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.

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

APPEARANCES

Brock Martland, QC Patrick McGowan Steven Davis Cullen Commission

Jacqueline Hughes Chantelle Rajotte

B.C. (Ministry of Finance and GPEB)

Katherine Shelley Ashley Gardner Canada

Ludmila Herbst, QC

Law Society of B.C.

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

Robin N. McFee Maya Ollek

James Lightbody

Christine Mainville

Robert Kroeker

David Gruber Meg Gaily Gateway

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

Paul Burns

Canadian Gaming Association

Morgan Camley

BMW

Patrick Weafer

B.C. Real Estate Association

Megan Tweedie Emily Lapper **BCCLA**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Opening Statement by Mr. Gruber Gateway Casinos and Entertainment Ltd.	1
Opening Statement by Mr. McFee James Lightbody	2
Opening Statement by Ms. Mainville Robert Kroeker	10
Opening Statement of Mr. Burns Canadian Gaming Association	25
Opening Statement by Mr. Usher and Mr. Mayr Society of Notaries Public of B.C.	32
Opening Statement by Ms. Camley BMW	45
Opening Statement by Ms. Tweedie B.C. Civil Liberties Association	60

Opening Statement by Mr. Gruber Gateway Casinos and Entertainment Ltd.

 Vancouver, B.C. February 25, 2020

THE REGISTRAR: All rise. The hearing has now resumed.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr. Martland.

MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, we have a very slight adjustment to the batting order. Mr. Gruber is here on behalf of Gateway and he has a prior commitment that means he can't stay through the length of the day. So I'm suggesting, and Mr. McFee has kindly acceded to this, that Mr. Gruber might address you at the outset followed by Mr. McFee on behalf of Mr. Lightbody.

And the other housekeeping point it that there have been a few further written opening statements that have been provided to us, and those will be circulated as soon as we're able to all participants by e-mail. So folks can expect those if they don't have copies already.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right, thank you.

MR. MARTLAND: Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Martland. Yes, Mr. Gruber.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. GRUBER (GATEWAY CASINOS AND ENTERTAINMENT LTD.):

MR. GRUBER: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner. My name is David Gruber, and along with Laura Bevan and Meg Gaily, I am counsel for Gateway Casinos and Entertainment Limited.

Mr. Commissioner, Gateway did provide you with a written opening statement late last week which sets out Gateway's position --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you.

MR. GRUBER: -- in respect of these proceedings.

We're content to rely on our written opening
statement, but we did observe that yesterday you
had some questions for some of the participants.

So we're here in the event you had any questions
arising from our written submission to address
those, and otherwise simply to thank you and look
forward to our further participation.

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry. I just missed that last line.

MR. GRUBER: And otherwise just to thank you for the

opportunity for Gateway to participate in these proceedings.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right, thank you. Thank you,

THE COMMISSIONER: All right, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Gruber.

MR. GRUBER: Thank you very much, Mr. Commissioner. THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr. McFee.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. MCFEE (JAMES LIGHTBODY):

MR. MCFEE: Yes, Mr. Commissioner. As you are aware, but for the benefit of the audience, we represent James, also known as Jim, Lightbody, who's the President and CEO of the B.C. Lottery Corporation, who's been granted standing here.

To outline who Mr. Lightbody is and what his responsibilities are, he's been in a leadership position with the B.C. Lottery Corporation since 2001, so long tenure. He joined the organization as a Vice-President of Lottery Gambling, and for the purposes of these proceedings, he's been in a leadership position in the casino industry since 2011. From 2011 until January 2014, Mr. Lightbody was BCLC's Vice-President for Casinos and Community Gaming. And then in February of 2014, Mr. Lightbody was appointed President and CEO of BCLC.

Mr. Lightbody is presently on medical leave, but he's recuperating and he hopes to be back on the job soon.

And Mr. Lightbody welcomes and supports this Commission of Inquiry into Money Laundering in British Columbia as a means of investigating and, importantly, furthering enforcement efforts into anti-money laundering in the province. And Mr. Lightbody looks forward to assisting you in your capacity as the Commissioner and Commission counsel throughout the entirety of the process.

But more broadly, Mr. Lightbody looks forward to the opportunity to work with the Commission to help British Columbians better understand the role of the B.C. Lottery Corporation and the actions that the organization has taken to improve anti-money laundering controls as part of its ongoing -- and they are ongoing -- efforts to safeguard British Columbia casinos from illegal activity.

Now, as you've already heard, BCLC is the

 organization that conducts and manages commercial gaming on behalf of the Province, including casinos, lotteries, bingos and sports betting, through multiple channels of distribution. And for your purposes and for the purposes of this inquiry, it's important to understand Mr. Lightbody's role.

As President and CEO of BCLC, Mr. Lightbody has a broad mandate within the organization. Mr. Lightbody has provided leadership and direction and strategy, marketing, and product development as well as operational responsibilities for the provision of products, services, and support for patrons and business partners.

Mr. Lightbody has duties and responsibilities in a range of areas, including the areas of leadership, corporate strategy, planning and reporting, policies and controls, risk management, human resources, and external relations.

It's a broad mandate, but broadly speaking, Mr. Lightbody's responsibilities include:

- leading and managing the operations of BCLC on a day-to-day basis in accordance with the parameters established by the board of directors of BCLC;
- providing overall leadership and vision in developing the strategy and plans necessary to realize the organization's objectives and manage risks;
- and ensure strategy and annual plans are effectively implemented, the results are monitored and reported to the board, and financial and operational objectives are attained.

Importantly, Mr. Lightbody, as President and CEO of BCLC, works with the board of directors to develop and implement the vision, mission and values of the organization.

Now, let me go on to how Mr. Lightbody can assist the Inquiry and assist you and Commission counsel in advancing the objectives of this inquiry.

Opening Statement by Mr. McFee James Lightbody

As President and CEO of BCLC, Mr. Lightbody has been working within the organization and with a range of external organizations, enforcement and regulatory agencies to respond to the extent, growth and evolution of money laundering in the gaming sector, and to implement measures to complete BCLC's responsibilities to combat money laundering.

Mr. Lightbody is also Chair of the B.C. Horse Racing Management Committee, a position that he's held for approximately five years. Lightbody holds this position as part of his mandate as CEO of BCLC, but it's a separate position. The committee was formed to support and direct the horse racing industry. collaboration between owners of Thoroughbreds, owners of Standardbreds, and operators of the race track -- that is, in this province, the Great Canadian Gaming Corporation -- and includes GPEB as a non-voting member. The committee is responsible for the direction of the industry, revenue distribution, and marketing and business development investments. And Mr. Lightbody is similarly presently on medical leave from that position.

Now, as discussed by counsel for BCLC, BCLC is mandated by the Province of British Columbia to conduct and manage the commercial gaming business in British Columbia in a socially responsible manner for the benefit of all British Columbians, that is, in a positive economic, social and environmental way. And to that end, as President and CEO, Mr. Lightbody's responsibilities include:

- responsibility for fostering a corporate culture that promotes ethical practices and encourages individual integrity and social responsibility; and
- ensuring that all operations and activities of BCLC are conducted in accordance with laws, regulations and BCLC's policies and practices, including its Board-approved Standards of Ethical Business Conduct.

Mr. Lightbody takes pride in BCLC's social responsibility mandate and has worked diligently to help the organization fulfil this mandate. BCLC's social responsibility mandate, coupled with Mr. Lightbody's personal commitment to social responsibility, underpins and guides his leadership approach and management of the organization, including in the area of anti-money laundering.

Like all of the parties here today, Mr. Lightbody shares the public concern about money laundering in British Columbia. During Mr. Lightbody's time in various leadership roles at BCLC, BCLC as an organization and Mr. Lightbody personally recognized the threat of money laundering in the gaming sector.

As President and CEO of the organization entrusted to conduct and manage commercial gambling in British Columbia, Mr. Lightbody is committed to protecting the gaming industry and maintaining the trust of the people and communities of British Columbia through the ongoing commitment to anti-money laundering initiatives. Mr. Lightbody takes his role within the anti-money laundering system very seriously and is personally committed to ensuring that BCLC takes appropriate action when potential criminal activity takes place in and around casinos.

Consequently, BCLC and Mr. Lightbody's commitment to managing gaming in a socially responsible manner has meant ensuring that the organization did not ignore -- did not ignore -- the possibility of money laundering in the gaming sector. For BCLC and for Mr. Lightbody, there has never been a question of prioritizing revenue growth for BCLC over combatting money laundering. To do so would have been wholly inconsistent with BCLC's mandate.

Now, there have previously been suggestions in the media and allegations by some anonymous sources, as you've seen, interviewed by Dr. Peter German in preparation of his 2018 gaming industry report, Dirty Money: An Independent Review of Money Laundering in the Lower Mainland Casinos conducted for the Attorney General of British Columbia. And the suggestions are that BCLC's senior management was aware of large amounts of

money that were proceeds of crime being transacted in casinos, and that BCLC senior management turned a blind eye to this, opting to do nothing in response in order to maximize profits. Mr. Lightbody anticipates that the evidence that will be adduced before this Commission will establish that this is an inaccurate narrative, an entirely inaccurate narrative, during the time that Mr. Lightbody was in a leadership position as President and CEO of BCLC.

The evidence will establish that contrary to turning a blind eye to the possibility of money laundering, Mr. Lightbody made active efforts to be responsive to money laundering concerns in the gaming sector. These efforts included efforts towards greater coordination with organizations, enforcement and regulatory agencies across the industry, and with law enforcement, as well as working within BCLC to address money laundering concerns.

As you heard, BCLC is one of many working to combat money laundering in the gaming sector. These organizations and enforcement and regulatory agencies also include service providers, GPEB, FINTRAC, and law enforcement, each of which play distinct and important roles.

BCLC collaborates with this network of organizations, enforcement and regulatory agencies to help protect casinos in British Columbia by detecting, reporting and supporting regulatory or law enforcement investigations against anyone involved in money laundering. BCLC's role includes, amongst other things, providing information on specific activities to authorities and, where necessary, refusing such transactions.

Mr. Lightbody together with BCLC has worked to draw attention to money laundering issues and to press for more collaboration and coordination across these different organizations, enforcement and regulatory agencies involved in anti-money laundering work in the casino industry in British Columbia. This has included engaging regularly with law enforcement and pressing for more resources and enforcement. These efforts include the following initiatives:

- Number 1: BCLC led an industry anti-money laundering task force with service providers and GPEB starting in 2011. This was a cross-functional team of security, compliance, regulator, policy, and operation representatives.

- Secondly, BCLC saw the benefit of and initiated -- and it's important to understand that BCLC initiated -- an information-sharing agreement with the RCMP and other law enforcement agencies starting in 2014. This was the first such initiative in Canada.

 - Thirdly, BCLC pressed for greater law enforcement support from the RCMP and government in 2015, which precipitated the formation of the Joint Illegal Gambling Investigation Team that BCLC supported and funded.

 Under Mr. Lightbody's leadership, BCLC has taken steps in the context of the information available at the time, and the existing systems to respond to money laundering concerns with the gaming sector as they emerged and evolved.

You will hear that as President and CEO of BCLC, Mr. Lightbody prioritized anti-money laundering initiatives and made his support for such initiatives clearly known. Within BCLC, Mr. Lightbody saw to it that BCLC committed resources to anti-money laundering initiatives within the organization and to continuously improving such initiatives to position BCLC to respond with a flexible and risk-based approach to money laundering issues.

One example of BCLC's anti-money laundering initiatives that occurred during Mr. Lightbody's time as President and CEO of BCLC is the expansion of the organization's anti-money laundering investigation unit created in late 2013. This AML unit is staffed with certified AML investigators and certified intelligence analysts. It has authority to act independently, including barring certain patrons, advising casino service providers not to accept cash from

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

certain patrons, and working closely with regulatory and law enforcement agencies, including weekly meetings to discuss high-value customers and transactions. During Mr. Lightbody's tenure as President and CEO of BCLC, the AML unit's size and resources expanded and the leader of the AML unit was elevated within the organization from a manager position to a director position to reflect the priority being given to anti-money laundering initiatives.

