundering and terrorist financing.

Most notably, Canada is a founding member of the Financial Action Task Force, or FATF, which leads global efforts to adopt and implement measures designed to counter the use of the financial system by criminals.

The FATF develops international AML/ATF standards, and monitors their effective implementation through peer reviews and public reporting. To date, FATF has developed 40 recommendations and 11 immediate outcomes on AML/ATF, which are widely considered the international standard.

To encourage jurisdictions to strengthen their AML/ATF regimes, FATF publishes peer examinations of its members and publicly identifies non-compliance with the international AML/ATF standards. FATF also leads international efforts related to policy development and risk analysis, and identifies and reports on emerging money laundering and terrorist financing trends and methods.

Canada participates in FATF by regularly attending plenary and working group meetings; contributing to the development of policy, guidance, and typology reports; providing assessors and reviewers for peer reviews in other member countries; participating in joint regional review groups to monitor compliance of high-risk jurisdictions; and supporting capacity building

 of the global network.

Following every FATF Plenary meeting, FINTRAC issues an advisory to reporting entities to inform them of the FATF decisions with respect to countries that pose a risk to the international financial system.

Participation in the FATF Style Regional Bodies also further allows Canada to monitor, influence, and support the AML/ATF activities and efforts of member countries in regions of strategic interest to Canada.

Canada works in close cooperation with regional bodies, such as the Caribbean Financial Action Task Force, where Canada is a Co-operating and Supporting Nation, and the Asia/Pacific Group on Money Laundering, where Canada is a full member. Canada also provides substantial financial support and expert contributions in technical assistance to these groups through partnerships with federal departments and agencies.

In 2002, FINTRAC became a member of the Egmont Group. Comprised of financial intelligence units from 164 jurisdictions, the Egmont Group's goals are to foster communication and improve the exchange of information, intelligence, and expertise among the global network of financial intelligence units in support of member countries' AML/ATF regimes.

As Canada's financial intelligence unit, FINTRAC works with foreign intelligence units to protect Canadians and the integrity of Canada's financial system. Through over 100 bilateral agreements, FINTRAC is able to disclose financial intelligence to these units worldwide when the appropriate threshold is met. At the same time, financial intelligence units are able to share their information with FINTRAC, which broadens its analyses of international financial transactions.

Canada also provides technical assistance and shares expertise with foreign financial intelligence units, helping to enhance global knowledge of money laundering and terrorism financing issues and to strengthen international compliance and financial intelligence operations.

In the law enforcement realm, the RCMP

regularly contributes resources and expertise to international investigations, through its working relationships with the FBI, UK's National Crime Agency, Europol, and other international police agencies.

Along with regular bilateral engagement, the RCMP also continues to be a strong partner on the Five Eyes Law Enforcement Group Money Laundering Working Group and shares information with our Five Eyes partners on suspects and typologies involved in international money laundering. Beginning in March of 2020, the RCMP will actually chair this working group.

Canada also provides training, equipment, and technical and legal assistance to help countries develop capacity and frameworks to strengthen their AML/ATF frameworks. And that work is described in paragraphs 133 to 135, which I will leave for your reference.

So Canada's AML/ATF Regime and the financial intelligence generated by FINTRAC have contributed to combatting financial crimes and efforts by law enforcement across the country to combat organized crime and keep Canadians safe.

For example, the Toronto Police Service's Major Project Section of the Integrated Gun and Gang Task Force recognized the value of FINTRAC's financial intelligence in *Project Patton*, a ninemonth investigation focused on the criminal street gang, "The Five Point Generalz." Following the execution of 53 search warrants, more than a thousand charges were laid against 75 individuals, 78 firearms were seized, and 1.2 million of fentanyl, carfentanil, cocaine and heroin was taken off the streets of Toronto and other Canadian communities.

The CRA recognized the value of FINTRAC's financial intelligence in *Projet Collecteur*, a joint investigation with the RCMP that targeted a money laundering and tax evasion scheme in the Greater Montreal and Toronto areas. Charges were laid against 17 individuals, including laundering the proceeds of crime, and 10.9 million in drugs and proceeds of crimes were seized, as were several properties with an estimated value of 22 million. A legislative amendment made to the *Criminal Code* in 2010 allowed for the restraint

of property in this case.

The Ontario Provincial Police recognized the value of FINTRAC's financial intelligence to *Project HOPE*, an intercontinental investigation that netted the largest single drug seizure in OPP history. 1,062 kilograms of pure cocaine, with the street value of approximately 250 million, was seized. Three individuals were charged with the importation of cocaine and possession of cocaine for the purpose of trafficking.

In November 2019, the Alberta Law Enforcement Response Teams recognized FINTRAC's contribution to *Project Coyote*, a two-year international investigation that led to Canada's largest seizure of fentanyl -- 250,000 pills -- and 81 kilograms of cocaine. In total, 15 million worth of drugs, over 4.5 million in cash and assets, and 13 firearms were seized by police. Seven people face more that 77 charges, including laundering the proceeds of crime.

While Canada's domestic and international AML/ATF efforts are producing real and meaningful results for Canadians, there is no question that we are facing a challenging environment. This is not unique to Canada. Some of the challenges include:

- The global banking system and transnational nature of money flows have become increasingly complex and sophisticated;
- Technology has brought new and evolving challenges such as anonymity, speed, and much larger volumes of transactions;
- Cash transactions are being replaced by other negotiable instruments, including the use of electronic and digital means;
- The use of trade financing and the international trade system as a means to move value and illicit proceeds around the globe through trade-based money laundering techniques;

- Criminal organizations, hostile state actors, and terrorist groups have become more adept at using the financial systems to achieve their goals;

- and new and emerging technologies are adopted quickly by criminal organizations and individuals.

The increasing complexity of money laundering and terrorist financing schemes and the use of technology by criminals has imposed unprecedented demands not only on law enforcement but the whole of government to adapt and modernize capacity, to develop new expertise, and to revise legislation, policies, and regulations that may be outdated. These challenges are common throughout the world and we have to meet them head on.

Canada's AML/ATF Regime can only do this effectively by working together and sharing information and best practices so that we can stay ahead of the criminals and hostile actors who are always looking for new ways to exploit our financial system to launder their proceeds from large-scale fraud, trafficking, and corruption.

Canada's Regime is regularly reviewed by Parliament and international peers to ensure it remains effective and aligned to international standards and best practices. These independent reviews provide assurance and understanding of the strengths of the Regime and guide the government in targeting its ongoing efforts to further reinforce the Regime to close gaps and meet new threats.

Canada underwent a peer review by FATF in 2016, and this evaluation found that Canada has a comprehensive AML/ATF Regime that is largely effective, with appropriate legislation and regulations. It noted that Canada has a good understanding of the risks; effective cooperation of government bodies at both the policy and operational levels; effective supervision of reporting entities; and effective measures in place for preventing terrorists from raising, using, and moving funds.

At the same time, FATF identified several areas where action should be taken to strengthen the overall effectiveness of the Regime: improving the availability of accurate beneficial ownership information to be used by relevant authorities; including coverage of the legal profession under the Regime; and increasing the number of money laundering investigations and prosecutions, in particular relating to complex schemes involving professional money launderers. In addition, the report found that Canada's AML/ATF framework could be strengthened by expanding the scope of legislation to other types of businesses and sectors, and to apply new obligations to the designated non-financial businesses and professions sector in relation to politically exposed persons, heads of international organizations, and beneficial ownership requirements.

Every five years, a Parliamentary committee conducts a statutory review of the *PCMLTFA*. In February 2018, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance, or FINA, launched the most recent review. To support the Committee's work, the Department of Finance issued a discussion paper seeking feedback from Canadians on areas of vulnerability in Canada's AML/ATF Regime, including those identified by the FATF.

THE COMMISSIONER: In the Federation case, which dealt with the issue of whether lawyers should be part of the reporting regime to FINTRAC, after striking down the legislation, the court, as I recall, suggested that a modified scheme might be put in place to deal with the issue of lawyers reporting so that the scheme in effect would protect the solicitor-client privilege and avoid any derivative use. But it seemed to be an invitation to the federal government to consider modification of the legislation to meet the constitutional standard.

Has there been any discussion about that that you're aware?

MS. HOFFMAN: Certainly the federal government is in discussion with the Federation of Law Societies, and there is ongoing dialogue in that regard.

Again, I'm sure that your Commission counsel will ask questions of Canada in that regard.

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Right. 2 MS. HOFFMAN: And you will no doubt hear more about 3 that. At this point in time, I'm not able to 4 provide you --5 THE COMMISSIONER: No. 6 -- more detail. MS. HOFFMAN: 7 THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, fair enough. Again, I'm 8 more alerting you to things that --9 MS. HOFFMAN: Yes. 10 THE COMMISSIONER: -- might crop up during the course 11 of the Commission. 12 And that is certainly very helpful. MS. HOFFMAN: 13 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you. 14 MS. HOFFMAN: So in its -- and I'm speaking here about 15 the review that is done of the PCMLTFA. And in its final report tabled in November 2018, the 16 17 House of Commons Standing Committee made 32 18 recommendations including: the creation of a 19 central beneficial ownership registry; 20 legislative changes to integrate the legal profession into Canada's AML/ATF framework; the 21 22 implementation of a system for geographic/sector 23 targeting orders similar to those used in the 24 United States; the inclusion of new types of 25 businesses under the PCMLTFA such as white-label 26 ATMs, armoured car services, mortgage insurers, land registry and title insurers, and luxury 27 28 goods dealers; and requirements for all 29 businesses subject to the PCMLTFA to identify 30 beneficial ownership and determine whether their clients are politically exposed persons. 31 32 strengthening the Regime, the Government 33 continues to assess the full set of 34 recommendations, including to take into account 35 regulatory burden on businesses and implications for the privacy and Charter rights of Canadians. 36 37 Canada has already begun to take some 38 important steps to address the most pressing 39 vulnerabilities in our Regime. The stakeholders 40 that make up Canada's Regime are engaged in a 41 number of ongoing initiatives designed to fill existing gaps and enforcement, and to improve the 42 43 capacity of agencies to respond to new and

One of these is improving beneficial ownership transparency. Since 2016, the

emerging money laundering and terrorist financing

44

45

46

47

threats.

Government of Canada has been working with provinces and territories to advance a national approach to strengthening beneficial ownership transparency. In order to safeguard against corporations being misused to launder money and hide ownership of assets, like real estate, authorities need to know who owns and controls corporations.

In December 2017, Canada's Finance Ministers agreed in principle to pursue legislative amendments in their jurisdictions that would require corporations to keep up-to-date records of their beneficial owners that are available to law enforcement and tax authorities, and to eliminate the use of bearer shares. The ministers agreed to make best efforts to complete these amendments by July of 2019.

A series of legislative amendments to the Canada Business Corporations Act were completed and came into force in June of 2019 to fulfill this commitment at the federal level. You heard from Ms. Hughes about the Province's legislation that they have put in place.

The Government is now taking the next steps needed to further strengthen corporate ownership transparency. In June 2019, several of Canada's ministers of finance and ministers responsible for AML and beneficial ownership transparency met and agreed to cooperate to initiate consultations on a public beneficial ownership registry. Ministers reaffirmed their commitment to protect the integrity of the Canadian economy by improving beneficial ownership transparency in a way that balances transparency and privacy safeguards while ensuring effective access for law enforcement, tax and other authorities, and maintaining the ease of doing business in Canada.

On February 13th, 2020, Innovation, Science and Economic Development and the Department of Finance initiated consultations on creating a publicly accessible registry of beneficial ownership. Provinces and territories have been invited and encouraged to participate in crosscountry consultations with Canadians. British Columbia and Quebec have already moved ahead to initiate consultations on requiring corporations to disclose beneficial ownership information to

 government corporate registries and making this information public.

The results of these consultations will support the development of recommendations at the federal, provincial, and territorial levels for a path forward on strengthening corporate transparency in Canada.

The Government of Canada acknowledges the risk that the absence of AML/ATF obligations on members of the legal profession can pose to the effectiveness of the Regime and to the integrity of the financial system. FATF found that criminals seek out the involvement of legal professionals in their money laundering and terrorist financing activities. It is the financial services offered by lawyers that make them the gatekeepers to the financial system and that make them the most vulnerable. In addition to conducting wire transfers, issuing cheques, and accepting cash, these services include establishing trust accounts, forming and managing corporations and legal trusts, and carrying real estates and securities-related transactions.

The inclusion of the legal profession in Canada's AML/ATF Regime is important to the objective of detecting and deterring money laundering and terrorist financing. It is important that financial intermediaries, such as lawyers, take measures to ensure that they are not unwittingly used to launder money or to finance terrorism.

The Department of Finance and the Federation of Law Societies of Canada established a working group in 2019 to explore issues related to money laundering and terrorist financing, in order to address the inherent risks of money laundering and other illicit activity that may arise in the practice of law and to strengthen information sharing between the law societies and the Government of Canada.

The working group has met twice to discuss trends and typologies on money laundering in the legal profession as well as a discussion on law society supervisory and audit functions.

Ms. Hughes went over the B.C. Ad Hoc Working Group on Money Laundering and Real Estate, which we also describe in our submissions at paragraphs

161 to 163. So I'll just leave those paragraphs for your reference.

In June 2019, the Government of Canada finalized a series of amendments to the *PCMLTFA* regulations to address weaknesses in the framework with regard to the regulation of online casinos, due diligence requirements for domestic politically exposed persons, virtual currency and prepaid payment products, and the risk assessment of new technologies.

These amendments will designate businesses dealing in virtual currency as money services businesses and will expand the scope of the regulations to include foreign money services businesses, for example, online platforms with no physical presence in Canada. These legislative provisions come into force in June 2020 and the full suite of regulatory obligations in June 2021.

The Government of Canada continues to strengthen Canada's regulatory framework to address priority recommendations of both the FINA and FATF reviews. FINA is the House of Commons Standing Committee. On February 14th, 2020, the Department of Finance published proposed amendments to the PCMLTFA regulations for consultation, which aim to enhance customer due diligence by requiring designated non-financial businesses and professions, for example real estate brokers, to take enhanced identification measures, such as obtaining beneficial ownership information and screening for politically exposed persons. The proposed regulations also aim to align record-keeping obligations for businesses dealing in virtual currencies and customer due diligence measures for casinos with international standards.