Under Mr. Lightbody's direction, BCLC also worked to be responsive to and investigate reports of money laundering occurring within the gaming sector, including reports in the media. You will recall that yesterday Mr. Skwarok, on behalf of Great Canadian Gaming Corporation, referred to the Ernst and Young report that was commissioned in September of 2017. Now, as Mr. Skwarok told you, the allegations involved a Great Canadian facility. However, it's important to recognize that it was BCLC under Mr. Lightbody's direction that initiated that analysis and study. And that analysis was an analysis of cheques and patterns of play pertaining to a set of defined money laundering typologies at River Rock Casino Resort for a three-year period, from January 1st, 2014, to December 31st, 2016.

BCLC wasn't turning a blind eye. Lightbody wasn't turning a blind eye. commissioned this independent report following allegations in the media that patrons were coming to River Rock Casino with dirty money, buying casino chips, playing notionally, and then cashing chips in and receiving a cheque in return. BCLC wanted to know if there were in fact instances where anti-money laundering controls had been compromised. Based on Ernst and Young's analysis, BCLC was satisfied that there was no systemic pattern of money laundering activity relating to cheques issued by River Rock Casino during this three-year period. BCLC was transparent. BCLC released Ernst and Young's analysis publicly and it is available on BCLC's website. Since the timeframe of Ernst and Young's analysis, BCLC continued to enhance its anti-money laundering program to safeguard the

industry from the ever-evolving risks of criminal activity.

In his capacity as President and CEO of BCLC, Mr. Lightbody received and reviewed Dr. German's 2018 gaming industry report with interest. Mr. Lightbody has been instrumental in directing BCLC's response to Dr. German's report. However, Mr. Lightbody has identified a number of inaccuracies in the report and frailties in its underlying methodology, including, notably, as you've also already been told by other counsel, obtaining only minimal input from key people at BCLC. And Mr. Lightbody welcomes the opportunity to address his concerns with Dr. German's report through this Commission's process.

Money laundering is a complex and constantly evolving phenomenon. It demands, by its nature, a collaborative and coordinated approach to antimoney laundering initiatives across various organizations and sectors. Mr. Lightbody agrees wholeheartedly with the need for a greater collaborative and coordinated approach between those that work to eliminate money laundering within the gaming sector and across sectors. This means working towards greater clarity of roles and responsibilities and a greater focus on enforcement efforts, amongst other things. It is critical to take a broad, multi-sectoral approach to this issue, rather than approaching it in a siloed fashion.

Continually striving to achieve the level and quality of communication, cooperation, and enforcement initiatives by various entities involved in anti-money laundering is critical to ensuring the overall integrity of casino gaming and to public trust in this area.

Mr. Lightbody has been and is committed to being part of the solution to address concerns about money laundering in British Columbia and to helping BCLC to continue to meet its own responsibilities, to meet its responsibilities to regulators, law enforcement, and the public, and to work collaboratively with and in support of all agencies to combat money laundering.

Mr. Lightbody welcomes the work of the Commission as a means for investigating and furthering enforcement efforts into anti-money

laundering in British Columbia. And Mr.
Lightbody looks forward to an opportunity to
actively work with the Commission and to share
information about the work that has been and
continues to be done in the gaming sector and by
BCLC in particular to respond to and address
money laundering concerns as these arise and
evolve. Similarly, Mr. Lightbody looks forward
to the opportunity to share information about his
role as Chair of the British Columbia Horse
Racing Industry Management Committee and that
organization's work in supporting anti-money
laundering initiatives.

In closing, Mr. Lightbody encourages the Commission to take a broad, holistic approach to understanding and making findings of fact about money laundering in British Columbia. This holistic approach must also underpin and inform recommendations by the Commission for anti-money laundering initiatives going forward that span all potential industries that may be targeted by criminals. It is critical to support a risk-based, or standards-based, approach that is flexible and able to readily respond to the changing nature of money laundering as it continues to evolve.

Mr. Commissioner, subject to any questions you may have, those are our opening submissions. THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. McFee. Yes, Ms. Mainville.

MS. MAINVILLE: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Commissioner.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. MAINVILLE (ROBERT KROEKER):

MS. MAINVILLE: I'm here on behalf of Ms. Henein and myself, Christine Mainville, to deliver Mr. Kroeker's opening statement.

Mr. Kroeker welcomes the Commission's work and his ability to participate and provide his full and unhindered cooperation in the process. Mr. Kroeker has not yet been able to share his knowledge of events with the public, nor has he been afforded the opportunity to address the disinformation that has been in the public domain. He looks forward to being able to testify under oath and provide relevant

information to the Commission. The truth needs to be made known in respect of various false assertions that have been made in this highly politicized context on the state of money laundering and anti-money laundering measures in B.C.'s gaming industry. Transparency must be brought to bear on this issue that is legitimately very important to British Columbians and beyond.

From September 2015 to July 2019, Mr.
Kroeker was Vice President of Legal, Compliance and Security and Chief Compliance Officer at the British Columbia Lottery Corporation. In this capacity, Mr. Kroeker oversaw and monitored compliance in B.C.'s casinos. BCLC's compliance department worked alongside federal and provincial regulatory agencies, other Crown agencies, police, provincial and municipal governments, as well as private sector service providers. In other words, Mr. Kroeker dealt with police; he dealt with the regulator; and he had direct interactions with government officials in the context of his employment at BCLC.

Before that, from November 2012 to September 2015, Mr. Kroeker was in charge of compliance and regulatory affairs at Great Canadian Gaming Corporation, GCGC, the operator of several gaming facilities across Canada, including River Rock Casino.

In 2006 up until 2012, Mr. Kroeker led the creation, and subsequent operations, of the B.C. Civil Forfeiture Agency. During this period, he worked extensively with police and other enforcement agencies across B.C., in addition to U.S. officials collaborating with B.C. law enforcement, exclusively on money laundering and proceeds of crime matters. As Executive Director of the Civil Forfeiture Office employed by B.C.'s Ministry of Justice, he was responsible for the conduct of more than 1,200 money laundering, proceeds and instruments civil cases, which resulted in the recovery of approximately \$30 million in laundered proceeds. It was this experience that led to his being called upon by the provincial government in 2011, to review controls on casinos implemented by BCLC and the Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch, GPEB.

He has in-depth knowledge and understanding, not only of gaming in British Columbia, but of the events at the heart of this inquiry's mandate.

Mr. Kroeker saw first hand the diligent work that was done within BCLC and the casino service operators in recent years to comply with antimoney laundering legislation and regulations, to prevent its occurrence, and to track down offenders. Mr. Kroeker can also speak to the obstacles he and other persons of good faith encountered in their endeavours to address these challenges.

When Mr. Kroeker arrived at Great Canadian Gaming, FINTRAC had just completed its 2012 review, which had gone well. It was his understanding that no money laundering transactions had been detected during this review, providing him with a certain level of assurance regarding the controls in place at the Nevertheless, Mr. Kroeker set out to time. update GCGC's corporate level compliance plan. He worked with BCLC, in particular Brad Desmarais, who had taken on the lead compliance role at BCLC around the same time that Mr. Kroeker took up his at GCGC. They frequently communicated regarding AML, anti-money laundering, and worked together to enhance the existing controls and to develop closer connections to the police and GPEB.

While at Great Canadian Gaming, Mr. Kroeker and colleagues at BCLC noticed an increase in cash transactions and suspicious transaction reports. They did not ignore it: they introduced new measures to track and monitor these transactions and the individuals involved. The initial analysis showed that the increase in transactions and STRs followed a general increase in business in the casino sector. This was less of a cause for concern than if the STRs had increased where business was flat or declining.

Nevertheless, GCGC's efforts did not end there. It submitted reports to FinTRAC, to the regulator GPEB, to BCLC, and indeed conveyed this information to law enforcement. Everyone was aware of the rise in STRs, because GCGC -- and BCLC -- made them aware. BCLC not only monitored

 and analyzed the situation; it banned individuals from B.C. casinos and tried to get the police and the regulator to investigate. Both GCGC and BCLC actively sought the intervention and assistance of law enforcement and of the regulator, through 2013 and onward.

During Mr. Kroeker's tenure, it is unquestionable that Great Canadian Gaming and BCLC did not hinder anyone's work in investigating money laundering and loan sharking: quite the contrary. They urged investigations and participated fully in providing information.

In April 2014, a senior RCMP officer who specialized in proceeds of crime told Mr. Kroeker that it would be very difficult for money to be systematically laundered through a casino without detection given the controls in place. vulnerability was around already laundered proceeds being used to gamble. This was Mr. Kroeker's assessment as well. The officer went on to note that detecting proceeds of crime coming in from a financial institution or another source would be difficult for a casino to detect, and indeed would require an extensive police investigation. The casinos were doing their part, the officer said. Still, BCLC and GCGC continued to advocate for just such a police investigation. They also continued to pass on information obtained from player interviews and surveillance, including about illegal casinos and unregulated banking channels: what became the central feature of the so-called "Vancouver model."

This RCMP officer's observations have been borne out. It is hoped that the Commission will adduce the necessary evidence that demonstrates that BCLC and the casinos it manages in fact have a substantial range of money laundering controls. B.C. has been an industry leader in anti-money laundering, and their controls have received the approval and backing of FINTRAC and police at numerous points over the years. The "Vancouver model" of money laundering does not involve money being laundered through the casinos, in any traditional sense. Rather, the model involves money being laundered through financial institutions and unregulated banking channels,

away from gaming facilities, and provided to otherwise bona fide gamblers, who appear to be engaging in these activities as a way of getting around restrictions on money exiting China. Illegal schemes working in the financial sector and away from legal casinos are at the center of this model.

GCGC and BCLC reported the information it had regarding these potential illegal operations to law enforcement and asked that they be investigated. For such illegal operations to be tackled, officers with police powers of investigation needed to get involved. Inaccurate descriptions and loose language have persistently been used in the public domain, leading to misinformation and a misperception about what the real issue of significance is: the risk that proceeds of crime, already laundered through other sectors including the financial sector and legitimate gamblers with substantiated wealth, were being gambled at casinos. The work of this Commission will be critical to clarify the real issues, the real sources of money laundering, and the appropriate responses.

In June 2014, BCLC instituted, as we've heard, an information sharing agreement with the RCMP so that the police had ready access to information it required to investigate. This would also allow BCLC to create a proactive player banning program. At times, GCGC and BCLC were led to believe that the police would investigate, and did believe investigations were in fact taking place. They urged GPEB to also use their investigative powers to investigate. Alarms were raised. But over time, Mr. Kroeker saw no evidence of any police investigations taking place and began to suspect that no investigative steps were in fact being taken.

In April 2015, Mr. Desmarais and Mr. Kroeker learned that the RCMP's Federal Serious and Organized Crime Unit, the FSOCU, would finally open an investigation into BCLC's complaints.

The gaming industry, including BCLC, also welcomed the creation of the Joint Illegal Gaming Investigations Team, JIGIT, in 2016 in the midst of the MNP report.

The Commission should also hear about the

other significant steps that Mr. Kroeker took while in charge of compliance at Great Canadian In late 2014, GCGC noticed an increase in missing casino chips -- called "chip liability" -- which raised concerns of the chips being used in underground banking, underground casinos, or as stored value instruments by organized crime. GCGC reported the issue to BCLC and both started to monitor the situation more closely. In early 2015, Mr. Kroeker devised a chip replacement plan to take place on very short notice. BCLC's Brad Desmarais was on board, and the replacement was set to proceed. Notices to players went up so that legitimate customers could return their chips to the casino before the replacement date. This replacement would render valueless all chips not returned by legitimate players, and would have proven to be a significant problem for anyone operating an illegal scheme with vast amounts of casino chips. Under the replacement plan, if there was no record of the individual returning chips having purchased them, these would not be honoured and the individual would not be paid in exchange for their chips.

For reasons that remain unclear, GPEB directed that the chip replacement not proceed at the last minute. It eventually took place in January 2016, but the delay was problematic from GCGC and BCLC's perspectives. Because notices had gone up months earlier, the delay gave nefarious actors the opportunity to slowly and progressively return their chips to the casino over time in ways that avoided detection. It removed BCLC's ability to identify and interview individuals that appeared to have acquired chips inappropriately and to take measures against those individuals. It is hoped that the Commission will be able to shed light on what transpired in that instance.

When Mr. Kroeker then joined BCLC in September 2015, he became privy to recently acquired information from the RCMP suggesting that approximately 10 to 36 customers were acquiring their funds from illegal sources. Mr. Kroeker immediately ramped up BCLC's source of wealth and funds program. Source of fund

interviews became mandatory in all instances where there were any concerns regarding the source of a player's funds, if the player engaged in large cash transactions. While it is not possible to identify a direct cause and effect, since that point in time when Mr. Kroeker took up the compliance reigns at BCLC, there has been a closely correlated decline in suspicious transactions at B.C. casinos, both in terms of number and value. In other words, the STR decline commenced in the latter part of 2015 as a result of actions taken by BCLC, and cannot simply be credited to later policy changes.

Indeed, by August 2016, the number of STRs declined by 45 percent and the dollar value of suspicious transactions had dropped by 80 percent. Revenue from high bet limit tables had declined by \$120 million due to refused players and transactions. Over a similar period, the total value of individual LCTs, large cash transactions, of \$20,000 or more had declined by \$162 million or 66 percent, and the total value of LCTs over \$50,000 had declined by \$130 million or 80 percent. In their public disclosures through late 2015 and 2016, GCGC opined in their Management Discussion and Analysis, MD&A, that table revenue was in decline at River Rock due to new controls BCLC had put in place. By December 2017, the number of STRs had dropped by 72 percent from July 2015, and the value of those transactions dropped from over 27.4 million to 2.6 million, or 90 percent.

- THE COMMISSIONER: Are these numbers across the board, Ms. Mainville? That is, do they relate to all the casinos?
- MS. MAINVILLE: Yes, I believe that's accurate. And I can provide the source, if the Commissioner wishes, afterwards. Except where I specify at River Rock.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
- MS. MAINVILLE: It is also important for the Commission to provide much needed context to the public discourse. And this has been alluded to, but it needs to be made very clear. For years, prior to 2012, the regulator required casinos to deal only in cash. Everything else was prohibited. This means that very high volumes of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

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

cash would necessarily flow through the casinos. All casino customers had to come to a casino with bank notes to gamble. There was no authorized alternative. Customers were not permitted to use debit cards, credit cards, bank drafts, cheques, bank transfers, electronic funds transfers, money orders, or any other form of payment. Only cash.

With casinos operating under BCLC contract conducting more than \$8 billion in transactions annually, this restriction imposed by the regulator meant that massive amounts of cash were necessarily handled by casino operators. This created a major money laundering risk as the volume of cash moving in and out of casinos makes it very difficult to distinguish illegitimate cash from legitimate cash. Dr. Peter German Q.C. stated in his first report, Dirty Money, that "casinos are attractive to money launderers because they deal in cash." Casinos, he said, are "overwhelmed by cash." There can be no doubt, then, that implementing cash alternatives is important. Contrary to Dr. German's views, it was an important facet of BCLC's work in addressing money laundering risks.

Mr. Kroeker identified this issue when he was appointed in 2011 to conduct a summary review of anti-money laundering measures in B.C. He recommended the immediate introduction of alternatives to cash in B.C.'s gaming facilities, as is done in other jurisdictions around the world. Non-cash forms of payment are preferable, first, because they provide a paper trail and allow for better tracking of the movement of funds. They thereby facilitate investigations. Indeed, where money laundering concerns arise and an investigation is appropriately undertaken, non-cash transactions allow diligent and skilled investigators to follow the document trail. Transactions coming directly from a bank are traceable and carry a lower risk of money laundering than cash transactions.

Secondly, if less cash flows through casinos, it becomes easier to track dirty cash and money laundering schemes and take more targeted action. It allows gaming facilities to focus their AML attention on the higher risk customers who, despite alternatives, continue to

 play with high volumes of cash. When only cash is permitted, it is more challenging to differentiate between legitimate cash and illegitimate cash.

Since Mr. Kroeker's 2011 summary report, a number of cash alternatives have been introduced in B.C.'s casinos. This is an improvement. Still, that process faced obstacles and cash alternatives took longer to introduce than BCLC had hoped. And despite ongoing efforts on the part of BCLC to move customers to more secure lower-risk transactions, to this day the vast majority of transactions at B.C. casinos are cash. Disassociating legitimate cash from illegitimate cash therefore remains a concern. More does need to be done on that front, and that should be explored by this Commission.

Nevertheless, during Mr. Kroeker's tenure at GCGC and BCLC, cash transactions of significance were systematically detected and reported to police, to FINTRAC, and to the regulator, GPEB. Suspect incidents and transactions were looked into and reported. And as I've indicated, significant pushes were made for police and others to investigate suspicious players and incidents, largely without success. Efforts were made to reduce the amount of cash entering casinos, and to address other money laundering concerns, with some obstacles being placed in BCLC's way.

For instance, for a long time, because BCLC was only authorized to deal in cash, payouts to customers beyond \$10,000 also had to occur in cash. Of course, there are money laundering risks associated with large cash payouts. Remitting large sums of money by way of a traceable cheque is certainly preferable. The banking sector in fact expressed concerns over the large amount of bank notes being paid out to casino customers that they could not track, requesting that alternatives be introduced.

When at BCLC, Mr. Kroeker and his team attempted to limit cash payouts by requesting from GPEB that the \$10,000 limit on return of funds cheques be removed. The ability to issue a cheque in a greater amount would also allow BCLC to implement a daily limit of \$25,000 on cash

payouts. BCLC also sought authorization from GPEB to remove the requirement that a minimum of \$10,000 be deposited into a casino account to enable greater use of these traceable accounts, which require non-cash deposits. Despite these changes initially being endorsed by GPEB in 2018, there has since been a change in position for reasons unknown to Mr. Kroeker. He hopes this Inquiry will shed light on the issue and recommend a pathway forward, because despite BCLC's efforts, to the best of Mr. Kroeker's knowledge, these money laundering risks remain.

In recent years, BCLC has also endeavoured to introduce additional AML measures as risks continue to be identified and tackled, but it has not been able to operate freely to implement these changes as it sees fit. This is a cause for concern that should be addressed by this Commission.

The Commission should hear evidence about one measure that Mr. Kroeker was able to implement, that is a ban on funds emanating from money service businesses including Money Mart and Western Union. In mid-2015, the Government of Canada's updated National Inherent Money Laundering Risk Report gave MSBs the highest risk rating: Very High Vulnerability. After some players interviewed by BCLC indicated they were obtaining their cash from MSBs, the AML Unit under Mr. Kroeker's direction conducted a review with the aim of devising policies and controls specific to MSBs. Ultimately, MSBs were deemed too high risk and funds emanating from any MSB were banned altogether in B.C. casinos.

There have been reports of money laundering concerns as it relates to some of the cash alternatives that have been introduced in B.C.'s casinos, such as cheques and bank drafts. As my friends from GCGC and Mr. Lightbody alluded to, some of these reports are wrong, and they need to be corrected by this Commission. When various claims were reported, or were brought to his attention internally, Mr. Kroeker's reaction was that they could not be correct, absent BCLC's system having been compromised, and he had no indication of that occurring. Mr. Kroeker knows what it is possible to do and not possible to do

 in a casino given the controls in place. These reports suggested problems that either could not occur given the systems in place, or that were stringently controlled for and had not been identified.

For instance, it has been suggested that BCLC customers are laundering cash by depositing it in casino customer accounts and almost immediately withdrawing it. But cash cannot be deposited in a casino account. BCLC's anti-money laundering controls do not allow for it. other words, such a scheme is impossible. they were introduced in 2012 following Mr. Kroeker's review, casino customer accounts can only be held in the name of the customer, and cash cannot be deposited in these accounts. Moreover, funds can only be received in a casino customer account if they emanate from a Canadian bank or credit union, or from a top-50 American bank, no other international funds. If those funds are not clean, what needs to be asked, and what should be a focus of this Commission, is how they made it into the Canadian and the U.S. banking systems in the first place.

There are similar restrictions on the provenance of funds in the case of cheques, debit cards and electronic fund transfers, all of which were also introduced in 2012. With one exception — verified wins from another casino — the funds must be sourced from a Canadian financial institution or a top U.S. bank. These entities are subject to money laundering regimes and overseen by FINTRAC in Canada and FinCEN in the United States, which, while not definitive, should give some assurance the source of the funds has been vetted and is more likely to be legitimate.

In another case, it was reported that players were able to buy in with large amounts of cash and subsequently cash out cheques with little to no play having been conducted. BCLC has had tight controls on the issuance of cheques for a long time. Casinos may only issue a cheque to customers in limited circumstances, and cheque issuance is closely monitored by BCLC for indicators of money laundering.

Despite doubts regarding the accuracy of the

reports and claims that have been made, Mr. Kroeker and BCLC took them at face value and diligently followed up on them. They deemed it necessary to undertake comprehensive reviews or audits of BCLC's processes. In one instance that's been referred to a couple of times before you, Mr. Commissioner, they engaged an independent, well reputed, external auditor, Ernst and Young Advisory, based out of New York City, to review and audit every single cheque issued over a three-year period -- 2014 through 2016, which were selected based on the information contained in the media reports -- to identify any such concern. E.Y. found no evidence of cash being laundered through casinos in the manner alleged in the media reports.

In another instance, Mr. Kroeker tasked BCLC's AML team to locate and inspect every bank draft written over a near two-year period for every casino in B.C., in the face of allegations that BCLC customers were using anonymous bank drafts purportedly purchased with proceeds of crime. Again, BCLC had tight controls on bank drafts and had seen none of the activity alleged. This review also concluded that not a single bank draft presented the defects that had been reported.

In other words, the results of in-depth reviews found that the reported claims were unfounded. Mr. Kroeker looks forward to this information being laid out by the Commission, so that the public may be properly informed.

B.C.'s casinos are subject to numerous independent compliance reviews and AML audits. Aside from in-depth FINTRAC reviews and GPEB reviews, biennial reviews are statutorily mandated and conducted by external auditors such as PricewaterhouseCoopers and E.Y., Ernst and Young. B.C. has regularly gotten reviews clean of any substantive adverse findings, and indeed has been complimented on its controls by oversight bodies like FINTRAC and law enforcement officials. FINTRAC's reviews of BCLC have largely been positive.

Much has been made of the Administrative Monetary Penalty imposed on BCLC in 2010 -- prior to Mr. Kroeker's tenure -- and the litigation

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

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

that ensued. But as BCLC stated at the time, at the time the litigation ended, this AMP followed technical deficiencies arising from a new computer communications link between FINTRAC and BCLC. Those deficiencies were quickly remedied, and it was confirmed that "at no time did any money laundering transactions occur." The litigation ended with FINTRAC consenting to the appeal being allowed and the fine against BCLC being set aside by the Federal Court. Not, as Dr. German wrote, "in a draw."

When Dr. German recommended as an interim measure that a source of funds declaration be obtained for all cash transactions of more than \$10,000, with an exception for initial transactions by new customers, the public should know that BCLC went farther. It did not implement the exception, which was laxer than existing controls and fell outside of BCLC's risk There was also no way to track new tolerance. customers and the number of transactions they engaged in in real time. And at Mr. Kroeker's direction, BCLC continued to probe the source of funds in the case of suspicious transactions irrespective of dollar value -- so indeed beneath the \$10,000 threshold -- based on a risk assessment of the customer and the transaction. As I've mentioned, BCLC already required source of funds interviews to be conducted, and they believed they should occur in all suspicious instances, not just when the large cash transaction threshold was met. This is one example of how a risk-based or standards-based model can operate more robustly than a prescriptive model with overly precise, and constrained, requirements. BCLC's compliance team made sure that the existing risk-based controls continued to apply to all transactions irrespective of dollar value. It also went beyond Dr. German's source of funds declaration which required players to simply provide information regarding the financial institution and bank account from which the funds were sourced, to require a same-day receipt for the funds to be presented to and retained by the casino.

So let's be clear. During Mr. Kroeker's

tenure at GCGC and then BCLC, they took action. Despite this, BCLC's compliance approach was the subject of some criticism by Dr. German in his first report. In certain instances, Dr. German gave credit to GCGC or GPEB, with no recognition of the fact that BCLC's actions or information led to the relevant changes being initiated.