The Government of Canada's Budget 2019 also announced legislative amendments to modernize Canada's AML/ATF Regime, such as the addition of recklessness to the offence of money laundering in section 462.31 of the *Criminal Code*. This criminalizes the activity of moving money on behalf of another person or organization while being reckless to the risk that this activity could be laundering the proceeds of crime. This is an important tool to improve the ability to

investigate and prosecute professional money launderers associated with organized crime.

In addition to these legislative changes, Budget 2019 also announced an integrated set of measures to strengthen intelligence and enforcement capacity across Canada's AML/ATF Regime.

Money laundering investigations are often lengthy and complex endeavours, necessitating large teams to conduct surveillance, recruit confidential informants; obtain reasonable grounds for various judicial authorizations such as wiretaps and production orders for bank records; listen to and transcribe communication intercepts; and review, analyze and collate vast amounts of information and prepare disclosure for Crown.

The Government of Canada recognizes the capacity of law enforcement, Crown counsel, and the courts must be commensurate with the demands placed upon them to investigate and successfully prosecute money laundering and terrorist financing offences.

In recognition of the complexity of money laundering investigations, and the need to strengthen federal policing capacity, Budget 2019 announced 68.9 million over five years and 20 million in ongoing funding for enhanced police capacity, including to fight money laundering. Subsequent to Budget 2019, Ministers Morneau and Blair announced an additional 10 million for the RCMP to invest in information technology infrastructure and digital tools to pursue complex financial crimes.

Budget 2019 also created four dedicated real estate audit teams through the provision of 50 million over five years to the CRA.

Finally, Budget 2019 provided additional funding to FINTRAC, which is being used to strengthen compliance functions in relation to virtual currencies, foreign money service businesses, and customer identification. With this new funding, FINTRAC is also increasing their outreach and examinations in the real estate and casino sectors with a focus on the province of British Columbia.

There is no doubt that criminal elements

will continue to attempt to exploit the cracks in Canada's AML/ATF infrastructure. Canada is currently seeking to improve federal leadership and coordination of the AML/ATF Regime through a number of initiatives that aim to improve the efficiency of information exchange, expertise and coordination among public and private entities.

I introduced you to the ACE Team earlier on in my submissions, which is bringing together dedicated experts from across intelligence and enforcement agencies to strengthen interagency coordination and cooperation and identify and address significant money laundering and financial crime threats.

The ACE Team includes employees seconded from FINTRAC, RCMP, CRA, the Public Prosecution Service, OSFI, and Public Safety -- sorry, PSPC is not Public Prosecution Service. That's -- I'm losing track of my acronyms now -- that's, yes, Public Procurement -- OSFI, and Public Safety. The ACE Team's mission is to effectively coordinate and support interagency efforts to counter money laundering in Canada, through:

- Supporting alignment of horizontal operational AML priorities;
- Improving the sharing of information, knowledge, and expertise;
- Identifying and supporting significant money laundering investigations; and,
- Maximizing the use of public-private partnerships to identify AML threats and red flags.

The ACE Team is currently reviewing AML efforts across the country and internationally, to inform the development of its operations model and staffing plan. While the ACE Team's initial focus is at the federal level, it is also seeking opportunities for greater federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal cooperation, including by exploring options to expand the initiative over the long term to include the private sector and provincial, territorial, or municipal

enforcement or prosecution authorities.

The ACE Team is expected to become operational in 2021 and will provide interagency coordination and support to AML investigations and prosecutions across the country.

The Money Laundering Banker's Contact Group, or MLCG, is a public-private partnership whose members include the RCMP, financial institutions, and FINTRAC. The MLCG is pursuing opportunities to share information within Canada's lawful information sharing framework.

MLCG partners seek to work together to improve their collective understanding of money laundering threats. They also work together to clarify priorities, targeting and interventions, as well as to identify the benefits of, and obstacles to, information sharing amongst key Canadian AML/ATF Regime stakeholders.

The MLCG meets quarterly to provide government and private sector participants with a forum to exchange information on money laundering trends. The partners seek a common understanding of pressing issues and priorities, identify challenges to cooperation, and work collaboratively to strengthen the resilience of Canada's financial system.

Budget 2019 also announced 28 million over five years and 10 million in ongoing funding to create a Trade-Based Money Laundering Centre of Expertise, which will complement the work of the ACE Team.

And this centre is expected to be operational by April of 2020 and will bring together CBSA experts in both National Headquarters and regional offices across Canada to improve the CBSA's ability to identify and investigate the customs trade fraud offences that allow trade-based money laundering to occur.

The centre will also generate increased intelligence and investigative referrals to the ACE Team and the RCMP when trade-based money laundering is suspected. This initiative is also expected to result in increased CBSA referrals to other government departments, such as the CRA, for related offences such as tax evasion.

This initiative will therefore support whole of government efforts to enhance the safety and

 security of Canadians, and the protection of the integrity of Canada's financial and trade systems.

In recognition of the pivotal role of legal information exchange in the effective operation of the Regime, the federal government is working to strengthen new and existing partnerships across the public and private sectors.

CFSEU-BC, the Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit, recently launched *Project Athena*, a public-private partnership between domestic law enforcement agencies, financial institutions, casinos, and federal and provincial government bodies such as FINTRAC.

Project Athena was modelled after other successful public-private partnerships such as Project Protect, Project Guardian, and Project Chameleon, which are aimed at more effectively combatting money laundering associated with human trafficking in the sex trade, romance fraud, and the trafficking of illicit fentanyl.

The objectives of the project are threefold: to improve collective understanding of money laundering threats; to inform and strengthen financial systems and controls; and to disrupt money laundering activity.

Project Athena began in 2018, following the implementation of source of funds declarations at B.C. casinos. At that time, JIGIT and the Combined Forces Special Unit sought information from BCLC to launch a bank draft intelligence probe, with the aim to understand the use of bank drafts by those seeking to launder proceeds of crime and to assess the effectiveness of source of funds declarations in British Columbia casinos. Ultimately, the bank draft intelligence probe identified a number of deficiencies and misrepresentations in the completion of source of funds declarations.

As a result, law enforcement, BCLC, GPEB, and a number of financial institutions met for a bank draft stakeholders meeting. At this inaugural meeting, JIGIT shared the money laundering methodology they had observed in British Columbia casinos and provided information garnered from the bank draft intelligence probe, leading some financial institutions to change

 their internal processes for identifying clients on bank drafts. By engaging multiple stakeholders through lawful information sharing, systemic changes were thereby achieved.

Based on this initial success, *Project*Athena has evolved into a nationally scaled
public-private partnership that will link with a
formal governance structure for private-public
partnerships which includes an Executive Steering
Committee.

Project Athena meetings now provide an important forum for strategic level, lawful sharing information between core stakeholders including law enforcement, FINTRAC, and key financial institutions. On December 10th, 2019, FINTRAC issued its first Project Athena Operational Alert, titled "Laundering the proceeds of crime through a casino-related underground banking scheme."

As Canada seeks to strengthen the Regime, the federal government has renewed its commitment to transparency, accountability, and public outreach in AML/ATF initiatives. The Government of Canada is focused on sharing more information with Canadian businesses, with an eye to ensuring that they understand and are able to fulfill the obligations that are so critical to our financial intelligence mandate.

As previously mentioned, as part of this broader transparency initiative, FINTRAC has published its Compliance Framework and its Assessment Manual, which outlines clearly and transparently FINTRAC's new method of calculating penalties for non-compliance. No other AML/ATF regulator in the world has done this.

Canada understands that regulatory burden is a key concern to the private sector, and that it is important to strike a balance between capturing financial activity that poses money laundering or terrorist financing risks, and the amount of resources, either public or private, that are needed to comply with obligations and analyze that activity. FINTRAC has engaged extensively with businesses in revising its suspicious transaction reporting guidance to make it clearer, more concise and tailored to each reporting sector.

FINTRAC has also recently provided businesses with strategic financial intelligence to support them with their risk assessments and in fulfilling their reporting obligations, including the December 2019 Operational Alert entitled "Professional money laundering through trade and money services businesses" and the "Terrorist Financing Assessment," which assists businesses in better identifying and reporting suspected terrorist activity financing.

Canada's commitment to sharing more with Canadian businesses was recently recognized by the Community of Federal Regulators, which presented FINTRAC with an award for Excellence in Regulatory Openness and Transparency.

The next section we speak of the cooperation between provinces and territories. And while Canada's Regime as a whole is a federal responsibility, stemming from the criminal law power, there are many areas with shared jurisdiction and responsibilities with provinces and territories. And all levels of government can do more to combat money laundering and terrorist financing in Canada.

Federal, provincial, and territorial governments share jurisdiction over incorporation, with approximately 10 per cent of corporations in Canada established under the federal Canada Business Corporations Act. Provinces and territories have jurisdiction over incorporation of trusts, partnerships, and companies with provincial objects, which can also be misused for money laundering and other criminal purposes.

And the following paragraphs, 201 to 204, provide more detail of that shared jurisdiction, which I will leave for your reference and move to Canada's vision for this Commission.

This Commission represents an important opportunity to engage members of the Canadian public and key stakeholders on how governments can better combat money laundering in Canada.

The crime of money laundering is complex, perpetrated by sophisticated criminals using elaborate methods. The money can and does come from crimes committed anywhere in the world, with Canada's experience only part of a chain of

 events. The solutions are similarly complex. Coordinated provincial and federal government action is required across legal, technological, and regulatory spheres in order to fight this problem.

The Government recognizes that any measures to enhance Canada's AML/ATF framework must also seek to strike an appropriate balance among sometimes competing objectives.

For example, the need to improve information sharing and provide timely and actionable intelligence to law enforcement agencies must be balanced against the imperative of protecting the privacy and *Charter* rights of Canadians. However, robust and comprehensive preventative measures to combat money laundering and terrorist financing must not place an undue burden on reporting entities, which are on the frontlines of the fight against money laundering and terrorist financing.

Canada trusts that the work of the Commission will support Canada's ongoing AML/ATF initiatives by providing further insights into the extent, growth, and evolution of money laundering in British Columbia, including new money laundering typologies and emerging areas of vulnerability.

Canada also hopes that the Commission will facilitate a better understanding of the current AML/ATF landscape in British Columbia and identify additional regulatory or enforcement measures that the province can take within its areas of jurisdiction to bolster Canada's defences against money laundering and terrorist financing.

In particular, Canada believes that the Commission can make a valuable contribution to bolstering Canada's defences by investigating and providing recommendations that the province can take within its areas of jurisdiction as to:

- The effective use of public-private partnerships to enhance the prevention, detection, and investigation of money laundering and terrorist financing offences;
- Creative ways to facilitate legal

information sharing and knowledge exchange between all stakeholders across the Regime;

- Lessons learned from the practices and processes used by international agencies in the enforcement, prosecution and investigation of money laundering;

- The identification of further risk-based approaches to AML/ATF and proactive measures to get ahead of new and emerging areas of vulnerability; and,

- Other efforts and initiatives that could be pursued by the Province of British Columbia, supported by the Government of Canada, to make the province an undesirable place to launder the proceeds of crime.

Canada supports B.C.'s renewed commitment to combatting money laundering and terrorist financing in the province and looks forward to engaging with other public institutions, private stakeholders and everyday Canadians throughout the Inquiry on the best way forward.

The Commission's work is of great importance to all Canadians, and Canada is committed to working with the Commission as it addresses the issues set out in its mandate. Canada will continue to participate in the Inquiry to the fullest extent possible and we are confident that by working together, we will gain an even greater understanding of how to tackle these important and complex issues.

 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Ms. Hoffman. You may recall I asked Ms. Hughes about the province's approach to the issue of quantification. The Commission, as you probably are aware, will be addressing that issue in the first segment of its hearings in the spring of 2020. And I think there are suggestions out there, and we may very well hear in evidence, that the issue of quantification is a very elusive one, and understandably so because it's a very secretive process.

But the Commission has determined it's important to at least address the issue of

 quantification for a number of different reasons, not the least of which is to try and identify the sectors or areas in British Columbia that are most affected by money laundering, and that's a function of the extent to which it may invade that sector or area.

Does Canada have a particular approach that it would urge upon the Commission to adopt in addressing the issue of quantification? And again, I'm not looking for an answer today. I'm just alerting you to the fact that we may be asking various of the parties to assist us in certain areas. So I simply put that out there so that you can consider it. And if you have any preliminary response, fine. But if not, it's something I want to put on your radar for the upcoming hearings.

- MS. HOFFMAN: Certainly that is a very, very difficult task, and I think elusive is a very appropriate way to describe that. We will certainly seek instructions on what we may be able to add to that.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. And finally, are there any areas -- you've set out a number of different areas in your pages 51 and 52 in your submissions that you submit or suggest that the Commission should pay heed to. Are there any other areas that you think we should be looking at that haven't so far been identified, any new areas such as cryptocurrency or anything like that? Do you have any suggestions for the Commission as to what your top four or five areas of inquiry should be?
- MS. HOFFMAN: Again, I represent a number of government departments, and that would be a question that I would have to take back to them, and we can certainly do that. And we will note that question and raise that with our client departments.
- THE COMMISSIONER: And similarly, if there are any areas you don't think would be particularly fruitful for Commission to pursue.
- MS. HOFFMAN: Thank you very much.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Thank you for your efforts.
 - Mr. Martland, I think we could get started on the next matter. We have 15 minutes. So why

don't we do that.

MR. MARTLAND: The Law

MR. MARTLAND: The Law Society is next [indiscernible - not near microphone].

THE COMMISSIONER: Ms. Herbst from the Law Society. MS. HERBST: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. HERBST (LAW SOCIETY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA):

MS. HERBST: The Law Society of British Columbia has a long and active history of engagement and innovation in addressing money laundering in this province. The Law Society's involvement has included rule-setting and enforcement, law firm audits, investigation and discipline, education of the legal profession, and collaboration with other agencies that also play a role in combatting money laundering. The Law Society works to minimize the risk that lawyers might, knowingly or unknowingly, have any involvement in money laundering.