The Commission is tasked with reviewing and "taking into consideration" Dr. German's reports, among others. It is imperative that mischaracterizations and errors in these reports be addressed publicly and corrected. As you've already heard from a few of my colleagues, Dr. German never met with Mr. Kroeker individually or sought out Mr. Kroeker's detailed knowledge of BCLC. Dr. German's only interaction with Mr. Kroeker, as was pointed out, on money laundering controls during his review was a single hour-and-a-half group meeting.

Improvements can no doubt be brought to bear on BCLC's AML program and the overarching compliance regime. But the public should not be misled about the past and current state of antimoney laundering measures and controls and the good faith and due diligence exercised by BCLC and casino employees over time.

Contrary to what some in the public may have come to expect, under Mr. Kroeker's watch, BCLC was open to the possibility of no longer offering high bet limit table play, should that have been deemed advisable. BCLC was also prepared to impose a cap on cash transactions. In fact, it studied this option and saw no issue with its adoption. Dr. German ultimately recommended that no cash cap be imposed, but one could be implemented should the regulator see fit to Whether a cash cap is in order or impose one. not will be for the Commission to determine, but the following should be made clear to the public: if they are concerned about large bags of cash entering casinos, a cash cap is the only way to change that reality. That is because legitimate cash can also travel in bags. And indeed it does. Many players with what is by all appearances legitimately sourced cash, will also use bags to carry it. What we have seen in heavily publicized images and videos is still

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

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

permitted today, in full abidance of Dr. German's recommendations and directives issued by the regulator. Without a cash cap, it will continue.

We expect the Commission will find that throughout, Mr. Kroeker has acted with integrity and in full cooperation with the Province and the regulators. He has discharged his compliance duties on behalf of BCLC honourably. specific instance, on which Mr. Kroeker may now comment, he intends to defend against an anonymous and malicious claim that he instructed staff at BCLC to "ease up" on anti-money laundering measures and "allow dirty money to flow into casinos." He not only fully denies that this, or anything like it, ever took place. He has been cleared of this false allegation. Indeed, on November 1st, 2019, after an in-depth investigation, Mr. Kroeker was notified by GPEB that the allegations were deemed "unfounded" and the matter was now closed.

Government and various social programming offered by government depend on casino revenue. BCLC does not. Aside from the costs related to running the enterprise, profits go to government. In other words, any conflict of interest does not lie with BCLC, unless it is not acting independently from government. The Commission may therefore wish to consider whether there is a need for BCLC to operate with greater independence from government, with appropriate oversight by an independent board and an independently operating regulator.

Unfortunately, the truth has been obfuscated by partisan interests and other questionable motivations. There are errors and falsities in the public discourse surrounding this issue, leading to a skewed understanding of casinos' vulnerabilities to money laundering, to the detriment of other, more vulnerable, sectors. There are several inaccuracies and inconsistencies in Dr. German's Dirty Money report, as you've heard, not the least of which is the suggestion that no one did anything. During Mr. Kroeker's tenure, the gaming industry, including GCGC and BCLC, were at the forefront of the actions that were taken in respect of preventing money laundering and detecting illegal

networks operating with proceeds of crime. 2 were monitored, and they complied. They asked 3 for investigations, and were repeatedly ignored. 4 We are confident that by the end of this process, 5 the public will be fully informed. 6 The Commission should have an accurate and 7 full factual foundation to make recommendations in the public interest and devise solutions to 8 9 real problems. I am confident that Mr. Kroeker's 10 participation will enhance the Commission's 11 ability to have a fair, accurate and complete 12 picture of the significant actions taken by BCLC 13 and others over the years in respect of money 14 laundering concerns in the gaming industry, and 15 of the true gaps and failures in the system. 16 Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. 17 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms. Mainville. 18 Martland. 19 MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, I thought I might 20 just rise to canvass, but we have the Canadian 21 Gaming Association, Mr. Burns is next on our 22 batting --23 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 24 MR. MARTLAND: -- roster, but I don't know if it's 25 preferable that he start now or we go to break or 26 whatever. 27 THE COMMISSIONER: Why don't we take 15 minutes now. 28 MR. MARTLAND: Thank you. 29 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. 30 THE REGISTRAR: Order. The hearing will recess for 15 31 Please remain standing in place while minutes. 32 the Commissioner exits the room. 33 34 (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED FOR MORNING RECESS) 35 (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED) 36 37 THE REGISTRAR: The hearing is now resumed. 38 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, sir. 39 40 OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. BURNS (CANADIAN GAMING 41 ASSOCIATION): 42 43 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, sir. 44 MR. BURNS: Good morning and thank you to the 45 Commission for the invitation to appear here

The Canadian Gaming Association is a

today.

46 47

national trade industry association working to advance the evolution of Canada's gaming industry. Our members are the leading gaming operators and suppliers to the industry, including organizations like Gateway Casinos, Caesars Entertainment, Hard Rock Casinos, Mohegan Sun Entertainment, Scientific Games, International Game Technology and actually many of Canada's leading law firms.

The CGA interactions with our industry and stakeholders are guided by set of principles:

- We believe in gaming as a legitimate form of entertainment and a positive contributor to our communities;
- We promote responsible use of our industry's products;
- We are Canada-wide and nationally focused;
- We balance the interests of our various stakeholders; and
- We seek insights to help the industry innovate.

Through advocacy and awareness, promoting research and innovation, we work to build a stronger understanding of our industry.

To give you a small snapshot of Canada's gaming industry:

- It directly employs more than 182,000 Canadians contributing \$11.9 billion in total labour income, with an average annual salary of \$65,000.
- Purchases more than \$14.6 billion annually in goods and services.
- Produces \$18.9 billion of valued-added GDP to the Canadian economy.

Nationally, the industry generates over \$9 billion for governments and charities each year.

Here in British In British Columbia, the gaming industry plays a vital part in the provincial economy by employing over 29,000 people and generating over \$5 billion in economic activity.

Canada's gaming industry is one of the most highly regulated industries in the country, as virtually every facet of the gaming industry is subject to regulatory oversight. Complying with the provincial regulatory frameworks as well as applicable provincial and federal legislation is fundamental to the day-to-day operations of casinos across Canada.

At every level of employee, there is responsibility and accountability to adhering to this regulatory oversight to ensure the casino industry can continue to be not only compliant, but also to ensure we remain an enjoyable, dependable source of entertainment for the millions of adult customers we have here not only in British Columbia and across the country.

The success of our business is built upon upholding the public trust -- of governments, regulators and customers -- by delivering fair games in safe and secure gaming environments. And we build on that trust through rigorous regulatory oversight, testing of gaming products, strong internal controls and polices, and world-leading responsible gaming programs.

To accomplish this and to operate in compliance with the regulatory structure, applicable laws, and enforcement agencies, the casino industry has committed extensive resources to ensuring these functions like surveillance, security and compliance can meet these obligations.

Quite simply, regulatory oversight is built into the DNA of our industry.

We are committed to rigorous regulatory oversight and being be a strong partner in Canada's anti-money laundering regime. We continue to do this by collaborating with FINTRAC, provincial gaming agencies and law enforcement, as we recognize that Canada's AML regime operates on the basis of really three interdependent pillars: prevention and detection, disruption and enforcement, and policy

and coordination. In short, it's a partnership that is strongest when we all work together.

So today I'd like to focus my remarks on the three pillars.

Talking about prevention and detection. For casino operators, their primary role is prevention and detection through compliance with anti-money laundering regulations and identifying suspicious transactions, large cash transactions and casino disbursements. We then report that information not only to FINTRAC, but also to gaming regulators and directly with law enforcement as needed.

Our industry's commitment to combatting financial crime is demonstrated by the deployment of a large number of dedicated and well trained security, surveillance and compliance professionals. We also use sophisticated tools such as state-of-the-art surveillance and information management systems to monitor, record and analyze activities.

Our compliance programs are regulated and audited by independent third-party firms, provincial regulators and FINTRAC themselves.

Despite the attention and media stories surrounding the issue of money laundering in Lower Mainland casinos, to the best of my knowledge it has never been asserted that gaming operators failed to detect and report suspicious activities in accordance with anti-money laundering regulations.

In fact, one GPEB report cited in the first report by Dr. German stated that:

It is believed that Casino Service Providers...are in fact being diligent and forthright in expediently reporting Suspicious Currency Transactions and other matters of wrongdoing via Section 86 reports.

This is an important point. While we are always looking to improve our compliance programs, there is every indication that gaming operators are playing their part in the anti-money laundering regime.

With casino reporting representing less than

two percent of the total reports received by FINTRAC in any given year, we highly value the industry's relationship with FINTRAC. We know the value our reports provide to their analysts in "following the money." They have been good partners to industry over the years by working on refinements and improving the reporting relationship.

Our industry also participates with the Department of Finance industry advisory group, and on several occasions, we have welcomed the participation of Department of Finance and FINTRAC officials for our industry's annual conference, the Canadian Gaming Summit.

In short, gaming operators are delivering on their pillar of Canada's AML regime: the prevention and detection of money laundering.

On to disruption and enforcement. There is a need for increased efforts by law enforcement.

In its 2016 mutual evaluation of Canada, the Financial Action Task Force noted in its key findings that: "Law enforcement results are not consummate with the [money laundering] risk and asset recovery is low." This observation was really reinforced by RCMP Assistant Commissioner Joanne Crampton during her testimony to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance in 2018, where she said:

Due to time constraints, resource limitations, and the efficacy of prosecuting certain charges over others in these dynamic and complex cases, following through on proceeds of crime or money laundering charges is not often tenable.

Part of the Commission's terms of reference involves looking at barriers to effective law enforcement respecting money laundering in British Columbia. And I do want to focus of the need to enhance resources for law enforcement.

Across Canada, the gaming industry has a strong and productive working relationship with law enforcement. It is critically important that there are resources for the industry's reporting efforts to be acted upon. Awareness of police investigations and the ensuing arrests or

seizures are visible outcomes and deterrents, as well as proof that the system works.

Law enforcement needs to be adequately trained not only in investigating money laundering and other financial crimes, but also to have a deep understanding of the industries they are actually investigating. Committed, long-term funding with permanent units will allow law enforcement to build the expertise to be more effective in all areas of AML enforcement including data analysis or forensic accounting.

On to policy and coordination. The CGA believes sound policy and coordination among stakeholders are critical to the foundation and the success of Canada's AML regime.

In Canada's gaming industry, the designation of the entity responsible for federal anti-money laundering compliance largely falls to the "government of a province" that "conducts and manages" gaming in accordance with the Criminal Code. Most provinces have created Crown corporations to conduct and manage gaming, so the responsibility for AML compliance and reporting under federal law has been delegated to these agencies. In British Columbia, that responsibility has fallen to BCLC.

But provinces also have legislation that governs the regulation and oversight of gaming and, in many cases, the provincial legislation predated federal anti-money laundering regulations. For example, gaming operators in British Columbia are required to file a Section 86 report with GPEB when they suspect any illegal activity, including money laundering. This is in addition to reporting requirements to FINTRAC.

As cited in Dr. German's first report, the transition to a risk-based or standards-based approach would be supported by the gaming industry. It is, and the model is seen in mature gaming industries across the globe but also in other industries. And we highlighted many of that in our initial submission. Here in Canada, we have a similar model in Ontario through the Alcohol and Gaming Commission of Ontario.

CGA supports items like further examination of the recommendation that Suspicious Transaction Reports be completed by service providers and

 should be submitted directly to FINTRAC, while these reports would also be shared with BCLC.

We understand there were similar recommendations in the 2018 report of the Federal Standing Committee on Finance in its review of the Proceeds of Crime Act, titled Confronting Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing: Moving Canada Forward.

We would encourage policy makers to look at these recommendations seriously and look at a comprehensive approach to preventing money laundering across the broader economy, regardless of sector, and focus on compliance and reporting obligations on certain at-risk activities and transactions, versus trying to define specific industries. For example, in the United States, any trade or business that accepts \$10,000 or more in cash from a customer must file a report with the IRS and FinCEN. It's not designated to a specific sector of the economy. We believe this approach would allow for actually a more a seamless approach to confronting AML.

So in summary, I want to reiterate the Canadian gaming industry's commitment to playing its part in the fight against money laundering and financial crime. As I said earlier, regulatory oversight is built into the DNA of our industry and is top of mind to every operator, every day.

The gaming industry will continue to be a strong partner in Canada's AML regime because it is strongest when we all work together. I hope my comments have highlighted some areas to focus on for the Commission and I would be happy to take any questions. Thank you very much.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR. BURNS: Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr. Martland.

MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, just because our record should reflect it, Mr. Burns, Paul Burns, who just spoke is the President and CEO of the Canadian Gaming Association.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MR. MARTLAND: He wasn't here yesterday and so wasn't introduced on the record then, so I just thought I would make sure his name is on our record.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

Opening Statement by Mr. Usher and Mr. Mayr The Society of Notaries Public of B.C.

MR. MARTLAND: We have Mr. Usher next for the Society of Notaries Public.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. USHER AND MR. MAYR (SOCIETY OF NOTARIES PUBLIC):

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

1

2

3 4

> MR. USHER: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr. Usher.

I'm here with John Mayr, our Executive MR. USHER: Director, so unless it presents some difficulty, we'll do this together.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Usher. MR. USHER: Just a note. I've handed up a copy of our written presentation. It's been given electronically to your staff and I take it it will be distributed to everyone later.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I understand that's the case. And I do have a copy. Thank you.

MR. MAYR: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. The Society of Notaries Public welcomes the opportunity to make this presentation to the Cullen Commission. We'd like to acknowledge that we're on the unceded territory of the Coast Salish people.

We'd like to express our thanks and gratitude to the you, the Commissioner, and the Commission staff for the opportunity. It certainly is an important inquiry that certainly needs to be done.

MR. USHER: A few background notes might be in order just through the uniqueness of the role of notaries public in British Columbia. So it is unique in fact that our members are legal service providers with a scope of practice that includes areas of non-contentious legal services, particularly including real estate transactions.

So throughout this when we refer to notaries public, we mean the members of the Society of Notaries Public of British Columbia who hold a Royal Commission granted by the Supreme Court of British Columbia appointing them as a Notary. course, all lawyers who are practising members of the Law Society are by statute notaries public in and for the Province of B.C., but of course we do not regulate lawyer notaries.

There are also, I should point out, a very small number of notaries directly appointed by the Government, mostly in government service, but

42 43 44

45 46

47

 Opening Statement by Mr. Usher and Mr. Mayr The Society of Notaries Public of B.C.

again, they are not regulated by us as well. There's probably 20 or 30 of those.

So of course some history is in order. B.C. notaries are common law notaries, and they've been in practice in British Columbia since the earliest days of the colonies of Vancouver Island and British Columbia. they do, as you might expect, is similar to the practice of notaries in England in the mid-1800s. Of course Ouebec has notaries and they are civil law notaries. The common law notarial practice split from the civil tradition in the 1500s. That said, there are many similarities between notaries around the world as they everywhere focus on non-contentious legal matters. of the current oath of office and commission in B.C. is directly taken from the English Public Notaries Act of 1843.

So every one of our members, when installed in the professional before a Supreme Court Judge, takes the following oath, and it has a bit of interesting arcane language in it that needs some explanation:

I do swear that I will not make or attest any act, contract or instrument in which I know there is violence or fraud, and in all things I will act uprightly and justly in the office of a Notary Public.

And of course the word "violence" here is a term from the 1800s. At that time a meaning of it was they would not -- a document altered without authorization. So if you did violence to a document, it meant you've made changes to it and you introduced fraud in it.

So that's the oath to this day. It's right from the *Notaries Act* and Regulation in our modern statute.

And we should note that the very first document filed in our Land Registry system, on May 4th, 1861, was witnessed by a notary public.

MR. MAYR: The Society of Notaries Public was established in 1926, and not unlike other professional organizations back then, it was an advocacy body which represented the profession as opposed to the public. It was about in 1967 that

Opening Statement by Mr. Usher and Mr. Mayr The Society of Notaries Public of B.C.

the provincial Government delegated to the Society the authority and responsibilities to regulate the profession in the public interest.

Currently the Society is responsible for setting and establishing standards of education, ensuring that commissioned notaries are competent to practise and protect the public in the delivery of legal services. We also enquire into matters of conduct and conduct discipline proceedings, always with the public interest in mind. We'd like to point out that currently notaries public must receive a Master of Arts in Applied Legal Studies or an equivalent level of education to be commissioned in this province.

The Society of Notaries Public, like other regulators in British Columbia, should be considered as law enforcement agencies. We do enforce the *Notaries Act*.

MR. USHER: So currently there are about -- well, actually not about -- exactly 396 practising notaries, our members, in the province. point out that that's not quite double the number of staff the Law Society has. So we're a fairly small organization. But those members, in the last 12 months, did 88,956 real estate transactions involving trust funds, in the 12 months preceding February 15th, 2020. This represents a significant percentage of the real estate transfers and mortgages done in the province. While there are no precise statistics, notaries are also primary providers of personal planning legal services, including wills, representation agreements and powers of attorney. Our notaries are generally storefront practices that build long-term relationships with their clients. The principles of "know your client" are fundamental to those relationships and assist in the understanding of the source of funds used in transactions.

Our notaries are reporting entities under the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act, and they comply with the provisions of that act. They are subject to FINTRAC audits. And it should be noted that to date no B.C. notary has been subject to a penalty imposed under that act.

Our members are bound by the privacy

Opening Statement by Mr. Usher and Mr. Mayr The Society of Notaries Public of B.C.

provisions of the British Columbia Personal Information Protection Act and other privacy legislation. It is important to note that solicitor-client privilege does not apply to their client relationships. There is a court decision giving that privilege to Quebec notaries but it does not apply to B.C. notaries. Notaries can and routinely do cooperate with police and tax enforcement agencies as required by law. Of course they're subject to compliance with our act, our rules, bylaws, and our Society's "Principles for ethical and professional conduct guideline," similar to the rules that lawyers must follow.

The practice of notaries necessarily involves compliance with the administration of federal and provincial statutes, the collection and remittance of applicable taxes as well as constant attention to the avoidance of money laundering.

As a regulatory body, the Society and its members recognize and understand the negative effects of money laundering, and we generally in our work have adopted the United Nations definition of money laundering, which I think is generally accepted.

MR. MAYR: There can be no doubt that there are complex interactions between government policy and legal services. Those include things like housing affordability, allegations of money laundering, the conversion of offshore capital, and the public sentiment and trust in the systems.

Concerns about affordability go back very far in British Columbia, and the Commission faces a daunting task in sorting out with some degree of precision to which money laundering is a significant factor, for example, in affordability. The Society stands ready to assist as we can in the task. But a serious attempt needs to be made to see if it is possible to do better than a guestimate of the inestimable.

There is a tension that exits between measures related to taxation and transparency and affordability and privacy. Despite the fact that the vast majority of land in the province is

 Opening Statement by Mr. Usher and Mr. Mayr The Society of Notaries Public of B.C.

owned by individuals, there is a concern that beneficial ownership is hidden through corporations and trusts. Our members will be on the forefront and centre of the effective launch and operation of the Land Ownership and Transparency Act.

MR. USHER: We sit on various consultative committees with our Land Title people and other agencies in the development of this, and we're very impressed. It looks like Land Title is just ready to go with that fairly soon.

LOTA -- that's the Land Ownership and Transparency Act -- will create a publicly accessible registry of beneficial interests in land that will include information on freehold interests, life interests, leasehold leases with a term of more than 10 years, contractual rights to occupy land, et cetera. These obligations arise in relation to interests that are registered. So don't forget, LOTA is not going to apply to unregistered interests in land, which of course is very rare, because without that registration, one does not get the benefits of our amazing Torrens system.

Not surprisingly, though, it is anticipated that reporting and maintenance of records related this will increase the cost related to real estate transactions by a significant amount. Every single real estate transaction in future, starting this year, will have a significant amount more work, a significant amount of formfilling. We're still just working with our members trying to get a sense of how much this is going to add to both fees and disbursements in every transaction.

Now, it's intriguing to note, of course, that information about shareholders used to be publicly available. It was for many, many decades. But access to that was removed through an act of the Province, interestingly due to concerns about the negative impact on foreign investment and privacy. So concerns of these rules -- for example, there was decades where we had to collect citizenship declarations. That came out of panic about European investment in British Columbia in the '70s. Hundreds of thousands of those forms were completed. I'm

 told no one ever looked at them until the day they were trucked out of a warehouse in Burnaby and burnt.

MR. MAYR: We'd next like to speak a little about real estate and the role of legal professionals. The involvement of notaries and lawyers in real estate transactions has can be summarized quite simply. It allows for strangers to exchange money for real property in a safe, effective, and efficient manner. How we carry out our real estate transactions in B.C. is the envy of much of the world and really speaks to the solid basis of our Torrens system.

In essentially every instance, the funds for real estate transactions that notaries receive come directly from regulated Canadian financial institutions. This is usually in the way of a bank draft, a credit union official cheque, or a direct deposit from one of these financial institutions.

Our members, notaries, do do due diligence on these deposits, including source of funds determinations. By rules, our members cannot accept certified cheques unless they personally attend to the financial institution, and a member may also deposit trust account cheques from lawyers or real estate brokerages. Historically, our system has been stable, safe, and trusted. Issues with bad funds are very, very rare.

MR. USHER: Of course, there have been many reports suggesting what are the indicators of money laundering. But we feel it's important to say that there are numerous and legitimate reasons that a person may purchase property, for example, and not require a mortgage. Money is not necessarily being laundered when a student from a well-off family purchases a home, even when the value is extraordinary, so long as the funds are not the result of "any act or attempted act to disguise the source of money or assets derived from criminal activity." We note, for example, that the Property Law Act specifies that it is illegal in British Columbia to discriminate in terms of the purchase of real estate in regard to national origin or citizenship. So that was baked into our Property Law Act at the time of the concerns in the '70s.

Opening Statement by Mr. Usher and Mr. Mayr The Society of Notaries Public of B.C.

So we urge the Commission to consult broadly with experts. We need to put B.C. in a world position. You know, we're not immune to worldwide trends and economic factors. This is often referred to as the financialization of real estate. And as we look for explanations, we can't look at British Columbia in some isolation.

But there are several other matters that we think are important. Unfortunately, it appears that current law enforcement and monitoring systems may be fundamentally broken. Amongst other factors, this is in part due to underfunding and resourcing. We are very sympathetic to the plight of the many dedicated persons in our agencies charged with law enforcement. They are entitled to resources appropriate to our expectations of results.

There are lots of statistics on crime rates. Money laundering convictions are rare. There are very few prosecutions. What criminals, though, take advantage of are siloes of information. We are very pleased to be part of *Project Athena*, which you heard about. It's a useful and tangible attempt to break down unnecessary barriers. Recently we hosted the project's real estate subgroup in a very successful meeting just a block away from here.

We are aware of a matter where FINTRAC received suspicious transaction reports with respect to one of our members. Neither the reporting entity nor FINTRAC or any other agency advised, notified or otherwise provided information to the Society in regard to their concerns. That information would have provided the opportunity for the Society as a regulator to conduct targeted audits and inspections.

MR. MAYR: The failure to share information, to inform and advise any regulator, including the Society of Notaries, simply deepened the fraud and caused harm to members of the public.

The Society recommends that the Commission examine and explore barriers to sharing information. We would ask that you encourage government to make clear provisions and statutes that provide for sharing of information with appropriate agencies, including regulators.

THE COMMISSIONER: I take it you're not looking for a

Opening Statement by Mr. Usher and Mr. Mayr The Society of Notaries Public of B.C.

regime that's similar to what BCLC does as the reporting agency for the service providers.

MR. USHER: In terms that we would provide the -- THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.

MR. USHER: No, no. I don't think so. And I think it seems to work -- the reporting is at the right level, I think.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

- MR. USHER: What we're talking about here, though, is how can we get in the loop. And for example, at the *Project Athena* meeting, the police were there was a shared information about a matter under way, and it took what was the time? 14 months to get a response from FINTRAC by the police.
- MR. MAYR: Yeah. The police requested information from FINTRAC and it was 11 months later that they received the information. And in today's society, the speed in which money moves, that was probably transacted a hundred thousand times before the RCMP received information about the transaction.
- MR. USHER: We need to find some way to make sure that the filing, for example, of STRs -- suspicious transaction reports -- can be more widely shared in a timely way with people who have regulatory authority. Nothing is more frustrating to a regulator than to hear, years later, that people were filing STRs and we knew nothing about it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.