The standard for lawyers is clear. Lawyers must never engage in activity that they know or ought to know is connected in any way with money laundering. If a lawyer knows or ought to know that money laundering is occurring, he or she must immediately cease acting. A rigorous set of rules and other anti-money laundering measures -- and I'll use the AML abbreviation throughout -- are in place setting out the high standard of conduct that lawyers are expected to meet.

Of course, the Law Society is one of many organizations participating in the fight against money laundering. All bring to the table different powers and perspectives, and face different constraints. The Law Society can do things that governments cannot in order to advance AML objectives; it has investigative powers and remedies that extend beyond those available to the government. However, the Law Society also has protocols in place by which it can refer to the police those matters that require police investigation.

The Law Society sought out and welcomes the opportunity to participate in this inquiry because it has much to bring to the fight that is

our common cause. It is one of the entities within society that has rolled up its sleeves to tackle this issue. It wants to ensure its efforts are as effective as possible, both independently and as part of a collective whole.

Today, in this opening, I take the opportunity to address several elements of what the Law Society is and what it does in the AML fight, and the constitutional and statutory framework within which its work is undertaken.

My comments are organized under a few One, firstly, a brief overview of the topics. Law Society. Second, AML as an aspect of the Law Society's mandate. Then, as part of the backdrop in terms of analyzing what can or should be done in terms of AML, the public interest in safeguarding clients' rights to committed and confidential representation. Then, addressing potential money laundering work while respecting clients' rights and the particular statutory means that are available to the Law Society to do that. Next, a more broad overview of the Law Society's AML work. And rounding off with the opportunities that we say are created by this inquiry and that this inquiry can advance.

So, particularly for the non-lawyers who are in the audience, what is the Law Society? The Law Society is a non-profit society that was established in this province about 135 years ago. Today it is a dynamic organization with about 225 staff, governed by a board of both elected lawyer benchers and appointed benchers who are members of the public.

All lawyers called to the bar of British Columbia are regulated by the Law Society. The oath that all lawyers must take to gain admission includes a pledge to conduct themselves in all things with integrity, to uphold the rule of law, and to uphold the rights and freedoms of all persons in accordance with the laws of Canada and the Province of British Columbia.

In order to practise law in British Columbia, a lawyer must apply to the Law Society and meet its high standards. The Law Society is a gatekeeper and applicants must be of good character and repute to become practising lawyers.

The role of the Law Society is not to represent lawyers. Rather, its role is to uphold and protect the public interest in the administration of justice. To do that, it has substantial investigative and disciplinary powers that I'll come back to a bit later in the opening.

The Law Society is both empowered by and accountable under a longstanding provincial statute, the *Legal Profession Act*. All that the Law Society does must be seen through the lens of the object and duty set out in section 3 of that statute, and that section provides:

It is the object and duty of the society to uphold and protect the public interest in the administration of justice by:

- preserving and protecting the rights and freedoms of all persons,
- ensuring the independence, integrity, honour and competence of lawyers,
- establishing standards and programs for the education, professional responsibility and competence of lawyers and of applicants for call and admission,
- regulating the practice of law, and
- supporting and assisting lawyers, articled students and lawyers of other jurisdictions who are permitted to practice law in British Columbia in fulfilling their duties in the practice of law.

And all those have a component in the AML work that the Law Society does.

The Law Society operates independently of government and does not receive government funding. The Law Society must uphold and protect the public interest in the administration of justice even as governments and their policies and priorities change. Indeed, as I'll come back to, lawyers have to be in a position always to protect their clients' interests in disputes with

the state. The independence of the Bar from the 2 state is central to a free society governed by 3 the rule of law. 4 Now, against that backdrop of the Law

Society's mandate, AML is an important aspect of ensuring and furthering it. Some of the matters and activities in which lawyers are involved -whether accepting retainers, being the intermediary for funds paid in settlement of litigation, or assisting clients navigate all sorts of day-to-day matters, complex property dealings, business transactions, family and relationship matters, end-of-life concerns, and so on -- involve the transmission of money.

Any segment of society that deals with money is at risk of being used by dishonest people in an attempt to launder money. Money laundering is a kind of crime that touches on many different sectors of society and utilizes many pathways. The result is that -- as the Law Society has long recognized -- lawyers may be at risk of involvement in money laundering by virtue of the types of work they do: perhaps most obviously, creating corporations, charities and trusts; working on cross-border transactions; and helping to buy and sell real estate and other assets.

The Law Society's mandate includes working to prevent lawyers from involvement in any dishonesty, crime or fraud, by clients or by anyone else. This includes money laundering.

The Law Society of course has detailed rules that are set out by the benchers under the Legal Profession Act, and those rules include a strict enjoinder on lawyers:

> If, in the course of obtaining the information and taking the steps required to identify a client, verify client identity, monitor, or at any other time while retained by a client, a lawyer knows or ought to know that he or she is or would be assisting a client in fraud or other illegal conduct, the lawyer must withdraw from representation of the client.

Further, along the same lines, the Code of Professional Conduct for British Columbia

44

45

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43

46 47

provides: "A lawyer must not engage in any activity that the lawyer knows or ought to know assists in or encourages any dishonesty, crime or fraud."

A lawyer is simply not permitted to proceed in these circumstances. A lawyer's obligation is to put an end to their involvement, not go on and watch matters unfold. And as I'll come back to in a few moments or after the lunch break, the Law Society has substantial investigative and remedial powers to enforce this prohibition.

Now, AML efforts in connection with clients are done in a particular constitutional and statutory framework, and I'll touch on this in the next part of my remarks.

In particular, the public interest requires that duties owed to clients be protected during AML efforts. The administration of justice -- which, as I've said, the Law Society is tasked with upholding and protecting -- requires protecting clients' rights to confidential dealings with committed legal counsel.

The Law Society was part of and notes here a case that has already come up this morning, the Supreme Court of Canada decision in Canada (Attorney General) v. Federation of Law Societies of Canada, which was decided in 2015 and set out very important parameters that applied in the AML context in particular the more general constitutional framework and principles that govern the work that lawyers do for clients.

The Supreme Court of Canada "has repeatedly emphasized the important role that lawyers play in ensuring access to justice and upholding the rule of law." The "rule of law" means that the laws of our province and country apply to everyone, including government officials, corporations and private citizens, no matter how wealthy or powerful; laws are to be administered and enforced equally and fairly; and citizens must be able to stand up against the government or other powerful interests without fear of reprisal or retribution.

In this context, citizens need the ability to obtain legal advice. As was said in the Supreme Court of Canada case McClure:

The law is a complex web of interests, relationships and rules. The integrity of the administration of justice depends upon the unique role of the solicitor who provides legal advice to clients within this complex system. ... The important relationship between a client and his or her lawyer stretches beyond the parties and is integral to the workings of the legal system itself.

And secondly, citizens also need the ability to:

have the assistance of a lawyer whose duty is to represent their clients' best interests and who remains independent of the state --

Picking up on one of the themes I touched on before.

The independence of lawyers from the state, which they need to be able to hold accountable, is one of the hallmarks of a free society. ... The public interest in a free society knows no area more sensitive --

The courts have said.

-- than the independence, impartiality and availability to the general public of the members of the Bar and through those members, legal advice and services generally.

Along those lines as well, the Supreme Court of Canada has said:

Lawyers are a vital conduit through which citizens access the courts, and the law. They help maintain the rule of law by working to ensure that unlawful private and unlawful state action in particular do not go unaddressed. The role that lawyers play in this regard is so important that the right to counsel in some situations has been given constitutional status.

 To exercise these functions, which are vital to the administration of justice, lawyers need to know from their clients the full story, and clients need to know that their lawyer will be committed to the client's cause. Of course, clients may not like the advice they receive after providing their lawyer with all the details, but the client will be able to make choices knowing where they stand and that the lawyer has the client's interests first and foremost in mind.

These concepts animated the Supreme Court of Canada's 2015 decision in the Federation of Law Societies case, which, as has been noted, resulted in portions of the federal anti-money laundering legislation being read down to exclude its application to lawyers and law firms. The court found that the state could not impose duties on lawyers that interfered with the obligations they owe to clients. In this regard, two key duties that lawyers owe to clients have been said to be "essential to the due administration of justice" and were impacted by the legislative scheme that was to advance AML at the time.

First, lawyers "must keep their clients' confidences." This duty against "misuse of the client's confidential information" is "reflected in solicitor-client privilege." This privilege, which is that of the client and open only to the client to waive, "is essential to the effective operation of the legal system." As such, it attracts constitutional protection.

Second, lawyers have a "duty of commitment to the client's cause." This "is an enduring principle that is essential to the integrity of the administration of justice." In this regard, a "client must be able to place 'unrestricted and unbounded confidence' in his or her lawyer" which "is at the core of the solicitor-client relationship." As such, it is "a principle of fundamental justice that the state cannot impose duties on lawyers that undermine their duty of commitment to their clients' causes." If clients and the broader public lack confidence in lawyers' commitment "to serving their clients'

legitimate interests free of other obligations that might interfere with that duty," "the lawyer's ability to do so may be compromised and the trust and confidence necessary for the solicitor-client relationship may be undermined."

THE COMMISSIONER: Ms. Herbst, would this be an appropriate time to break?

MS. HERBST: Absolutely, that would be fine.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. We'll adjourn for lunch and resume at 1:30.

MS. HERBST: Thank you.

THE REGISTRAR: Order. Please rise.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED FOR NOON RECESS) (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED)

THE REGISTRAR: Order. Please rise.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Ms. Herbst.

MS. HERBST: I had left off on page 7 of the opening, for those who have a written copy, and at the end of paragraph 23. So I'm now continuing with paragraph 24.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MS. HERBST: And back to the context that the Federation of Law Societies case forms for the work that the Law Society does in the AML context.

So because of these essential duties owed to clients -- and those were duties of confidentiality and committed representation -- certain AML measures in federal legislation that could have the effect of turning lawyers into state agents against their clients were found to be unconstitutional. In the Federation of Law Societies case, Justice Cromwell wrote for the majority:

...the [federal] legislation requires lawyers to gather and retain considerably more information than the profession thinks is needed for ethical and effective client representation. This, coupled with the inadequate protection of solicitor-client privilege, undermines the lawyer's ability to comply with his or her duty of commitment to the client's cause. The lawyer is required to create and preserve records

which are not required for ethical and effective representation. The lawyer is required to do this in the knowledge that any solicitor-client confidences contained in these records are not adequately protected against searches and seizures authorized by the scheme. This may, in the lawyer's correctly formed opinion, be contrary to the client's legitimate interests and therefore these duties imposed by the scheme may directly conflict with the lawyer's duty of committed representation.

Justice Cromwell continued:

I also conclude that a reasonable and informed person, thinking the matter through, would perceive that these provisions in combination significantly undermine the capacity of lawyers to provide committed representation. The reasonable and well-informed client would see his or her lawyer being required by the state to collect and retain information that, in the view of the legal profession, is not required for effective and ethical representation and with respect to which there are inadequate protections for solicitor-client privilege. Clients would thus reasonably perceive that lawyers were, at least in part, acting on behalf of the state in collecting and retaining this information in circumstances in which privileged information might well be disclosed to the state without the client's consent.

And again, as I'd noted before, privilege being the client's only to waive.

This would reduce confidence to an unacceptable degree in the lawyer's ability to provide committed representation.

 As part of its public interest mandate, the Law Society must ensure that it defends from state incursion the client rights that the court found

to have been threatened in the *Federation of Law Societies* case.

At the same time, the Law Society must work

At the same time, the Law Society must work firmly and vigorously to safeguard against a situation in which a lawyer crosses the line between fulfilling their obligations to the client, and becoming the facilitator of the client's illegal activities. The high standard that the Law Society requires lawyers to meet in its Rules of Conduct and Code of Conduct draws that important line. As the majority said in the Federation of Law Societies case:

Of course the duty of commitment to the client's cause must not be confused with being the client's dupe or accomplice. It does not countenance a lawyer's involvement in, or facilitation of, a client's illegal activities. Committed representation does not, for example, permit let alone require a lawyer to assert claims that he or she knows are unfounded or to present evidence that he or she knows to be false or to help the client to commit a crime. The duty is perfectly consistent with the lawyer taking appropriate steps with a view to ensuring that his or her services are not being used for improper ends.

And so against that backdrop, and given the need to draw and enforce the line that I've just set out, the Law Society has undertaken considerable AML efforts, both through application of its pre-existing powers and, in many cases, through the development of new tools to address these matters that fall within its jurisdiction.

And I say this for the benefit of, in particular, members of he audience who aren't lawyers. No mistake should be made about this. Lawyers are heavily regulated in this sector and in others, to the point that they have to withdraw from representation in certain circumstances. It's just that, to protect clients' rights, regulation comes in a different form.

The Law Society's broad AML efforts are

something that I'll come back to, by way of overview at least, in a few moments. But for the next few moments, I'll talk about a more specific issue, and that's this: the fact that the restrictions on state action, including in relation to legislation, as noted in the Federation of Law Societies case, don't apply in the same way to the Law Society as they do to government. And the Law Society recognizes, in this regard, that its work has to fulfil a role that government cannot.

Pursuant to the Legal Profession Act and the Law Society Rules, the Law Society may request information from lawyers; seek disclosure of client files, banking records and other materials; require persons -- including non-lawyers -- to answer questions under oath or affirmation; and conduct forensic audits of law practices. Lawyers have to comply with Law Society requirements or face serious discipline, including suspension.

The information that comes to the Law Society through use of its investigative powers may be subject to solicitor-client privilege. However, the Legal Profession Act, the provincial statute, specifically provides that "[a] person who is required under the Act or the [Law Society] rules to provide [to the Law Society] information, files or records that are confidential or subject to a solicitor client privilege must do so, despite the confidentiality or privilege."

The provision of privileged information specifically to the Law Society does not run afoul of the principles set out in the Federation of Law Societies case for several reasons.

First, unlike many investigative agencies and tribunals, the Law Society is not government or an arm of the state. The Law Society can therefore investigate and regulate lawyer activities while at the same time protecting the interests of clients who seek out a lawyer's advice, counsel, or assistance. Again, as a result, the Law Society recognizes that in the AML fight, its work fills a role that government cannot.

Second, specifically pursuant to the Legal

Profession Act, the provincial statute, as part of its public interest mandate the Law Society may audit and investigate the work of lawyers -- including work subject to solicitor-client privilege -- without any waiver of that privilege. Thus s. 88 of the Legal Profession Act, which pertains to audits and investigations that the Law Society undertakes and disciplinary proceedings that may flow from them, provides that:

...a person who, in the course of exercising powers or carrying out duties under this Act, acquires information, files or records that are confidential or are subject to solicitor-client privilege has the same obligation respecting the disclosure of that information as the person from whom the information, files or records were obtained.

And it also provides that:

A person who, during the course of an investigation, audit, inquiry or hearing under this Act, acquires information or records that are confidential or subject to solicitor client privilege must not disclose that information or those records to any person except for a purpose contemplated by this Act or rules.

Third, against the backdrop of those protections, the Law Society has the qualifications and expertise to ensure that privilege and confidentiality are properly identified, and that client information is safeguarded, in compliance with these statutory requirements and constitutional imperatives.

The provisions of the Legal Profession Act mean that while the Law Society may learn the client's privileged information in the course of its audits, investigations or proceedings, that information will remain protected from the government, parties adverse in interest to the client, and the public at large. The confidentiality on which the client and ultimately the broader public depend to ensure

 the due administration of justice is thereby preserved in conjunction with the important AML work that the Law Society undertakes.

Now, even stepping back from that, the Law Society also has a variety of other means by which it seeks to prevent lawyers from having any involvement in money laundering, and it's to that basket of broader work that I'll turn now.

So moving more broadly to what the Law Society does in terms of its AML work, and perhaps broader still to two of the questions that we expect the Commission may be addressing in the course of its work.

We expect that those are the following. Have regulators like the Law Society demonstrated commitment to AML efforts, and have the measures that they have taken been appropriate?

So for its part, the Law Society has been engaged with AML since at least the 1980s, with increasing AML involvement since the enactment of federal AML legislation in 2000. The Law Society's commitment is found at all levels of the organization.

The work of the Law Society has included the formulation and refinement of rules intended to limit the potential for lawyers to have any involvement in money laundering. It has undertaken this work partly in conjunction with other law societies in Canada, but it has also taken pioneering measures in its own right.

Of course, rules are not enough. They must also be known, respected and enforced. The Law Society fulfils very considerable auditing, investigative and enforcement functions; it imposes disciplinary measures where appropriate; it provides significant education and practice advice; and it collaborates with other entities including other regulators.

We expect the Law Society's work will be the subject of evidence and submissions going forward in the course of this inquiry. The work has been both intensive and wide-ranging. And so what I'll do now in the next few moments is simply to provide a summary of the general categories of work that have been undertaken.

One aspect of the Law Society of B.C.'s work has been rule-making and reform. Clear rules are

 important in setting out or confirming expectations for the legal profession, constraining certain activities that might increase the risk of lawyers knowingly or unknowingly having any involvement in money laundering, and providing both standards against which to measure conduct and a fair basis on which to impose disciplinary measures.

Now, as I've referred to, the Law Society Rules include a duty to withdraw from representation if "a lawyer knows or ought to know that he or she is or would be assisting a client in fraud or other illegal conduct." Further, again, the B.C. Code of Conduct provides that lawyers must not engage "in any activity that the lawyer knows or ought to know assists in or encourages any dishonesty, crime or fraud."

Now, those are broad prohibitions. The Law Society has also implemented and improved upon more specific restrictions that are intended to minimize the likelihood of any lawyer involvement in money laundering, including, firstly, the so-called "no cash rule," first put in place in 2004, which limits the amount of cash that a lawyer may accept from any one client and sets out how that cash is to be dealt with.

Second, client identification and verification rules, including in relation to obtaining information about the client's source of money. These rules are in keeping with a "lawyer's obligation to know his or her client, understand the client's financial dealings in relation to the retainer with the client and manage any risks arising from the professional business relationship with the client." Client Identification and Verification rules were first introduced in 2008 and have steadily been advanced.

A third example is the various rules regarding trust accounting and use, including a recent rule requiring that "[e]xcept as permitted by the [Legal Profession Act] or these rules or otherwise required by law, a lawyer or law firm must not permit funds to be paid into or withdrawn from a trust account unless the funds are directly related to legal services provided by the lawyer or law firm."

 The Law Society of B.C. has taken a leadership role among law societies in Canada, working with the Federation of Law Societies of Canada to coordinate development and implementation of AML rules throughout the country.

Now, another aspect of the Law Society's work in the AML context is associated with its Comprehensive Trust Assurance Program. Many of the law firms located in the province of course have trust accounts. Funds by necessity flow through these accounts as part of client transactions and litigation matters or retainers. The Law Society's Trust Assurance department reviews annual trust reports from every law firm in British Columbia; provides periodic compliance audits of all law firms; and provides education, advice and resources to help ensure that lawyers handle trust funds appropriately.

Traditionally the Law Society conducted audits of each law firm at least once every six years, but more recently it increased the frequency of regular audits to once every four years for firms that practise mainly in higher risk areas such as real estate or wills and estates. Both historically and today, the Law Society conducts audits even more frequently where concerns arise. Flags for more frequent audits include failure to file a trust report; information on a trust report that indicates noncompliance with the trust accounting rules and procedures; referral from other departments of the Law Society; and so on. The Law Society is also developing new tools for auditing complex files and larger firms, including the development of customized data analytics and artificial intelligence software.

Currently, five accountants engaged in trust account regulation at the Law Society have obtained certification from the Association of Certified Anti-Money Laundering Specialists with 11 more auditors expected to achieve this certification by spring 2020, so very shortly. Three staff are Certified Fraud Examiners. All trust assurance auditors and management have Chartered Professional Accountant designations. And the Law Society has increased its staffing

budget by more than 30 per cent for the Trust Assurance Department from 2015 to 2019.

A further aspect of the Law Society's AML work is in the form of rigorous investigations and enforcement. The Law Society has a Professional Regulation group responsible for investigations, monitoring and enforcement, as well as disciplinary proceedings.

Any person who believes that a lawyer or law firm has been guilty of professional misconduct, conduct unbecoming to the legal profession, or a breach of the Legal Profession Act or Law Society Rules may make a complaint to the Law Society. Complaints come from many sources, including the public, other lawyers, institutions or the courts. The Law Society also opens files on its own initiative when conduct concerns come to its attention, whether from media reports, court decisions, audits or mandatory self-reports from lawyers.

The Law Society has developed substantial in-house expertise to address alleged misconduct that may involve allegations of inappropriate financial transactions. Investigations are conducted by either experienced lawyers or a Chartered Professional Accountant or a Certified Fraud Examiner, or all of the above, with assistance from forensic accountants, forensic accounting analysts, an investigator who is a former officer of the RCMP, and paralegals as needed. Several of the Law Society's investigators and forensic accountants have achieved or are in the process of achieving designations as Certified Anti-money Laundering Specialists, and four forensic accounting staff as well as two investigations staff are Certified Fraud Examiners.

The Law Society has increased the investigations, monitoring and enforcement group, which investigates serious complaints, by over 30 percent from 2015 to 2019.

The Law Society's powers in terms of investigations are significant and include the ability, as I mentioned earlier, to require a person to attend to answer questions on oath or affirmation and produce records in their possession or control. The Law Society -- and I

 emphasize this -- does not shy away from using
its strongest investigative powers.

Lawyers have a duty to cooperate with Law Society investigations. This includes providing written responses to questions, producing books and records, and attending interviews. A lawyer must produce information to the Law Society regardless of a potential claim to privilege, given the protections in s. 88 of the Legal Profession Act.

In addition, the Law Society may obtain an order from the chair of its Discipline Committee to conduct a forensic audit of a lawyer's practice where there are reasonable grounds to believe that a discipline violation may have occurred. The order is normally obtained without notice to the lawyer to ensure that evidence is not tampered with or destroyed. With the order, the Law Society's forensic service providers may make a forensic image of the practice's computer hard drives and other electronic data used in the law practice, including cell phones.

The Law Society has the ability to act quickly when the public is at risk even during the investigation phase. If there are reasonable grounds to believe that extraordinary action is required to protect the public, the Law Society may bring interim proceedings seeking a suspension or the imposition of restrictions or conditions on the lawyer's practice. The lawyer may be requested to sign an interim undertaking that imposes restrictions or conditions on their practice, which would be publicly disclosed on the Lawyer Directory.

When an investigation establishes evidence of a discipline violation, a referral can be made to the Discipline Committee with a recommendation for a disciplinary response. If determined to be warranted after a hearing, disciplinary action may include a substantial fine, the imposition of conditions or limitations on the lawyer's practice, suspension from the practice of law, or disbarment. The Discipline Committee includes public representation in the form of an appointed bencher who is not a lawyer.

An additional element of the Law Society's AML work comes in the form of dedicated

 educational efforts. The Law Society educates lawyers on their AML obligations, and is increasing the delivery of AML content in the Law Society's Professional Legal Training Course for those about to enter the profession.

Law Society staff provide significant contributions to national-level educational initiatives, including through the Federation of Law Societies of Canada's Anti-Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing Working Group, which has put together publications that provide further guidance and risk advisories for lawyers in the AML context.

The Practice Advice department of the Law Society, with which many of us are familiar, provides education and resources relevant to AML. The practice advisors -- all of whom are lawyers -- provide one-on one advice. They assist lawyers who may have some concern about a client interaction or some area of the practice, including compliance with Client Identification and Verification rules or identifying red flags for money laundering. There is also a trust compliance auditor hotline which assists with similar inquiries.

The Trust Assurance department provides education and resources for lawyers and law firm staff as well, including a Trust Accounting course, handbook, and other materials.

Further, the Law Society publishes on its website Hearing Panel decisions where lawyers have been found to have committed professional misconduct or breached the Law Society Rules. Summaries are included in Benchers' Bulletins that are delivered to lawyers and linked to the involved lawyer's profile on the lawyer directory on the Law Society website.

Now, another important aspect of the Law Society's work is collaboration with government or other investigative agencies. Money laundering -- and this is a common theme of today -- affects every aspect of our society and its institutions, including financial institutions, law enforcement agencies and professional regulators. No single agency has the resources to effectively combat money laundering on its own, and different agencies have different

powers, strengths and forms of expertise.

The Law Society supports initiatives to elevate interagency collaboration, cooperation and, where appropriate, information sharing, and has been working toward increasing the level of activity on this front. It has developed relationships with such organizations as the B.C. Securities Commission, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, the Society of Notaries Public, and the Land Title Survey Authority, and has encouraged them to refer to the Law Society, for investigation, any concerns they may have or that may come to their attention about lawyer conduct. The RCMP has been invited to do the same.

The Law Society has also, together with other agencies, participated in discussions regarding AML and fraud-related trends, activities, typologies and red flags. The Law Society is part of *Project Athena*, which was touched on earlier, the private-public initiative dedicated to eradicating money laundering. It's also part of a new federal working group that has been touched on today as well, established by the federal Minister of Justice. And two of the Law Society's senior officials, including its Chief Finance Officer and Director of Trust Regulation and the person internally responsible for investigations and enforcement, have been part of that endeavour.

Now, I touched on earlier the constitutional and statutory framework that requires client rights to be protected in the AML process, and the means used in the context of the Law Society's investigations and disciplinary proceedings to do so. But beyond that, protocols have been developed among the Law Society, law enforcement, Crown counsel and the courts that deal with the search of a law office, which may allow law enforcement to access information while properly addressing solicitor-client privilege.

The Law Society Rules permit the Law Society to deliver information that may disclose a criminal offence to law enforcement agencies while properly addressing solicitor-client privilege. During an investigation, the Law Society encourages complainants and witnesses to

directly report their concerns about criminality, including on the part of a lawyer, to law enforcement.

And in the rare instances where it is clear that communications between a lawyer and a client are of themselves criminal or where those communications relate to obtaining advice with respect to facilitating a criminal enterprise, confidentiality protections either never applied or are lost.

Now, a further aspect of the Law Society's AML work relates to legislative reform. It's mindful of opportunities that may exist to reform legislation in ways that facilitate AML efforts by lawyers, by the Law Society as a regulator, and by other agencies. And one of those areas has been the increased transparency for ownership of property, which we've heard about earlier today and the Law Society strongly supports.

Now, the categories and examples of work that I have touched on are not exhaustive. The Law Society recognizes that money laundering is serious and evolving. It's alert to identifying possibilities for further AML work to be undertaken and for additional AML measures to be employed.

In addition -- and now I'm at paragraph 66 -- the need to uphold and protect the public interest in the administration of justice requires that the Law Society and the legal profession that it regulates maintain public confidence. The Law Society is committed in its efforts to inform the public and other agencies about its work, both to ensure public confidence and to find ways to collaborate.

And here I'll turn to the last batch of comments I have, which is about the opportunities that this Commission of Inquiry brings. The Law Society very much welcomes the opportunities that this Commission presents to examine and assess the nature of money laundering issues that face our province, to evaluate the AML work that's been done to date, and to build further bridges among the agencies that are deploying their resources and expertise to grapple with the problem.

Now, in terms of particular opportunities

 that the Law Society views as arising, firstly, it sees this as an important forum for the Commission, participants and witnesses to discuss and address money laundering and how it should be combatted. The Law Society welcomes the opportunity to work together on recommendations arising from the broad mandate set out in the Terms of Reference.

The Law Society takes particular note of, and applauds, the fact that the provincial government instituted this inquiry. While consideration of regulatory models and methods employed in other jurisdictions may be appropriate, constitutional and statutory imperatives highlight the importance of a "madein-Canada," and indeed to a certain extent a "made-in-B.C." approach to AML. We expect this to be a theme over the course of the Inquiry. The Commission is particularly well placed to understand the local and legal context and from there to find solutions that work well for those involved in AML efforts in this province in particular.