- MR. MAYR: For clarity, we would propose that a scheme for information sharing include agencies like FINTRAC, Canada Revenue Agency, courts at all levels, law enforcement agencies, taxation audit programs, and of course professional regulators.
- MR. USHER: Just to make it clear, in B.C. the information held by our members is under this Personal Information Protection Act, but s. 18 of that gives the circumstances when it can be shared. So for example -- and I set that out, s. 18 -- and a good example is on an urgent basis recently, we were able to respond and work with the RCMP, who were dealing on a weekend with an urgent situation in one of our member's offices. I was able to attend and explain to them how s. 18 worked and that that provision allowed them that very sensitive -- time sensitive criminal

 Opening Statement by Mr. Usher and Mr. Mayr The Society of Notaries Public of B.C.

investigation to proceed without delay. And as a result, the RCMP were able to gather the necessary evidence directly in the office of the notary.

Current provincial law, of course, requires disclosure of information regarding transactions. However, we want to point out that some laws require unrelated individuals -- by that I mean strangers -- verifying information about other people. We would suggest that the information reporting systems could be strengthened by the Commission making recommendations concerning the collecting of information from appropriate parties. By way of example, requiring the buyer of a property to provide information about the seller, and then to subject the buyer to fines for the quality of that information of a seller is nonsensical.

I think a key here is we want to consider what improvements can be made to the collection of critical tax and ownership information -- and here's the key point we want to make -- so that the right information is collected at the right time, attested to by the right party. Notaries are well positioned to be trusted collectors and remitters of appropriate and necessary transactional information from properly advised clients.

MR. MAYR: With respect to the objects of the Commission and your mandate, it deals with the interaction between professional services, legal and accounting, and money laundering. Members of the Society are legal services providers who are entitled to and provide legal services directly to the public. They collect information and maintain information directly from the public. Courts have long held that the standards of practice, standard of care, is no different for a lawyer in this province than for a notary.

We'd like to note that there now exists technology which would allow a regulator to monitor and collect data from trust account activity seamlessly and using technology. And we'd like to see some of these very forward-looking technological applications considered as within the mandate of regulators.

MR. USHER: The Law Society in their presentation

 Opening Statement by Mr. Usher and Mr. Mayr The Society of Notaries Public of B.C.

mentioned this, and this would require perhaps some statutory authority to us to use these technologies. And this would very much allow us -- we of course audit trust accounts -- but if we could have sort of a more real-time monitoring of those, that would be much appreciated.

Of course, you're also charged with looking at acts or omissions of regulatory authorities. I can tell you we're not aware of any acts or omissions or allegations that we have acted or failed to act.

That said, though, we're a small organization and there's always new things happening. We are very committed to regularly reviewing our operations to ensure that best regulatory practices are being maintained and improved in response to changing conditions.

The Society adopted and fully embraced the FINTRAC regime, and that's something that frankly has worked out fine. As a result, we provide training and education to both our members but also we've -- I personally on a number of occasions have provided education to FINTRAC auditors and assessors so they can fully understand. So this has been a regular thing we've done over the years, that they meet with us, we meet with them, so they fully understand what our members do.

Because it was a new thing. It was a new thing for FINTRAC to deal with our members, who we're mostly single practitioners. FINTRAC is often working with the Royal Bank, for example. So it was quite a different world for them to understand how transactions work, and in particular how transactions work in B.C. estate practice is a provincial requirement in Canada. And so just because it works some way in Alberta, that's not how it works in British Columbia. So we've really appreciated their reaching out to us to make sure that their audits make most sense in the light of how things are actually done in British Columbia.

MR. MAYR: You are also charged with reviewing the scope and effectiveness of the powers, duties and functions carried out by regulatory authorities. The government and the public would benefit from strengthening the statutory framework for

Opening Statement by Mr. Usher and Mr. Mayr The Society of Notaries Public of B.C.

regulatory professionals, and we've seen some action there with respect to real estate professionals.

The Notaries Act, although it's functional, is dated, and effective regulation requires modernization and forward-looking statutory provisions. Money laundering rarely looks backwards.

With the existing framework, the Society is an effective regulatory agency. We regulate our members in the public interest and in the interest of a civil society. That said, we look forward to working with the Commission on a range of possible enhancements to the regulatory regime in the province.

MR. USHER: Of course there are barriers to law enforcement. And of course a theme we've been hearing about is how can we enhance our tools and share information. I think that's really critical. Our act is very inflexible in the discipline we can impose. And again, we've long sought improvements to the various manners in which we can carry out our disciplinary requirements. We need to look and recommend how everybody involved in this ecosystem can share information.

Some further suggestions. There is no doubt that those involved in money laundering and financial fraud take advantage of the speed at which money now moves.

With respect to real estate transactions, we propose that slowing down the transaction by statutorily requiring a set period of time between contract finalization and completion would allow for legal professionals and other reporting agencies to be able to fully carry out appropriate due diligence, data collection, tax clearances and data validation.

We need some high quality registries and data validation tools that are available for our members to access. This needs to be done affordably, because of course the cost of all these registries and searches -- for example *LOTA* will be a new search that our members are going to have to do. Of course, it ends up being a consumer cost.

Of particular concern to us is that the

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

Opening Statement by Mr. Usher and Mr. Mayr The Society of Notaries Public of B.C.

Commission needs to take a careful look at mortgage lending by unregulated and non-reporting entities. Of particular interest there will be the source of funds used for making those loans.

We've already had communications with the B.C. government in regard to the remarkable digital initiatives they're taking. particular, for example, some remarkable tools to do digital identification, linking driver's licence/B.C. card directly with government databases to verify them. I've had the experience in my office of giving evidence in court based on the ID I took in a transaction. I'm pleased to report that the fellow was It was someone pretending to be a convicted. seller. Unfortunately the bad guys got the money. All collapsed based on disclosure laws. But at least the guy I gave evidence about went to jail. And that was based on the ID practices I had in my law firm at the time.

The ubiquitous use of the digital exchange of funds is inevitable. So we're going that way. So it's very important that the systems be designed to provide auditable, contextual data that will allow for appropriate confirmation of the source and reliability of funds, and for our timely auditing. In that end we've been attending Canadian Payments Association meetings, and there are many really interesting enhancements coming. The Canadian Payments -what's now called Payments Canada is the statutory regulator of the payment system in Canada. They're doing some remarkable work in the international context. Again, that's going to allow for this contextual data to travel with A difficulty of so many of our the funds. current systems, all that travels is an account number, an amount and a date, and it does not provide contextual information for that. we support the work that the Canadian Payments Association is doing in that regard, and I would urge that someone -- obviously missing from this room, in my view, are the financial institutions and Payments Canada. So I urge you to take a look at them.

On the not so simple end, an examination needs to be made for reform to courts and

 judicial systems. Obviously this is complex and controversial, but effective prosecutions remain the ultimate deterrence to crime. I ask -- and I appreciate the controversy exists in the legal world. I think it's timely to ask if the R. v. Stinchombe disclosure requirements need to be reconsidered. Are they really serving justice?

Obviously in all of this we've got to find a

Obviously in all of this we've got to find a balance between privacy and transparency. But we cannot allow privacy to be a shield to obfuscate source of funds, beneficial ownership, and money laundering.

We've got to follow the money, and I would just urge the Commission to make sure you've got in the room the people who are tasked with both guarding the money and creating systems that follow money flow.

There's a law that is absolutely going to play out here. It's the law of unintended consequences. Many good ideas on first blush have consequences that we really can't anticipate. So I just urge the Commission -- you've got an excellent staff -- to explore with a forward-looking perspective and diverse consultations you make, the potential effects of any recommendations you make.

So for example, what are the costs? What are the time costs? What are the implications of these things? So there are many ideas that have been touted over the last few years about these issues, rarely, though, with a fulsome look at the consequences of those ideas.

MR. MAYR: In closing, the Society of Notaries Public and counsel for the Society are available to assist and inform the Commission concerning real estate and land transactions in this province.

We encourage the Commission to maintain a connection with he Society of Notaries Public, as we are committed to supporting the Commission in the daunting work of developing real world solutions to money laundering concerns based on methodical research and thoughtful policy development.

Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Mayr and Mr. Usher.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. CAMLEY (BMW):

MS. CAMLEY:

Canada and BMW Financial Services, a division of BMW Canada Inc.

BMW Canada Inc. is a Canadian subsidiary of BMW AG, a German multinational company that

BMW AG, a German multinational company that manufactures and distributes luxury vehicles and mobility services through its retail network.

BMW Financial Services provides financial services, including leasing and financing of vehicles to BMW customers in Canada.

Mr. Commissioner, we are counsel for BMW

As a globally recognized manufacturer and marketer of motor vehicles, the BMW name and brand is well known. BMW's vehicles are marketed under the following brands: BMW, MINI, and Rolls-Royce. BMW has a substantial presence in Canada, with 51 BMW retailers, 30 MINI retailers, four Rolls-Royce retailers, and 20 BMW Motorcycle retailers nationally.

In British Columbia, BMW, MINI, and Rolls-Royce vehicles are sold through authorized retailers in Vancouver, North Vancouver, Richmond, Langley, Victoria, Nanaimo, and Kelowna.

Additionally, BMW vehicles are heavily traded on the Canadian used car market both with authorized and unauthorized dealers.

BMW is the only luxury vehicle manufacturer, seller and financer who has applied for and been granted standing as a participant in this inquiry. BMW is privileged to be taking part in this historic inquiry as a participant and to have the opportunity to address the Commission today.

BMW sought participation in this inquiry because, as an industry leader, it believes it can help the Commission fulfil its mandate to make fair, accurate, and helpful findings and recommendations for the benefit of the automotive industry and British Columbia consumers. The scope of the Commission's mandate is broad. It has been called upon to make findings of fact and recommendations respecting money laundering in British Columbia.

As money laundering is insidious in nature, it is important for those who may have on-the-

 ground knowledge about its extent, growth, evolution, and methods of money laundering to share their experiences and insights with the Commission.

We cannot forget that this inquiry was established for the benefit of the British Columbia public. Money laundering is a serious problem in British Columbia. It will continue to flourish if action is not taken. The people of British Columbia are concerned. BMW is concerned, as are its customers.

As Peter German writes:

All those attributes which make Greater Vancouver a very desirable region in which to live, also make it desirable to organized crime. In recent years, the region has acquired the unenviable reputation for serving as a site for money laundering, drug trafficking, and capital flight.

It is both an embarrassment and a threat to society that adheres to the Rule of Law, for organized crime to take advantage of all that is good in our society and subvert it for its pecuniary advantage.

BMW seeks to contribute to the Inquiry by being open and transparent in its insights, experiences, and industry leading practices.

Vancouver is known as the luxury car capital of North America. As you will know, it is not unusual to see many high end luxury vehicles on the streets of Metro Vancouver at any time on any given day of the week.

Not only is there a huge market for luxury vehicles in British Columbia, there is a demand for luxury housing for luxury vehicles. A development called the Trove located in Richmond is currently selling auto storage condominiums to luxury car owners. Trove promises to "redefine what it means to own a luxury vehicle in Vancouver." The base price for one unit is \$600,000 and its owners can choose to pay more to customize their units.

Given the climate and appetite in British Columbia for luxury vehicles and their high end

accessories, perhaps unsurprisingly, the terms of reference direct the Commission to review Peter German's second report, which deals with luxury car vehicle sales. The second German report engages in an extensive review of the luxury vehicle market and its use in money laundering and grey market schemes, and makes findings and comments related to:

- The cash sales of luxury vehicles as a means to launder proceeds of unlawful activity;
- The use of straw buyers and nominees to effect illegal export of luxury vehicles of grey market schemes in China and elsewhere, including tax refund schemes;
- The export of luxury vehicles for the purposes of laundering money for criminal organizations and terrorist organizations; and
- Theft of luxury vehicles for money laundering purposes.

As one of the world's leading luxury car manufacturers, BMW has important information to present to the Commission relating to the unlawful export of BMW vehicles and the use of straw buyers and nominees to conduct these exports. Additionally, BMW will share with the Commission the various efforts BMW already undertakes to combat this issue.

BMW will provide the Commission with recommendations which would ensure a balance between the efficient growth in the luxury car vehicle industry while building in safeguards to combat money laundering.