The Commission also provides a particularly important forum for encouraging collaboration rather than litigation. As the Federation of Law Societies case demonstrated, there is a risk that legislative measures imposed by a government may inadvertently produce consequences that are found to be unconstitutional. If legislative measures were imposed in future that seemed to threaten the public interest in the administration of justice, the Law Society and, we expect, other participants here may well need to return to the courts to ask the courts' view of whether those measures are constitutional. Litigation consumes considerably more time and resources and detracts from the AML work that needs to be done. more productive to address the underlying issues in a collaborative manner.

The Law Society sought, and was granted, a broad grant of standing in this inquiry, in part because the work of its more than 12,500 practising lawyers and the Law Society itself in regulating them touches on many of the areas identified in the Terms of Reference.

The Law Society sees its role in the

 Commission process as twofold. First, as providing a clear and accurate understanding of the Law Society's place in AML efforts, and the constitutional and statutory framework that it, and lawyers, operate within in relation to AML.

And second, beyond its direct role as regulator, providing the Commission with information and resources that the Law Society has gathered and brought to bear on this issue over the years.

The Law Society also appreciates the fact that the Commission will raise awareness of the money laundering risks and challenges that British Columbia is facing. Increased awareness helps all regulators be more effective. From the standpoint of the Law Society, it assists the Law Society by further raising the profile of the issue for lawyers, and by raising the profile of the issue for members of the public who may provide information for Law Society investigations.

In exploring the specialized resources, skills and responsibilities of the various organizations engaged in AML work, we expect as well that the Commission's process will reveal further avenues for cooperation and information sharing, as well as gaps that may exist. We continue to engage actively with other entities that share a common interest in AML work, and the Law Society welcomes suggestions on how to build on those efforts.

So in conclusion, the Law Society acknowledges that money laundering is a serious issue. It also acknowledges the importance of its participation in AML efforts compatible with its regulatory mandate and informed by the Federation of Law Societies case.

Successfully addressing money laundering will require a wide range of organizations to play a role commensurate with their mandates, their expertise, and the constitutional and statutory framework in which they operate. The framework includes recognition that the administration of justice obliges lawyers to maintain their clients' confidences and advance their clients' causes, especially when those causes may put their clients in conflict with the

state, subject of course to lawyers' duty not to have any involvement in any dishonesty, crime or fraud.

The Law Society commits to continue working collaboratively with other organizations and the Commission and to supporting the public inquiry process in order to advance the AML fight.

And subject to any questions, that is the Law Society's opening today.

THE COMMISSIONER: You will recall that I did ask Ms.

Hoffman about what appears to be an invitation,
or at least a comment made by Justice Cromwell in
the Federation case, about the prospect of
modifying the provisions of the Proceeds of Crime
(Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act to
have lawyers report but while protecting
solicitor-client privilege and derivative use.

And I'm just wondering -- I took it from your opening submissions that it's your view that legislation, even as suggested by the Supreme Court of Canada, is not necessarily the route to go?

MS. HERBST: I think at this stage that's correct.

Certainly there is ongoing collaboration with the Law Society and the federal government, and discussions may lead in various avenues and to various paths. But the one thing -- or several things I'd say on that. As I noted, legislation and crafting it to address the very serious issues that arise here is very difficult, and I think that was proven by the history leading to the Federation of Law Societies case.

And at this point, I think there are other and more beneficial ways to engage in collaboration than something that potentially raises the risk again of further litigation. So yes, from that perspective.

Time has also moved on in the sense that other forms of disclosure are now available. For example, the land owner transparency legislation, which is a very large step in terms of providing information directly, without lawyers as an intermediary, to people who are interested in money laundering efforts.

And so I would say certainly there's still discussion open and available, but there do seem to me better and more productive routes to the

42 43

44 45

46

47

Opening Statement by Ms. Smith B.C. Government & Service Employees' Union

```
1
            regulation that needs to take place.
 2
       THE COMMISSIONER: And I suppose the issue of public
 3
            confidence is one that the societies need to
 4
            address as well.
 5
       MS. HERBST:
                    Yes, absolutely.
 6
       THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Well, I mean -- thank
 7
                 As with Ms. Hoffman, I'm simply asking
 8
            these questions not to press you for an answer
 9
            right now, but simply to put it on the agenda for
10
            future consideration at the Commission.
11
       MS. HERBST: Absolutely. And we've proposed a witness
            panel, for example, and there will be ongoing
12
13
            discussion, I'm sure, that can flesh this out.
14
       THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
                                     Just one final
15
            question. Do you have any suggestions for the
16
            Commission as to what could most profitably be
17
            pursue by us as discrete topics? Or is that
18
            something that you'd like to think about?
19
       MS. HERBST:
                    In terms of particulars, I'd like to
20
            think about it and of course get back to
21
            Commission counsel, who have been very helpful in
22
            terms of engaging so far. But certainly -- and I
23
            realize these aren't particularly discrete
24
            topics, but from the standpoint of regulation, I
25
            think it is very much -- have regulators that are
26
            involved in the context of the Law Society.
27
            Law Society has shown commitment to this issue,
28
            and how have its measures measured up, if I could
29
            put it that way, against the goal of reducing
30
            money laundering in the sector in which it
31
            operates and perhaps more generally.
32
       THE COMMISSIONER:
                          Thank you.
33
       MS. HERBST: Thank you.
34
       THE COMMISSIONER:
                          Thank you, Ms. Herbst.
35
       MR. MCGOWAN: Mr. Commissioner, the next participant
36
            to present their opening is the British Columbia
37
            Government and Service Employees' Union.
38
            counsel, Mr. Mistry, is present but I understand
39
            he may depend on someone else to make the
40
            opening.
```

OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. SMITH (BCGEU):

THE COMMISSIONER:

MS. SMITH: Good afternoon, Commissioner Cullen. My name is Stephanie Smith. My pronouns are she and her. And I am president of the B.C. Government

Thank you, Mr. McGowan.

1 2 3

 and Service Employees' Union.

It is my honour to appear before you today on behalf of the more than 80,000 members of the BCGEU to make this submission on the traditional and unceded territory of the Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh peoples.

Before I begin, I want to thank the Commission for granting our union's application for standing and assure Commission counsel that I will be providing a written copy of this submission. I also want to thank the other participants for being part of this proceedings.

And I would like to quickly introduce the BCGEU staff who are here with me today: Jitesh Mistry, our general counsel, and in the gallery, Danielle Marchand, press secretary.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MS. SMITH: In my statement today, I will address three broad topics: why the BCGEU applied for standing, what our union plans to contribute to the Inquiry, and what outcomes and remedies we are hoping to see as a result of the Commission's work.

The BCGEU applied for standing as a continuation of our advocacy on behalf of our members whose lives have been impacted, altered and, in some cases, endangered by the criminal money laundering activity that is at the core of the Commission's mandate.

Several factors inspired our advocacy. The first factor is the make-up of our membership. The BCGEU is one of the largest, most diverse, and fastest growing unions in B.C. We represent more than 80,000 members who work in virtually every community in the province and almost every sector of the economy from public service to non-profit to private enterprise.

A few membership groups are particularly relevant to these proceedings and I would like to review them briefly. The BCGEU is the lead union for workers in the provincial public service. More than 30,000 of our members work in direct government and over 30,000 more in the broader public service, including in departments of the Ministry of the Attorney General and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing tasked with regulation, enforcement, and oversight of many of

 the sectors impacted by money laundering, like the Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch.

The BCGEU also represents workers in the financial services industry, who face potential risks related to organized crime groups attempting to move their laundered funds through legitimate banking institutions.

And the BCGEU is the lead union in B.C.'s gaming sector. Thousands of our members work in some of the most profitable casinos in B.C., including Metro Vancouver's River Rock, Hard Rock, Starlight, and Grand Villa casinos. From their positions in the cages, on the gaming floor, in food and beverage service, and security, they have seen, heard, and felt the impacts of money laundering.

Finally, the BCGEU represents workers whose work has thrust them to the frontlines of the overdose crisis, including our members in frontline community health, mental health and addictions, social services, court services, corrections, and even libraries.

I am spending time describing these membership groups because I want to emphasize for the Commission that, while it is true that money laundering has impacted every British Columbian in some way, BCGEU members have experienced unique impacts, including seeing their livelihoods and personal safety threatened by the criminal activity that has been allowed, possibly even encouraged, to flourish in B.C.'s gaming sector over the past decade and half; seeing the reputation of the sectors that they work in damaged by media coverage of money laundering; having the substantive nature of their work change as policies and regulations are being implemented to eliminate money laundering; and dealing with the serious safety risks and heavy emotional toll of the opioid crisis in their workplaces, families and communities.

For tens of thousands of BCGEU members, money laundering has been and continues to be a very real factor in their working lives as well as a real and present risk to their mental and physical health and safety. The BCGEU applied for standing to be the voice of those members in this inquiry.

 Before I move on to discussing our intended contributions and hoped-for outcomes, I want to address another critical factor in why we applied for standing and the unique nature of our union. Like all unions, one of the BCGEU's core objectives is to protect and empower our members and to improve their working lives through a rigorous and innovative approach to labour relations, including: collective bargaining, internal organizing and various other tools, techniques and tactics.

But, unlike some unions, the BCGEU has a broader objective. We are part of a progressive social justice movement that aims to create a more just and equitable society where all people have access to human rights, including the right to feel, and be, safe in their communities, homes, and workplaces and all people are treated with dignity, respect, and fairness.

Our targets for social justice advocacy are driven by our members through resolutions to our triennial policy conventions as well as through our intra-convention governance body, our provincial executive. Our advocacy takes the form of sophisticated multi-platform campaigns that aim to raise awareness, inspire action, shift discourse, and change policy.

Three of the advocacy campaigns we have undertaken over the last three years are of particular relevance to the Commission's mandate, and I will briefly review those campaigns and their relevance.

Our Affordable B.C. campaign, launched in November of 2017. Like all British Columbians, our members have struggled because of the housing crisis, whether they have found themselves unable the communities they work in or whether or whether they have found rental stock in their community unaffordable, unavailable or inaccessible. Our members in communities across the province told us that lack of safe, affordable housing was their biggest challenge. They wanted their union to step up and we did with the Affordable B.C. campaign.

The Affordable B.C. campaign consisted of:

⁻ Working with partners, including other

 unions, to identify, develop and lobby for policy options aimed to address various aspects of the crisis, including tax policy, land use zoning, renter protections, and real estate speculation, just to name a few;

- Reaching out to our members and the general public to hear their stories and discuss our policy proposals. This part of the campaign included a series of public forums on housing in some of B.C.'s hardest hit communities as well as a dedicated website to collect stories;
- Direct engagement with all levels of government including municipal, regional, and provincial to promote policy change;
- We also launched several online petitions to build public support for our plan and give us leverage to get our plan implemented.

The Affordable B.C. campaign is still active and has been successful. Our public forums were standing room only. Our petitions garnered tens of thousands of signatures, and the relationships we built with our partners remain strong and productive. And our policy proposals are having an impact. Nevertheless, as you know, and as our members keep telling us, the housing crisis persists.

In December of 2017, we launched a campaign focused on the fentanyl crisis that was, and still is, changing and ending lives across our province. The BCGEU's fentanyl campaign was driven by the tens of thousands of BCGEU members in mental health and addictions, community health, corrections, social work, sheriffs, and even public libraries, who were dealing with the fallout from the overdose crisis in their worksites and their communities.

Some had lost clients or co-workers to overdose. Some had witnessed and responded to overdoses in their workplaces. But all of them were desperate for support as they dealt with the impact of the crisis. And again their union

stepped up.

Our fentanyl campaign has two goals:

- Connect with our members to better understand the them and develop education, training, and other supports to help them deal with the impact of the crisis on their mental emotional and physical security in and outside of their workplace;

- and public advocacy to exert pressure on all levels of government to take whatever action they could to stop the crisis and mitigate its impact on people.

Like Affordable B.C., our fentanyl campaign is still active. It has been successful in that our members can now access resources, like education, training, and other supports. And we have seen our government and other organizations taking action. But, also, like Affordable B.C., the problem that inspired the fentanyl campaign has not been "solved." So, two campaigns, both successful in their way but both focused on issues that have not been solved, issues that continue to impact our members and all British Columbians.

Which brings me to the third campaign I want to discuss before moving on to our contributions and remedies. That's our Public Inquiry Now campaign, which was launched in December of 2018.

By that point there was mounting evidence indicating that the subjects of our two other campaigns -- housing affordability and fentanyl -- were linked to each other and that both were somehow linked to organized crime and money laundering. That evidence included leaked RCMP reports as well as the three reports commissioned by the provincial government from Dr. German and others.

In effect, Public Inquiry Now built on and merged Affordable BC and our fentanyl campaign to achieve one objective: pressure the provincial government to call a public inquiry into the links between the housing affordability crisis, the overdose crisis, and criminal money laundering in casinos.

 We knew what we had learned through our campaigns. We knew what the government and the police had learned through research and reports. And we knew there was a link. And we knew that a public inquiry was the only way to achieve three goals:

- Get to the truth of how these issues are linked and how we got to this place of crisis;
- Hold those responsible accountable for their actions and inactions;
- Reverse the damage that can be reversed and protect British Columbians from anything like this ever happening again.

In launching Public Inquiry Now, the BCGEU became one of the first voices in civil society to call for a public inquiry. And with our participation in the Inquiry we hope to continue to advance the goals of that campaign.

I will now move on to discuss our participation in the Inquiry specifically: what we plan to contribute to the proceedings; and what outcomes and remedies we are hoping to see from the Commission.

I want to take a moment to acknowledge that the BCGEU applauds and supports the work done by our current provincial government, including the Finance Minister and the Attorney General, as well as the contributions of Dr. Peter German and others in investigating money laundering in B.C. After years of inaction, the measured approach to fact-finding, research and data analysis over the past three years has built a strong foundation of knowledge about key factors, like the actions and inactions of previous governments and other decision makers and the gaps and deficiencies of the historic and current regulatory, investigatory and enforcement regimes that have been exploited for too long.

But none of the work undertaken to date grapples with the questions of accountability, fault-finding, and remedies. It is those questions the BCGEU is asking the Commission to

Opening Statement by Ms. Smith B.C. Government & Service Employees' Union

grapple with.

In addition to the Commission's broad mandate to investigate the scale, scope, impacts, causes, and solutions to money laundering, the BCGEU would like to see the Commission address some additional issues we believe will be critical to our province's ability to move forward from this crisis.

One, improved working conditions in the gaming sector. Published reports and communication with BCGEU members suggest that criminal activity has been a known problem in B.C. casinos since the late 1990s. Workers in some casinos have faced a visible organized crime presence in their workplaces for more than two decades. Some have dealt with harassment and intimidation from known criminals and/or associated VIP gamblers.

All too often, casino management has turned a blind eye to these issues, or in some cases even enabled them, in order to maintain and grow their business.

I want to be clear that BCGEU firmly supports the gaming sector --

(BACKGROUND NOISE)

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm just going to ask you to wait for a moment. Yes, thank you.

MS. SMITH: Thank you. I do want to be clear that the BCGEU firmly supports the gaming sector, especially for its vital role in funding the public services that families and communities across our province rely on every day. And for that reason, we would like to see the Commission investigate and make recommendations related to regulatory and institutional reform in the gaming sector, with the health and safety of workers as a central consideration

Key avenues include enabling and protecting whistleblowers. The German report makes limited recommendations regarding measures to encourage and protect whistleblowing by VIP gaming room employees. But there is little else in the recommendations from the Commission's mandate reports regarding mechanisms, processes, and protections to encourage whistleblowing by

workers in the wider gaming sector or in other workplaces where money laundering or related illegal activities could either occur or be detected in the course of regulatory and enforcement activities. Accounts from the Commission's mandate reports, the media, and our union's communications with members suggest that efforts by workers to blow the whistle on illegal activity in the gaming sector have been blocked by managers and even elected officials, with whistleblowers facing sanctions up to and including dismissal for speaking up.

The BCGEU acknowledges that the *Public*Interest Disclosure Act, our province's recently enacted whistleblower legislation, offers some protection for some workers in some circumstances, particularly those in public sector employment. However, the legislation falls well short of best practices internationally, and would not have enabled or protected attempts at whistleblowing around money laundering in the gaming sector.

For example, former casino worker Muriel Labine, whose case I will discuss briefly later in this submission, would not have access to whistleblower protection even if she was bringing forward her concerns about money laundering and loan sharking today, with the legislation in place, rather than in the late 1990s, when she bravely attempted to speak up.

Based on these considerations, the BCGEU asks the Commission to make recommendations to expand and strengthen whistleblower legislation, protections and processes, including:

- Extending whistleblower legislation and protection to employees in the private sector, as has already happened in Australia and several other jurisdictions;
- Expanding legal protections to whistleblowers who use the media as a channel for whistleblowing activity; and,
- Establishing a formal regime to support whistleblowing in high-risk sectors, such as the gaming sector, real estate, financial

services, and luxury car sales.

B. Increasing resources to expand public sector-led enforcement and compliance in vulnerable sectors. Scaling-up regulation, enforcement, and compliance is implicit in many recommendations of the Commission's mandate reports. The BCGEU supports these recommendations and believes that the Commission must directly address the need for more resources to carry out this work.

The existing Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch, for example, is allocated around \$14 million annually to oversee a multi-billion-dollar gaming industry that is extraordinarily vulnerable to organized crime. Findings in the Commission's mandate reports suggest that regulatory and enforcement bodies in real estate, financial services, and luxury automobile sectors may be similarly under-resourced.

Whatever regulatory, compliance, and enforcement regimes are eventually recommended by this Commission, it will be crucial that they are accountable to the public, rather than to the industries they regulate, and that they have the resources and funding they need to effectively carry out their mandate.

The BCGEU also asks the Commission to recommend that funding for increased regulation and enforcement come from licensing fees and taxation of higher-risk sectors, including gaming, real estate, financial services and luxury automobiles.

C. Eliminating the source of laundered funds by addressing the connection between money laundering and the opioid crisis. As I discussed earlier in my statement, the impact of the opioid crisis has been a key driver of the BCGEU's participation in this inquiry. While money laundering is an important issue and a critical risk to our province, we believe it is crucial that the Commission address the fact that the money being laundered is revenue from the drug trade, a trade that is at the root of a public health crisis that has already cost thousands of lives in B.C. and across Canada.

The BCGEU believes that the location chosen

to launder the proceeds of crime -- whether it be casinos, real estate, luxury goods or something else -- is only the tip of the iceberg and that the source of the funds must be addressed.

Again, I want to acknowledge the actions already taken by our current government in relation to the opioid crisis, including implementing harm reduction programs that save lives and launching a class action lawsuit to recover the costs of the crisis from opioid manufacturers.

These are valuable and impactful measures. But as Dr. German pointed out, criminals need to launder money and they will find the ways and means to get that done. Recent reports suggest that it is already happening and that our province and others have vulnerabilities in areas like international student fees.

On this basis, the BCGEU asks that the Commission hear evidence and take reports on all aspects of the opioid crisis in this province, including identifying individuals and organizations -- criminal and otherwise -- implicated in and profiting from the crisis. The Commission should direct particular attention to organizations and individuals involved in the production, importation and distribution of synthetic opioids, such as fentanyl and carfentanil.

Based on that work, the BCGEU asks the Commission to make recommendations aimed at addressing all aspects of the opioid crisis, including:

- Potential law enforcement measures to disrupt the criminal organizations supplying opioids;

- Expanded harm reduction measures to reduce deaths and improve outcomes for individuals living with substance use disorders;

- Better protections and protocols for workers who are prescribed opioids after being injured on the job; and

- Improved social service supports and

1

4 5

6

11 12

13 14 15

16

26 27 28

30 31 32

33

34

35

36

29

37 38 39

40 41

42 43 44

45 46 47 treatment options to reduce opioid demand and promote public health.

Investigating the possibility of undue influence on municipal, provincial and federal officials to affect public policy decisions that could have prevented or disrupted the escalation of money laundering or the opioid crisis.

The sheer scale and scope of criminal activity outlined in the mandate reports, leaked RCMP reports, and media accounts suggests the possibility must be explored and the BCGEU believes that exploration should be undertaken by the Commission.

As part of that exploration, the Commission should scrutinize the policy, regulatory, and enforcement decisions that enabled money laundering in high-risk sectors to develop and escalate despite multiple warnings from experts in law enforcement, regulatory bodies, and the gaming sector. What actions were taken or not Which decision makers knew or ought to have known the potential harm of those actions and inactions?

In particular, and at a minimum, we believe the Commission should investigate:

- Published allegations that senior management in the B.C. casino sector knowingly ignored warnings of suspicious activity in B.C. casinos.
- Decisions within the Ministry of Attorney General in 2013 to ignore internal reports warning of large-scale money laundering in the gaming sector, and the subsequent decision in 2014 to fire, without cause, the GPEB employee who brought these warnings forward.
- The provincial government's 2009 decision to disband the RCMP's B.C. Integrated Illegal Gambling Enforcement Team after that team had documented significant money laundering and warned that an organized crime associate had been allowed to buy part of a B.C. casino.

- Allegations of willful blindness by BCLC executives regarding money laundering and other suspicious activity in the B.C. gaming sector.
- The relationships between private gambling operators and elected officials, including lobbying activity related to gaming policy and political donations to elected decision makers at the provincial and municipal levels.
- E. Actions to eliminate the impact of money laundering on housing prices.

The research underpinning our Affordable B.C. campaign clearly demonstrated what many decision makers also know: speculative investment in real estate has made our province one of the most expensive places in the world to live, particularly in the Metro Vancouver area.

Fewer working people are able to find appropriate, safe, affordable housing to buy or rent that meets their needs. Homelessness is more widespread and increasingly severe. And while various factors have contributed to the housing crisis, the most troubling underlying cause is that housing has come to be seen primarily as a lucrative investment opportunity rather than a basic human need.

Evidence points to a multi-billion-dollar portion of this speculative investment being connected to money laundering, including efforts to hide illegally transferred offshore money and operations to launder money from drug trafficking and other organized criminal activity.

Because of the lack of regulation, B.C.'s real estate market, not unlike casinos, offers a rare opportunity for criminals to launder the proceeds of crime while also growing their money.

Again, I want to acknowledge that our current government has done extensive work to mitigate the impacts of the housing crisis through policy, regulatory, and legislative changes, and the BCGEU applauds and supports these efforts. However, we believe that the link between the housing crisis and the money

5 6

13 14 15

12

25

32 33 34

35

36

30

31

37 38 39

40 41 42

43

laundering is one that the Commission must investigate further.

Specific areas of inquiry for the Commission include the extent to which regulators and other decision makers in the real estate and development industry, as well as elected leaders and government, were aware of this problem and why more was not done to combat it.

We ask the Commission to investigate the scale, scope, and impacts of money laundering on housing affordability in our province and make recommendation on further measures to remediate those impacts and ensure that safe, stable, affordable housing is available and accessible to working people in our province.

I have discussed at length why the BCGEU is participating in this inquiry and the outcomes and remedies we hope to see from the Commission's I want to close my submission by outlining work. what the BCGEU intends to contribute to the Commission's work through this inquiry process.

Our key and critical contribution will be the stories of our members and staff, including, one, the perspective of frontline workers who witnessed the genesis of money laundering and organized crime in casinos.

For instance, Muriel Labine, a former member and staff person with the BCGEU. Ms. Labine's experiences attempting to speak up about what she saw and protect herself and her family and her coworkers from what was happening illustrate how criminal activity took hold of our province's gaming sector and offer instructive lessons for other high-risk sectors.

The BCGEU is working with Ms. Labine to fully consolidate her evidence for submission to the Commission, but I would like to briefly highlight some of her experiences here as part of my submission.

Ms. Labine worked in casinos as a dealer, supervisor and hostess from 1992 to 2000 and documented the influx of organized crime, loan sharking, and probable money laundering into her workplace starting in the late 1990s.

Soon after baccarat betting limits were increased from \$25 to \$500 per hand in 1997, Ms. Labine noticed what seemed to be loan sharking

Opening Statement by Ms. Smith B.C. Government & Service Employees' Union

activity on the gaming floor. Higher stakes, high-turnover games brought in more VIP gamblers and a dramatic increase in cash flow, with thousands of dollars being played in a single five-minute game.

Men she learned had gang affiliations would bring clients and sit with them at the tables, passing players casino chips and bundles of \$20 bills.

Loan sharks soon became a fixture in her casino, working up to 12 hours per day, with dozens of loan sharks on the casino floors at once. Their presence was so ubiquitous that staff came to know their faces and street names.

Over time, in addition to loan sharking, Ms. Labine and her coworkers noticed known gang members engaging in activity typically associated with money laundering such as exchanging large sums of \$20 bills for \$100 bills and buying casino chips to cash in without playing.

Eventually, and perhaps inevitably, incidents of serious violence involving loan sharks became known and staff became acutely concerned for their own safety.

Most notably, one lower-level loan shark who was a regular in Ms. Labine's workplace was shot in a public place by another regular loan shark from the casino. The shooter was later named an associate of the Big Circle Boys gang.

As casino workers became more alarmed about the increasingly obvious presence of organized crime in their workplace, Ms. Labine approached casino managers with her concerns. Management refused to act on her information, dismissing what Ms. Labine and her coworkers knew to be obvious loan sharking activity as "just friends loaning money to friends."

Publicly, management denied any organized crime presence in the casinos, but Ms. Labine continued to notice and record instances of management awareness of and even communication with organized crime figures.

In one incident, Ms. Labine noted having seen a casino vice-president shaking hands with and engaging in long conversations with a man eventually identified as a Big Circle Boys kingpin, top casino loan shark, and a violent

Opening Statement by Ms. Smith B.C. Government & Service Employees' Union

drug trafficker.

In another incident, higher management prevented the removal from the casino of a gang associated VIP gambler who had threatened female staff.

In addition to keeping a detailed journal, Ms. Labine began working with the BCGEU on a unionization drive in the hope of securing a safer, gang-free workplace for herself and her co-workers. Our union worked very hard on that campaign but, ultimately, we lost. And, because of her union activity, Ms. Labine was fired.

Though Ms. Labine went on to work as an organizer for the BCGEU with a passion and talent for the casino sector, casino employers barred her from the floor of most Lower Mainland casinos in an effort to stop their employees from seeking the protection of a union.

Though Ms. Labine was unable to directly observe suspicious activity in casinos, she was well known and well connected in the sector and continued to hear reports of problems from other workers.

Ms. Labine is just one casino worker and her story is just one story. Our union is actively engaged in reaching out to our members with experience in the casino sector as well as the other key sectors I mentioned earlier to collect their stories of how the situation we now face was allowed to happen.

We are making every effort to encourage our members to share their stories with the Commission while also ensuring they feel safe, and are in fact safe, from repercussions in their workplace and elsewhere. We will continue our efforts throughout these proceedings.

We will also offer the perspective of frontline workers tasked with implementing the new anti-money laundering regime in the casino sector regarding the weaknesses of that regime.

Since taking office in 2017 and based on the recommendations of the German reports and others, the current provincial government has begun to take action to mitigate the impacts of money laundering in high risk sectors. And while the BCGEU applauds the efforts in this regard, according to our members the early days of

9

10

16

26

33 34 35

36

31 32

37 38 39

41 42 43

40

44 45 46

47

implementation have had mixed results.

B.C. Government & Service Employees' Union

We intend to bring forward the experiences of BCGEU members currently working on the frontlines in the casino sector who tell us of ongoing problems with measures introduced to stem money laundering, including ineffective procedures that download monitoring, tracking, and enforcement onto floor-level employees, rather than the development of a comprehensive system to accurately monitor transactions.