So what is the vehicle grey market? The Financial Action Task Force defines trade-based money laundering as "the process of disguising the proceeds of crime and moving value through the use of trade transactions in an attempt to legitimize their illegal origins or finance their activities."

The Financial Action Task Force considers

8 9 10

12 13 14

11

15 16 17

18

19

24 25 26

32 33 34

35

31

45

46 47

trade-based money laundering as one of the principle methods by which criminal organizations and terrorist financiers move money for the purpose of disguising its origin and integrating it into the formal economy.

A grey market exists where a brand owner or manufacturer's products are purchased and then resold outside of an approved distribution network. Money laundering through exporting vehicles purchased for domestic use, known as the vehicle grey market, is an example of trade-based money laundering.

The grey market export scheme is further described by Peter German in his Second Report at page 196 as follows:

> The grey market export of vehicles in B.C. is a significant and rapidly growing problem. There has been an explosion in the number of grey market vehicles exported to China since 2013 growing from less than 100 vehicles in 2013 to over 4,400 vehicles in 2018.

These vehicles are purchased for domestic use by straw buyers --

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry to interrupt you.

MS. CAMLEY: Yes?

THE COMMISSIONER: But is that all B.C. numbers. MS. CAMLEY: As far as I understand, it is, but I can confirm that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. CAMLEY: Yes. It's directly out Mr. German's report.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.

MS. CAMLEY: These vehicles are purchased for domestic use by straw buyers working for a fee or commission on behalf of exporters, who then rapidly ship the vehicles overseas where international price differentials ensure huge profits. B.C.'s unique geographic location and ethnography make it an incredibly attractive venue for this activity.

> A straw buyer is not the true purchaser of an asset but represents that he or she is. An exporter of luxury cars will employ a network of family, friends, or sometimes

Opening Statement by Ms. Camley BMW

17 18

23 24 25

26 27 28

29 30 31

32 33 34

35 36 37

38

39 40

41 42

44 45

47

43 in the following manner: 46

people recruited online or via word of mouth. These straw buyers or agents will sign the paperwork at dealerships, buy cars, and then drop them off to be exported. return, they receive a small commission on the vehicle, typically ranging from a few thousand dollars and corresponding to less than five percent of the vehicle's value.

Because these grey market vehicles are being exported with appropriate taxes paid and are not reported as stolen, [Canadian Border Services Agency] [and police] neither has the mandate nor the authority to detain or seize the vehicles prior to export, even if trade-based money laundering is suspected.

So BMW is aware of and actually works to combat the grey market in its vehicles. BMW --

- THE COMMISSIONER: BMW has a pecuniary interest in this, I take it. It undercuts their market in the foreign countries? Is that the idea?
- MS. CAMLEY: That's part of it, but it's also from a corporate citizen perspective.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, I missed that.
- MS. CAMLEY: It's also from a corporate citizen perspective --
- THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
- MS. CAMLEY: -- and a brand protection perspective.
- THE COMMISSIONER: No, I understand that
- MS. CAMLEY: Yes.
- THE COMMISSIONER: But there is a market issue there for BMW.
- MS. CAMLEY: There is, yes. And we hope that when we are a the point of providing evidence that we'll be able --
- THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
- MS. CAMLEY: -- to expand that particular issue.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.
- So in BMW's experience, experience, the MS. CAMLEY: unlawful export of its vehicles typically occurs
 - A straw buyer or nominee presents at a BMW dealership seeking to purchase a vehicle;

 - The straw buyer or nominee enters into an agreement for the purchase of the vehicle, pursuant to which a down payment is made, followed by payment of the balance of the purchase price, typically to be made in instalments for a specified term.

This is either a loan or a lease.

- The straw buyer or nominee provides the down payment to BMW, usually in the form of a bank draft as opposed to cash;
- The straw buyer or nominee takes delivery of the vehicle;
- Shortly after entering into the agreement for the purchase of the vehicle, the straw buyer or nominee contacts BMW to request a quote on an early payout of the financed purchase price of the vehicle;
- Soon after this, the straw buyer or nominee provides a bank draft to BMW, representing the balance of the purchase price for the vehicle;
- The circumstances in which the bank draft is sent to BMW are routinely suspicious, leading BMW to suspect that the vehicle has already been transferred to an unknown third party, without BMW's consent in breach of the lease or finance agreement. BMW attempts to exercise its rights to periodically determine the location of the vehicle under the agreement, by:

Using either GPS tracking equipment to determine the location of the vehicle. However, through human intervention, GPS tracking equipment can be rendered unresponsive, resulting in a failure to indicate the vehicle's location. The failure of GPS tracking equipment, on its own...is a rare [occasion].

And then the second opportunity is:

Demanding that the straw buyer or nominee advise BMW of the vehicle's location and to produce the vehicle for inspection. Again typically, the straw buyer or nominee reneges on producing the vehicle, or fails or refuses to do so.

- Then BMW cannot determine the location of the vehicle.
- And then often the vehicle is not recovered.

So why is this a problem for BMW? Customers who purchase, lease, or finance certain BMW models in Canada must sign a non-export agreement. The export of these specific models from Canada, within a certain timeframe after the customer takes delivery of the vehicle, constitutes a breach of the non-export agreement.

BMW has been and will continue to vigorously enforce its non-export agreements through civil litigation. As a good corporate citizen, it has committed to combatting money laundering. It upholds its commitment by seeking the assistance of the civil courts when necessary.

Additionally, BMW is aware of global trends and tactics in relation to money laundering. It has first-hand knowledge that exporters seeking to unlawfully export BMWs often set up schemes which involve straw buyers or nominees, as previously explained. Through these schemes, illegitimate money may be converted into a tangible asset, being a BMW vehicle, which is then exported from Canada and sold at a great profit to external markets.

Further, as Peter German describes in his second report, the grey market for the export of luxury vehicles takes advantage of the current legislation to avoid paying provincial sales tax, which is not payable if the vehicle is purchased with the intent to resell.

As resellers are legally entitled to have the provincial sales tax refunded, illegal export results in a significant burden on the Ministry

of Finance, as substantial time is required to process tax return claims by civil servants.

Further, the Province of British Columbia loses millions of dollars in lost provincial sales tax revenue through wrongful refunds. On luxury vehicles in British Columbia, the provincial sales tax equals 10 percent of vehicle prices between \$57,000 and \$125,000. It's 15 percent on vehicles between \$125,000 and \$150,000, and it's 20 percent on vehicles \$150,000 and more.

In this way, the vehicle grey market scheme interfaces with the legitimate economy.

The Commission and the people of British Columbia should be troubled by what is happening. BMW is troubled. BMW wishes to assist the Commission to make recommendations to curb the proliferation of the vehicle grey market. It is costing the Province significant money, while illegal exporters are making great profits, profits which may not be reported as income to the Canadian Revenue Agency and are therefore not taxed.

So what is BMW doing to combat illegal exports? BMW is regarded as a leader in the automotive community in its commitment to combatting the unlawful export of vehicles from Canada. That's why it asked to participate in the Inquiry.

The mechanisms that BMW employs to combat unlawful export include:

- The implementation of an export prevention policy applicable to BMW retailers across Canada, which mandates the use of a know your customer process and a red flag checklist to determine whether a sale, lease, or finance of a BMW vehicle should be completed;
- The continued education of BMW retailers;
- The auditing of BMW retailers;
- The use of non-export agreements; and
- The enforcement of non-export agreements

through civil litigation.

 In terms of internal policies, BMW has implemented certain internal policies applicable to all BMW retailers across Canada designed to curb unauthorized reselling and unlawful exports of vehicles. These policies set out a series of mandatory steps its retailers are obliged to follow when selling, leasing, or financing certain BMW models.

As an industry leader, BMW revisits and amends these policies on a regular basis, to ensure that its practices effectively address the changing methods by which money laundering occurs in the luxury vehicle market. As part of this process, BMW conducts meetings with its retailers to ensure the lessons learned from the retail networks are meaningfully incorporated into its policies and procedures.

As mentioned, one of the mechanisms through which BMW attempts to curb unlawful exports is through the implementation of a mandatory know your customer process. This process applies to all BMW retailers nationally and must be carried out each and every time a BMW vehicle is sold, leased, or financed in Canada.

In certain circumstances, retailers are encouraged to carry out an enhanced measure on top of the mandatory know your customer processes, such as when a customer resides a great distance from the retailer or is new to BMW. In these circumstances, retailers must request additional financial or employment information from those customers to ensure sufficient credit-worthiness and to minimize the risk that the vehicle is not being purchased with illegitimate funds.

Additionally, BMW retailers are required to use a red flag checklist in determining whether or not to complete a sale, lease, or finance of a BMW vehicle. This checklist asks the retailer to take into account a number of considerations about the customer, including:

- Whether the retailer that the customer is attending is the closest retailer to the customer's home or place of business;

- Whether the customer is attempting to purchase multiple vehicles; and
- Whether the customer is attempting to conduct the sale transaction over the phone or via email.

This checklist also asks retailers to consider how the vehicle is being financed. There is a note warning that such schemes may involve financed or leased vehicles, with large cash down payments and minimal financing.

Another mechanism that BMW employs to curb money laundering is through the continued education of BMW retailers. For example, BMW leadership has clarified with its national retailer network that the practice of placing personal property liens on vehicles will not provide the retailer any additional protection to prevent the unlawful export of vehicles as such liens can be paid out by customers immediately.

By participating in the flow of information within BMW's retail network, BMW ensures that its authorized retailers maintain an accurate understanding of how unlawful export activity may be curbed effectively.

In addition, BMW conducts export compliance prevention audits of its retailers to ensure compliance with the non-export policies. At minimum, BMW conducts audits of retailers whose reseller/export index is greater than three percent of the total retail volume per calendar year.

In summary, BMW has established certain mandatory internal policies that bind all of its retailers across Canada, including the obligation to carry out the know your customer process, the use of the red flags checklist each time a BMW is sold, leased or financed, and through the use of non-export agreements. Further, BMW conducts export compliance prevention audits of its retailers. As an industry leader, BMW's approach to combatting the unlawful exports of vehicles and money laundering is comprehensive, and employing the use of various safeguards.

So an example with respect to the use of

 non-export agreements, as previously set out, customers intending to purchase, lease, or finance certain BMWs in Canada must sign a non-export agreement as part of the transaction. Currently, this policy applies to BMW X5 and X7 vehicles sold, leased, or financed in Canada. The X5 and X7 models are luxury sport utility models. These vehicles are particularly desirable for exporters as they may be sold abroad for large profits and are seen as a status symbol due to their exclusive nature.

The material terms of the current version of the non-export agreements include, first, that the client must not export the vehicle or permit the vehicle to be exported from Canada without written consent of BMW within 12 months of receipt of the vehicle; or enter into or acquiesce to any agreement whereby the vehicle is leased or sold outside of Canada.

Additionally, under the current version of the non-export agreement, BMW has the right to periodically determine the location of the vehicle for the 12 months following a customer's receipt of the vehicle, or for the entire duration of the lease or financing of the vehicle through BMW Canada. It may do so by accessing the vehicle's GPS and/or using other technology to confirm the vehicle's location in Canada, as well as an automatic alert system when the vehicle enters into a high-risk zone associated with export activities, such as borders or ports.

Enforcement is a necessary part of BMW's multi-pronged approach to actively combatting money laundering. On May 9, 2019, alone, BMW commenced four actions in the British Columbia Supreme Court against individuals located in Coquitlam, Richmond, Surrey, and Burnaby, in breach of contract, conversion, and wrongful detention of BMW property. This series of litigation was reported in the media, including by CBC News.

In one such action, the defendant entered into an agreement to finance a BMW X5 vehicle with a purchase price of \$94,206.54. A down payment in the amount of \$24,955.74 was provided to BMW by the defendant. The balance of the purchase price was to be paid over 60 months.

Approximately 10 months into the term, the defendant mailed a bank draft to BMW for the sum of \$59,600.68, representing the balance of the purchase price at that time. The bank draft was provided to BMW under suspicious circumstances, including that:

- First, it was sent in the same Canada Express Post envelope as another early payout draft for a separate BMW purchased by a different individual;
- Both bank drafts were from the same TD Bank account;
- Both bank drafts were issued the same day; and
- Both bank drafts appear to have been signed by the same individual, whose name was not decipherable from the signature.