These procedures make it difficult to accurately track patrons' cumulative transactions across multiple games and tables, opening the door to evasion of anti-money laundering measures that only come into effect once a certain threshold is reached. This decentralized approach to tracking and monitoring makes it difficult for employees to catch suspicious activity but increases their workload and opens them up to potential discipline if casino management or regulators judge that the forms have not been completed properly.

In addition, many casino workers report a lack of proper training on the completion of forms which are meant to capture suspicious activity, and fears of discipline in cases where they unwittingly fill out the forms incorrectly.

In some cases, anti-money laundering related duties that had previously been done by management are now being downloaded onto frontline staff. The persistence of a management culture that encourages employees to appease and enable VIP gamblers and to keep them playing, even in the face of problematic activity and behaviour.

Our members report that, in many cases, management are simply going through the motions of compliance with AML measures but making clear to employees that these are unwanted requirements that the employer then blames on regulators or in some cases the employees' union.

By bringing forward the experiences and evidence of our members, we hope to inform the Commission's work, addressing two of the three questions that inspired the BCGEU to launch our Public Inquiry Now campaign: How did we get where we are? What can we do to remediate the

Opening Statement by Mr. Smart B.C. Lottery Corporation

damage, and make sure nothing like this happens in other sectors?

It is our sincere hope that the Commission

It is our sincere hope that the Commission's work will also address the other questions that formed the foundation of that campaign: Who was responsible and how will they be held accountable?

With that, I would like to thank the Commission for the opportunity to make this statement on behalf of the 80,000 plus members of the BCGEU. I look forward to contributing to the work of the Commission over the coming weeks and months. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Smith.
I think what we will do now is take the break for
15 minutes. So we will resume shortly before
three o'clock. Thank you.

THE REGISTRAR: Order. The hearing will recess for 15 minutes.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED FOR AFTERNOON RECESS) (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED)

THE REGISTRAR: All rise. The hearing will resume. THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr. Smart.

MR. SMART: Mr. Commissioner. I have Ms. Ramsay beside me in case you ask questions. THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. SMART (B.C. Lottery CORPORATION):

 MR. SMART: Like the other participants, the British Columbia Lottery Corporation is pleased to be able to participate in this public inquiry and to assist -- hopefully assist -- the Inquiry to fulfil its mandate. We prepared our written opening before having the opportunity to review the province's opening, so there is some repetition from what you've heard from Ms. Hughes this morning.

As you heard from her, gaming in British Columbia is authorized by the provincial *Gaming Control Act*. It's a highly regulated industry that must be conducted by the provincial government within the confines of the federal *Criminal Code*. BCLC, as a Crown agent, is

statutorily mandated to conduct and manage gaming on behalf of the provincial government. That's its role. And it does so within the policy framework established by the Province, and within a regulatory scheme that includes oversight by the Gaming Policy and Enforcement Branch, GPEB, which you heard about this morning, and it's a body that is independent from BCLC. BCLC is not a regulator. They're not a service provider. They have a different role.

As the hearing of this inquiry is still many months away, we intend to be relatively brief in our opening statement. But there are five main points we wish to make at this point in time.

The first is there is a crucial distinction between two important but separate roles in countering potential money laundering in the gaming industry. The first is the responsibility for identifying and reporting specific transactions to the federal government's financial intelligence unit, FINTRAC, which you heard about this morning. And this first responsibility of identifying and reporting specific transactions to FINTRAC also includes identifying and reporting certain conduct to GPEB.

Now, the second role dealing with money laundering is the responsibility for the enforcement of anti-money laundering laws. BCLC wants to emphasize in its opening that it is BCLC's responsibility to identify and report and it is the responsibility of regulators and the police to enforce. And so this distinction between identifying and reporting, which is BCLC'S responsibility, and enforcement, which is the responsibility of regulators and the police, is central in understanding BCLC's efforts to prevent money laundering in its casinos.

While BCLC collaborates with and supports regulators and police, they -- that is the police and regulators -- are ultimately the ones with the authority to detect, investigate, and seek charges against anyone suspected to be involved in money laundering and other criminal activities.

The second main point we want to emphasize in our opening is that BCLC believes that it has

implemented effective measures to control or prevent money laundering in or associated with casinos in this province. To go back to the last speaker, much has changed in the last 20 years in terms of gaming in this province.

The cooperation and assistance of those responsible for enforcing anti-money laundering laws -- I say the police and regulators -- have been an important element of BCLC's ability to implement these preventative measures.

The third main point in our opening that I want to emphasize is that BCLC believes that much of what has been said publicly about its responsibility for money laundering associated with casinos is misinformed, and BCLC welcomes this opportunity to provide to the Commission, and to the public, with a more complete and accurate factual record of BCLC's past efforts to combat money laundering and its continuing efforts to do so.

The fourth main point in our opening is that while BCLC has adopted a number of the recommendations from Dr. Peter German's 2018 gaming industry report, BCLC submits, with deference to Dr. German, that his analysis contains some inaccuracies concerning BCLC's role in confronting money laundering and, again with deference, it does not fairly or adequately state what BCLC has done to address the problem. may be due to the fact that Dr. German sought only minimal input from key people at BCLC when preparing his report. That may be the result of time constraints placed on him to complete his report, but BCLC again welcomes the opportunity to address what it perceives to be inaccuracies in Dr. German's report.

And finally, the fifth main point BCLC wants to emphasize in its opening remarks to you is that there is a significant public benefit that accrues from legalized gaming in British Columbia, and we encourage the Commission to recognize and consider this public benefit as it addresses the issue before it. In other words, when the Commission makes its recommendations, we urge caution be exercised so as to not unnecessarily diminish the significant public benefit that accrues to British Columbians from

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

gaming.

I'll just expand upon three of these points before offering some more general observations on behalf of BCLC.

First, coming back again to the division of roles and responsibilities with respect to money laundering. As we've stated, when considering the subject of money laundering it is important to recognize this distinction between these two important but separate roles in countering money laundering within the gaming industry. As we've said, the responsibility for identifying and reporting specific transactions to FINTRAC and certain conduct to GPEB, and second being the responsibility for the enforcement of anti-money laundering roles. Under this division, BCLC's responsibility, it has a reporting role, not an enforcement role. Its responsibility is to identify and report certain transactions to FINTRAC, including suspicious transactions.

And we've emphasized that, that is, BCLC's role as a reporting entity because it informed -- it informed how BCLC initially assessed and responded to increasing amounts of cash entering British Columbia casinos. And you'll hear more about that, I expect, in the course of hearings in the fall. BCLC has always consistently sought to comply with and meet its obligation to report these transactions to the appropriate entities, and it has actively taken steps to encourage and support law enforcement in the performance of its role of enforcement.

While BCLC has been diligent in its efforts to identify and report suspicious transactions to FINTRAC, its mandate and authority does not include criminal or regulatory investigation powers in relation to such transactions. that reason, BCLC also reports all suspicious transactions to GPEB and to the RCMP for their further consideration. These are the entities with the mandate and authority to conduct criminal or regulatory investigations related to such transactions and to take enforcement action when they deem appropriate. And of course, as you know, it's Crown counsel in British Columbia that has the authority to decide whether or not criminal charges will be laid.

46 47

The second main point I want to amplify is BCLC's anti-money laundering program, that we submit is effective. Anti-money laundering is a priority for BCLC, and it invests substantial resources to continuously monitor and improve its AML programming. Here are just some of the steps that BCLC has taken since 2012 to confront potential money laundering in this province in the casinos. These efforts are summarized on BCLC's website for members of the public to review. And again, I anticipate you will hear more about them from BCLC investigators when you hear evidence in the fall.

In 2012, BCLC implemented policy changes to enable British Columbia casinos to offer Patron Gaming Fund accounts. This allows players to transfer money from their bank accounts into a separate gaming account, eliminating the need to bring cash into a casino and creating, importantly, a traceable source of funds.

In 2013, BCLC established a dedicated antimoney laundering unit. This unit was expanded in 2012 and is staffed with internationally certified AML investigators and certified intelligence analysts.

In 2014, it established an Information Sharing Agreement with the RCMP to assist BCLC in identifying and banning certain individuals from casinos, such as those who are suspected of criminal activity, believed to constitute a public safety risk, or suspected members of organized crime groups. Since the establishment of this Information Sharing Agreement with the RCMP in 2014, BCLC has leveraged information obtained through the agreement to ban more than 450 individuals from casinos across British Columbia.

Another step is that BCLC requires and supports anti-money laundering training for all BCLC staff and all service provider staff in casinos -- and of course, service providers are the casino operators -- so that employees know how to identify, report, and help prevent potential money laundering.

Another step BCLC has taken is to require casinos to clearly label all cheques it issues to customers as "return of funds -- not game

 winnings" or as "certified win" cheques, right on the cheques, to prevent individuals from buying in with large amounts of cash, playing nominally, cashing out, and then receiving a generic casino cheque. Thus clearly labelling the source of cheques reduces the risk of casino cheques being used to launder money. Unlike cash, cheques provide regulatory and law enforcement agencies with the ability to trace funds for investigative purposes.

In late 2014, BCLC began placing certain players on sourced-cash conditions, meaning that they cannot buy in -- that is, purchase chips to gamble -- with any amount of cash unless they can prove their funds were sourced from an approved financial institution or constitute confirmed prior winnings from a BCLC gaming facility.

Another step was in 2018, BCLC implemented a receipting policy whereby anyone who attempts to buy in with \$10,000 or more in cash -- an amount recommended by Dr. German -- is required to first prove the source of such funds. This is an even more stringent requirement than Dr. German's interim recommendation that source of funds declarations be required. In addition, casinos have the discretion to ask anyone to provide the source of their funds, regardless of the amount.

BCLC has also in place a Know Your Customer process, which includes using various intelligence tools and methods to better understand its customers and their financial dealings and to assist in identifying any potential risk.

Finally, BCLC continues to work with the provincial government on the recommendations made in Dr. Peter German's 2018 report.

Now, the third area from our five main points we wanted to emphasize at the beginning is the public benefits from legalized gaming in British Columbia. As you heard from Ms. Hughes, millions of dollars of revenue flow from gaming to the government of this province every year to be used for the benefit of British Columbians. This totalled \$1.4 billion in the 2018/2019 fiscal year. The public benefit to be gained from gaming funds is one of the reasons why, in the late 1990s, the government of the day

 expanded gaming in this province and permitted the introduction of slot machines in casinos.

Gaming funds, like all government revenues, support a variety of important community and infrastructure programs. Additionally, the provincial government earmarks some gaming funds specifically for charitable, sports, and arts organizations, and it shares a percentage of casino revenue directly with local governments that host casinos. Thus, local governments, in turn, use the money to benefit their communities. The reach of these funds is significant and should not be understated, as emphasized a short while ago by counsel for the BCGEU.

So it is in the public interest to keep gaming revenue from local facilities that are operated in a socially responsible manner, rather than sending British Columbia residents and non-residents alike elsewhere for their gaming entertainment, which was what happened a few decades ago.

Accordingly, we respectfully urge the Commission to recognize and consider the important public benefits that flow from responsible gaming in this province as you address the issue of money laundering in the gaming industry.

Now, having said that, the importance of public revenue, BCLC's focus has never been intended to be at the expense of sustainable gaming conducted in a socially responsible manner. BCLC takes its responsibility to enhance the positive social benefits of gaming while minimizing the potentially negative aspects or consequences.

And money laundering is contrary to BCLC's mission, vision, and values, and has no place in gaming in this province. That is why BCLC has invested significant resources and efforts into its anti-money laundering unit, and continues to do so today.

I'll close by making a few general observations. BCLC observes, as you've heard this morning, that tackling money laundering associated with the gaming sector, and more generally in society, is a complex issue because it is an international problem involving

sophisticated organized crime with global reach. As was said some years ago by the Attorney General of Great Britain: "Crime has become as global as banking." And that can be said today about money laundering in particular.

You heard from Ms. Hoffman this morning on

You heard from Ms. Hoffman this morning on behalf of Canada of the extensive efforts that the federal government has undertaken nationally and internationally to deal with global crime and money laundering.

BCLC suggests that money laundering in this province is not an industry-specific problem that can be resolved with only industry-specific solutions. It requires broader solutions, because eliminating money laundering associated with any one sector does not address the underlying cause of the problem; it simply moves it elsewhere. That is why, we submit, a holistic, cross-sector, and cross-jurisdictional approach is required.

Similarly, prevention of money laundering cannot be the responsibility of one entity alone. It requires a coordinated effort among all entities who play a role, who have a responsibility in monitoring, investigating, and taking action against potential criminal activity, from those responsible for monitoring and reporting, such as BCLC, to those responsible for enforcement, such as regulators, police and, ultimately, Crown counsel.

It is also, as you've heard earlier today, essential that the solutions to money laundering remain flexible, so that money laundering efforts can adapt quickly and effectively to the evolving money laundering efforts of organized crime. This requires adopting a risk-based approach and avoiding prescriptive rules that criminals will quickly learn and develop ways to work around.

So BCLC welcomes the opportunity this inquiry presents for an objective and thorough review of the extent, growth, evolution and methods of money laundering in this province. We know much more today about money laundering and the methods and means by which it occurs than we did even a decade ago. This enhanced knowledge and awareness applies not just to the gaming industry but also to other sectors in our

 estate, and the legal and accounting professions.
What struck me today listening to the

society, including financial institutions, real

What struck me today listening to the thorough and helpful opening submissions by Ms. Hughes and Ms. Hoffman, besides the number of acronyms we're going to have to deal with in this hearing, were the significant efforts made in recent years -- and I emphasize recent years -- through various organizations, working groups, national and international, and through new legislation to deal with money laundering in particular and international crime in general.

I highlight the relative recency of these efforts because it highlights that our understanding of the extent of money laundering and the methods by which it occurs has evolved over time. We're much more knowledgeable today than we were some years ago. And so we suggest that caution should be exercised by the Commission when you assess past events and past responses to money laundering through the lens of what we know today about money laundering. As often said, hindsight is always 20/20.

And finally, BCLC acknowledges and appreciates the efforts the Commission has taken to date to speak with BCLC employees and learn about BCLC's anti-money laundering efforts. To that end, BCLC will continue to cooperate with Commission counsel in providing witnesses, documents, and other information as required.

And we look forward to the Commissioner, with the assistance of his capable counsel, developing meaningful and effective recommendations that will enhance the ability of all relevant parties to address money laundering and the associated criminality in this province.

And while BCLC appreciates the Commission's intention to meet what I'll call the tight deadlines established under the Terms of Reference -- and BCLC also seeks a timely resolution of this process -- it is confident that endeavouring to meet these ambitious deadlines, that that will not come at the expense of investing the time and attention needed to thoroughly understand and address the complexities of the topic before the Commission.

Those are our submissions. Thank you.

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Smart.
2 MR. SMART: Before I sit down, I quess I

MR. SMART: Before I sit down, I guess I'd better wait.

THE COMMISSIONER: And Ms. Ramsay.

MR. SMART: Yes. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR. SKWAROK: Great Canadian filed its opening statement before the other presenters today. I'll do my best not to be duplicative.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR. SKWAROK: But I can't guarantee that I'll be successful.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. SKWAROK (GREAT CANADIAN GAMING CORPORATION):

MR. SKWAROK: Great Canadian submits that the Commission's analysis of money laundering in British Columbia should be viewed in two different contexts.

First, the context of how the gaming industry and AML regime has evolved over time, and why. Second, in the context of the company's limited powers, duties and obligations in that regime.

Great Canadian anticipates that the evidence presented to this Commission will demonstrate that many public criticisms that have been made about its conduct and actions are factually unfounded or have been overly critical. The company has achieved a very high standard of compliance with AML requirements and, in many cases, has exceeded those requirements.

Great Canadian is a B.C. corporation with operating subsidiaries in Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and has a 40-year history in British Columbia. It was the first gaming operator in B.C. and is now the largest gaming service provider in Canada.

Over the past years, significant concerns have been raised about the risks of having substantial amounts of cash entering into casinos. It is submitted that the adequacy of the steps taken to address money laundering concerns should be assessed by considering the evolution of gaming and not judged with the benefit of hindsight.

 Gaming in B.C. has always been predominantly a cash business and still is. No credit is offered. Cash is brought in by patrons or withdrawn from cash machines. Great Canadian has always been alert to potential money laundering concerns and complied with the various AML requirements.

However, in recent years there has been an increasing recognition of potential risks of money laundering. These changes in the perception of risk coincided with a period of very rapid growth in the industry, more gaming offerings, and especially increased betting limits, which went up to \$100,000 per hand in 2014. These changes led to more money coming into casinos. However, in a cash-based business, bringing in large amounts of cash into a casino is not in and of itself an unusual event. There are patrons who may win or lose large amounts, so large cash buy-ins, without more, do not raise concerns about possible money laundering.

There was no single crystallizing event that led to the increased recognition of potential risks of money laundering. A number of such events will be considered during the evidentiary part of the hearing. However, the increase in cash buy-ins clearly was a notable factor.

As these concerns about potential money laundering evolved, they were answered in the forms of new rules and practices. It is submitted that these developments and the context in which they arose are important to keep in mind when reviewing the adequacy of those responses.

I'll just briefly outline the regulatory regime that Great Canadian finds itself in.
Gaming is one of the most, if not the most, regulated industries in this country. As Dr. German highlighted in his report, there is arguably a greater emphasis placed on compliance in the casino industry than in virtually any other financial industry. As he noted, Great Canadian is subject to a "dizzying array of regulations and policies."

In B.C., Great Canadian is regulated by GPEB and must abide by their policies and directives, as well of those of the British Columbia Lottery Corporation. And, since the company is licensed

to provide operational services in other provinces, the company must comply with gaming regulatory requirements in four different jurisdictions.

Great Canadian is also a publicly-traded

Great Canadian is also a publicly-traded company, which means it's required to comply with all of the requirements of the Toronto Stock Exchange and the provincial securities commissions.

One of the consequences of being so highly regulated is that Great Canadian's commitment to the integrity of gaming is the paramount priority for the company. If any of these regulators determined that Great Canadian is not living up to the standards that have been set, Great Canadian would be unable to operate.

Just to be clear, compliance with AML requirements is not just a good thing to do for Great Canadian. It's a fundamentally critical thing, precondition, to its continued existence.

Given the regulatory environment, it is not surprising that Great Canadian spends millions of dollars annually on compliance and has overseers of the highest seniority in the company.

Now, the success of the AML regime in B.C. is dependent on each of five distinct entities doing their job and fulfilling their responsibilities. They are the police, FINTRAC, GPEB, BCLC, and service providers. If any one of these organizations doesn't do their job, the whole system collapses.

The police, of course, are responsible for recommending criminal charges. We've heard about FINTRAC and what it does. It's important to note that FINTRAC regularly visits and audits service providers like Great Canadian.

Under the Gaming Control Act, GPEB is the regulator responsible for licensing. It also has investigators who are clothed with the status of special constable and they work either independently or in conjunction with the police. They are the investigators. GPEB too also regularly visits and audits Great Canadian.

The British Columbia Lottery Corporation. In order for a service provide to operate in British Columbia, it must enter into an operational services agreement with BCLC for each

 facility. These agreements together with BCLC standards, policies, rules, procedures and guidelines are detailed and prescriptive as to what Great Canadian must do as a service provider. This includes AML compliance and reporting.

BCLC has investigators on site at each of its properties, and the company provides offices for the investigators' use. The investigators' job is to facilitate and monitor compliance with AML reporting requirements, and BCLC receives immediate notification of reports of unusual financial transactions. BCLC also regularly audits Great Canadian and hires third parties in addition to conduct comprehensive audits.

BCLC has always worked closely with Great Canadian while monitoring and supervising various of its activities. Great Canadian has always believed and continues to believe that the British Columbia Lottery Commission is a diligent, hard-working organization and a very good one.

Lastly, we come to service providers. As has been described by my learned friend for BCLC, service providers are responsible for identifying certain types of activities and reporting them to BCLC and/or GPEB. Great Canadian is not responsible for investigating criminal conduct. Some people say to the contrary, but it's of substantial importance that this reality be recognized. It's not responsible for investigating criminal conduct, including money laundering.

The company is not a law enforcement agency nor a regulator. It does not have, nor should it have, the investigative powers or authority to determine whether patrons are bringing in legitimate funds or proceeds of crime. The company's obligation is to report certain financial transactions to others who do have the training and authority to perform such investigations.

In the next two pages I discuss the various types of forms at paragraphs 18 through 22, I guess. I talk about the forms. I don't want to take up too much time describing them. I will mention two in particular.

One of them is the Large Cash Transaction report. This is a report that is filed whenever a patron brings in more than \$10,000 cash at one time or over a 24-hour period. One of the requirements for completing an LCT, a Large Cash Transaction report, is that the patron is required to provide government-issued identification and various personal details, all of which are reported to BCLC, and in turn FINTRAC, as part of the report. If a patron does not provide the information, Great Canadian refuses the buy-in.

Great Canadian also produces documents that have been referred to as Section 86 reports, referring to s. 86 of the Gaming Act. And what these are are reports sent to GPEB that describe information in every UFT, Unusual Financial Transaction, that occurs in this province -- and And then on the UFT front, this is other things. a document that is prepared by Great Canadian whenever they witness an unusual financial transaction. An unusual financial transaction is assessed by looking at a list of 43 indicators published by BCLC in conjunction with FINTRAC. BCLC reviews the UFT reports and determines whether to file what's called a Suspicious Transaction report with FINTRAC.

And just to put matters into somewhat of a perspective, between the years 2014 and 2019, just for River Rock, Great Canadian filed 125,000 LCT reports, 6,000 Unusual Financial Transaction reports, and 18,000 Section 86 reports. These reports and the reports filed by Great Canadian for its other properties were variously directed to BCLC, GPEB, FINTRAC, and the police.

The fact that a report is prepared does not mean that money laundering or other criminal activity is necessarily occurring. But these numbers show that the company took its reporting obligations very seriously.

As I mentioned, Great Canadian is monitored by FINTRAC and audited by FINTRAC, GPEB and British Columbia Lottery Commission -- Corporation. In addition, Great Canadian itself conducts internal and external audits. It hires third parties to audit its activities.

In short, the company's compliance

 activities are checked, rechecked, and checked again to ensure they meet appropriate standards.

If I may, I'd like to address one particular myth that's been perpetuated about a form of money laundering that allegedly takes place at River Rock. It's been suggested in recent years that patrons of Great Canadian laundered very substantial amounts of money by buying chips with large amounts of cash. They then would gamble for a short period of time or make only small wagers and then cash out and receive a cheque from the casino for all of the chips cashed in. This simply did not happen.

In 2017, the BCLC commissioned Ernst and Young LLP to undertake a comprehensive analysis of cheques issued by River Rock and the payees' pattern of play for the three-year period from January the 1st, 2014, through to December the 31st, 2016. This included a review of every single cheque of \$10,000 or more related to table game play. There was 2,031 such cheques. The purpose of the review was to identify instances of cheques issued to patrons that were not supported by the patrons' gaming activity.

Ernst and Young's report, issued in February 2019, led BCLC to conclude that there was "no systemic pattern of money-laundering activity related to cheques being issued by River Rock Casino during the three-year period of 2014 to 2016." To the extent that Ernst and Young's review identified any errors, they were extremely few in number and administrative in nature.

While Great Canadian's obligations in the AML regime are limited to what is prescribed, it has in many instances sought to go above and beyond its narrow role of identifying and reporting by implementing new procedures to respond to the rapid growth of gaming in the province. It has taken numerous steps to combat money laundering on its own and in cooperation with other parties.

For example, the company has consistently supported and encouraged the use of technological solutions, such as licence plate recognition technology, at its facilities. This technology, introduced by BCLC, assists the police in identifying the location of certain individuals

as well as assisting the casino in refusing entry for self-excluded, trespassing or banned patrons.

In 2014, Great Canadian upgraded to a new state of the art surveillance system at River Rock. In 2016, using this technology, Great Canadian was able to identify cash drop-offs from suspected loan sharks or associates in its parking lots and then track the associated patrons to the casino. These persons' buy-ins were refused.

Great Canadian has also implemented its own background searches using an open-source search system. This system allows the company to conduct reviews of customers who were previously unknown to Great Canadian and who produced \$10,000 or more in cash. These searches are done before buy-ins are accepted.

Great Canadian has also proactively brought suspicious activities to the attention of the police. For example, in 2012, Great Canadian took the initiative to identify and report suspected loan sharking activity taking place within and around the River Rock Casino. This resulted in several players being barred by BCLC and reported to the police. Certain of these individuals were subsequently associated with the failed E-Pirate investigation and the unlicensed money services business of Silver International Investment. The evidence was forthcoming from Great Canadian.

During these years, it's important to note that Great Canadian's surveillance team has been recognized by the police for excellence in the performance of its duties. In 2012, the officer in charge of the Richmond RCMP Detachment awarded River Rock's surveillance team with a certificate of appreciation in recognition of "continued professional and timely assistance with criminal investigations." Later, Richmond RCMP awarded a second certificate of appreciation. This one was in recognition of the surveillance team's "outstanding assistance conducting surveillance reviews for members beyond the scope of [its] regular duties."

The company's dedication to emphasizing and enhancing AML compliance was typified when the board of directors directed that Great Canadian's

 compliance team was to be restructured. Terrance Doyle became the company's chief compliance officer a year ago. Mr. Doyle is the President of Strategic Growth for the company and the second highest officer of the company after the CEO. He reports directly to the board of directors, which includes the president and chief executive officer.

The new compliance structure also includes the positions of an executive vice-president of compliance, vice-presidents of compliance in British Columbia, Ontario and Atlantic regions, and an executive director of AML. Other roles include the development of an AML analyst position, an AML reporting coordinator, and additional large cash transaction clerks.

In addition, Great Canadian has a steering committee comprised of key executives in the company's operations, legal, compliance, and privacy departments that deal with AML. The company has created what's called an AML Champions Committee comprised of subject matter experts for each region, and a national AML Operations Management Committee.

These governance and leadership restructurings have been coupled with increased training for gaming employees that go beyond the training that BCLC gives. Outside of the gaming sphere, Great Canadian has taken the initiative to implement AML policies for all of its hospitality and food and beverage operations, not just the gambling operations.

Non-gaming employees have been trained to identify indicators of potential money laundering, and Great Canadian proactively submits what are called voluntary information records to FINTRAC whenever there are grounds to suspect a non-gaming transaction may be associated with money laundering.

The evidence that I anticipate will be heard by this Commission will be that the company took its obligations extremely seriously. If mistakes were made by Great Canadian in identifying and reporting certain transactions, they were statistically few, of a minor nature, and were the result of inadvertent human errors.

In conducting its inquiry, it may be

45 46 47

tempting for the Commission to look back with the benefits of hindsight and say that service providers like Great Canadian could have done more, and sooner, to combat money laundering in the gaming sector. However, the evidence will show that Great Canadian consistently upheld its obligations and exceeded them.

Those are my opening remarks. Canadian looks forward to assisting the Commission in its important work.

Thank you, Mr. Skwarok.

MR. MCFEE: Mr. Commissioner, I'm in your hands. you know, we appear on behalf of James Lightbody, the president and CEO of B.C. Lottery Corporation. We won't need the 45 minutes allocated to us but we'll probably take more than

I'm sorry. You may --

- MR. MCFEE: We'll take more than the 15 minutes that's left today but we won't take the 45 minutes that
- All right. Well, unfortunately, we are required to vacate by 4:00 from the So we can either start with you now and finish tomorrow morning, or we can adjourn until tomorrow morning and commence at that time. And I leave it up to you as to what --
- Yes, rather than break it up, I'd just as soon start tomorrow morning. I know counsel for Mr. Kroeker is here and ready to go after us.
- THE COMMISSIONER: We'll do that at 9:30 tomorrow Thank you.
- THE REGISTRAR: The hearing is now adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow morning.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO FEBRUARY 25, 2020,