Similarly, each of the defendants in the other three actions commenced by BMW on May 9, 2019, also made large payments representing the balance of the purchase price of the vehicle by way of bank draft early on in the financing term.

In BMW's experience, the use of bank drafts to pay off manufacturer loans is commonly used in schemes to unlawfully export luxury vehicles.

Although the actions we described are still ongoing, BMW advises the Commission and the people of British Columbia that through the civil litigation process, it has successfully recovered vehicles destined for export in multiple cases.

As part of their recommendations to the Commission, BMW supports the imposition of a regulatory requirement prohibiting cash transactions for vehicles in amounts above \$10,000.

BMW further supports the prohibition of the use of cash and cash-like instruments to pay off manufacturer loans, except where the instrument has sufficient information on it to link it to a specific account at an existing reporting entity, such as a financial institution.

Completely barring the use of bank drafts

would be unduly restrictive and impractical for BMW and its customers. For example, if a nominee purchased a luxury vehicle on a financing plan and then sought to pay off the balance, the province could require the funds to be sourced from a financial institution that is a reporting entity. This would make the funds traceable and dramatically improve transparency, without relying entirely on the industry's own methods to combat these practices. This approach is highly efficient and significantly mitigates the need to expand the list of reporting entities under the federal regime.

Ports play a big role in money laundering. And in addition to adhering to the internal policies that curb the unlawful export of vehicles and by enforcing non-export agreements through the civil litigation process, BMW works closely with Canada Border Services and police services whenever possible to prevent export of vehicles through location and recovery. BMW seeks civil remedies to seize vehicles found in circumstances, including vehicles financed and leased by BMW.

Sometimes these vehicles are driven from a BMW retailer's lot directly to the port for export. For example, in one instance, a BMW found at the port had only 10 kilometres of mileage.

When BMW vehicles are found for export, CBSA may contact BMW to determine if it has an interest in the vehicle. However, Canadian ports, including Vancouver, Surrey, and Prince Rupert, do not have a dedicated police presence, and therefore resulting in a gap in law enforcement. This makes it more difficult for BMW to identify and to recover vehicles destined for unlawful export.

If BMW has an interest in a vehicle, it must make arrangements to recover the vehicle. CBSA has limited authority to assist BMW in recovering the vehicle, which is not considered stolen by police services, as enforcement of non-export agreements is considered a civil and not a criminal matter.

Practically, BMW will be advised as to the location of the vehicle, whether it is situated

7

13 14 15

16

12

22 23 24

25

21

32 33 34

35

36

37

38

39

30

31

40 41 42

43

44 45

46 47

arrange to pick up the vehicle. In BMW's experience, enforcement and transparency at ports should be dramatically improved. BMW is appreciative of the collaborative efforts of CBSA and local police. However, the volume of exports from Canada's

inside a container at the port or has been

brought to a nearby towing yard, so BMW can

body to police those exports. Accordingly, BMW seeks the work of the Commission to develop recommendations in relation to increasing assistance and enforcement at Canadian ports.

ports exceeds the ability of any one regulatory

Specifically, BMW asks the Commission to consider recommending that the provincial and federal governments regulate the export of vehicles from British Columbia and Canada.

This regulatory regime could impose transparency and reporting requirements on the In whatever form it takes, it should exporters. be enhanced regulatory requirements imposed on exporters that increase the difficulty of exporting vehicles unlawfully.

Currently, the industry, BMW, and its retailer network must dedicate its own resources to this problem without being able to rely on any regulatory framework or enforcement agency dedicated to preventing unlawful exports. Industry efforts on this issue alone can never be sufficient or comprehensive enough to provide maximum deterrence. BMW cares, but BMW needs help.

So in conclusion, money launderers will continually reform their methodologies to evade regulation. Any new provincial regimes or expansion of the federal regime should carefully consider whether the new anti-money laundering requirements properly balance the additional compliance the additional compliance costs and complexities imposed on industry against the ability of money launderers to evade any new requirements.

As the Inquiry progresses, BMW urges the Commission to remember that industry -especially the automobile retail sector -- is not a regulator or a police service. It should not

 be expected to investigate the possibility of crimes or itself attempt to search through the chain of nominees or beneficial owners, which are often hidden.

An effective regime would ensure that any form of reporting and compliance is easy to implement at the level of the immediate transaction. It would also ensure that industry can benefit from and rely on pre-established registries. For example, a new regime could include a reasonable know your client requirement for certain kinds of purchases but also permit industry entities to rely on a corporate beneficial ownership registry established, maintained, and enforced by government.

In summary, BMW has sought participation in this inquiry because, as an industry leader, it believes it can assist the Commission in fulfilling its mandate in making findings of fact and recommendations with respect to money laundering in the luxury goods and financial services sectors. It is the only luxury vehicle manufacturer, distributor, and financial services provider who has applied for and been granted standing to participate in this inquiry.

Through the course of the Inquiry, BMW will engage in an open and transparent dialogue with the Commission and, in doing so, BMW is hopeful that Commission's work will yield practical recommendations to curb and restrain money laundering in the province of British Columbia.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MS. CAMLEY: Thank you.

MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, I'm just alerting you that we're going to proceed a little out of the sequence because we have two participants who need to present tomorrow morning as opposed to today --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MR. MARTLAND: -- due to availability. And so next we'll hear from the B.C. Civil Liberties
Association. Then in the afternoon session we'll hear from the Canadian Bar Association and Criminal Defence Advocacy Society. And just for everyone's benefit, tomorrow we'll hear from the Transparency International Coalition as well as B.C. Real Estate Association.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you. Yes, Ms. Tweedie.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. TWEEDIE (B.C. CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION):

MS. TWEEDIE: Thank you. The British Columbia Civil Liberties Association, or the BCCLA, wishes to thank the Commissioner and Commission staff for the opportunity to make this submission on the unceded territory of the Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh nations.

The BCCLA is a non-profit, non-partisan, unaffiliated advocacy group, incorporated in B.C. in 1963 pursuant to the B.C. Societies Act. The objects of the BCCLA include the promotion, defence, sustainment and extension of civil liberties and human rights throughout B.C. and Canada. As one of Canada's oldest and most active civil liberties organizations, the BCCLA works in furtherance of its objectives through public education, position papers, and legal action, including launching complaints with the government and other administrative agencies, appearing in court as a plaintiff or applicant, and intervening in legal matters that raise civil liberties issues.

The BCCLA has a long-standing, genuine, and continuing concern for the rights of the citizens in B.C. and Canada to liberty, democracy and The BCCLA has expertise in a myriad of freedom. civil liberties matters including criminal law reform, police accountability, access to justice, due process and the impact of investigative and enforcement mechanisms on privacy, all of which intersect with the subject matter of this inquiry. The BCCLA will bring this expertise to its role as a participant to provide a much needed civil liberties-based perspective to the issues that arise when investigating and addressing money laundering in this province. particular, the BCCLA will address the proper balancing of rights and freedoms in the context of governmental and private sector efforts to combat money laundering. This perspective is crucial, and the BCCLA intends to be a voice for the citizens of the province who cannot speak for

38

39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47

1

themselves at this inquiry.

The BCCLA supports efforts to combat money laundering in B.C., and recognizes that, if left unchecked, money laundering has significant social and political consequences. However, the recommendations proposed to date call for significant expansions of police and regulatory powers and the over-collection of private information, without evidence demonstrating that these changes would be effective in combatting money laundering. The risk to British Columbians is profound. Time and time again, we have seen that unfettered police powers lead to abuse. example, without proper checks and balances, flawed laws empower governments and police forces to use civil forfeiture to benefit their bottom lines rather than to combat crime. Massive data collection, retention and information sharing programs place Canadians' private information at Programs that track and collect more and more sensitive information can also be weaponized to unlawfully monitor immigrants, activists, and entire neighbourhoods. In considering effective strategies for combatting money laundering, the implications for the rights and liberties of Canadians must form a part of the analysis.

Within the Commission's mandate is the review and consideration of four reports dealing with money laundering commissioned by the Provincial Government. These reports contain several recommendations for an anti-money laundering, or AML, regime.

In reviewing the numerous recommendations found in the provincial reports, certain common threads emerge that have potentially grave implications for the privacy rights and civil liberties of Canadians. Broadly speaking, these threads are:

- First, recommendations to increase the amount and types of data collected by public and private sector institutions, and to increase the sharing of personal and confidential data amongst public and private institutions;
- Second, recommendations to increase the

presence and powers of police and regulatory investigators within the gaming industry;

- And third, recommendations for invasive remedies such as civil forfeiture and the potential introduction of unexplained wealth orders.

In the submissions that follow, the BCCLA

has highlighted some of the implications for the privacy rights and civil liberties of Canadians that arise from these types of recommendations. These submissions are not exhaustive. And the BCCLA submits that AML measures should not be recommended or implemented without serious consideration of, and independent research into, the efficacy of such measures and their potential harms. Furthermore, the BCCLA submits that there must be checks and balances in place for all measures that are recommended to ensure that they operate in a manner that does not unduly infringe on the rights and liberties of Canadians.

The BCCLA wishes to ensure that federal and provincial reporting requirements related to money laundering do not result in the over-collection and retention of highly confidential personal information by multiple agencies in a manner that is not sufficiently protective of the right to privacy. The BCCLA is critical of expanding the government and other agencies' ability to collect and retain sensitive information without a warrant or due process.

 In 2015, the BCCLA made submissions to the federal Standing Committee on Finance regarding FINTRAC and the issue of terrorist financing in Canada and abroad. The BCCLA spoke about the troubling over-collection and retention of personal information that was consistently found in audits of FINTRAC by the Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada. The BCCLA advocated for a review of FINTRAC's efficacy in combatting money laundering and terrorist financing, and we hold these same concerns today.

The BCCLA opposes expanding the number of entities that are required to report to FINTRAC and increasing the scope of information that FINTRAC is able to collect. Adding more

reporting entities will inevitably capture a greater number of innocent transactions and the personal information of innocent individuals. more entities are required to act as de facto agents of the state, collecting information solely for the purpose of reporting it, the government will acquire vast amounts of personal information for investigatory purposes without having ever shown reasonable grounds for obtaining this information. These recommendations pose a significant threat to the privacy rights of Canadians. Further, the BCCLA is concerned that the recommendation to have FINTRAC flag transactions with a foreign component could lead to profiling and discrimination.

The BCCLA is also concerned with the recommendations aimed at expanding FINTRAC's powers to disclose data to other agencies. The sharing of data, including proprietary confidential data, creates a serious risk that the confidential, personal information of Canadians will be compromised when their information is shared.

Similar concerns arise with the recommendation to create a Transaction Analysis Team to review all Suspicious Transaction Reports (STRs), leading to the sharing of sensitive information amongst numerous entities, including GPEB, a possible designated policing unit, JIGIT and BCLC.

The BCCLA submits that these types of recommendations fail to consider the serious privacy implications of mass data sharing between agencies and fails to provide appropriate measures to safeguard the personal information of Canadians. The BCCLA is further concerned that no credible, verifiable evidence has yet been produced which suggests that a data-sharing framework would be effective in combatting money laundering.

Canadians have the right to know how and why their personal information is being used by an organization or a public body. Organizations and public bodies that collect personal information must secure it against unauthorized access, and releasing or sharing personal information is only

 permitted in very particular circumstances and with required lawful authority. These basic privacy rights of Canadians must be respected and upheld when considering measures for an AML regime.

The BCCLA is also concerned with the recommendations in the provincial reports advocating for increased police presence and powers. The BCCLA submits that it is critical to ensure that policing units, including the proposed Designated Policing Unit, or DPU, to police casinos and related gaming activity, are not created or expanded unnecessarily, and that they do not operate in a rights-infringing manner.

If the creation of a DPU is to be considered, further independent research should be conducted to provide a better picture of its potential role and impact. The scope of such research should include:

- independent research on the efficacy and the potential impact on affected communities of a DPU;
- independent research on the overlap and potentially duplicative nature of the DPU's work and the work of other entities, such as JIGIT and local law enforcement; and
- consultation with the Information and Privacy Commissioner to create a policy on data collection, protection, and retention.

With respect to JIGIT, the BCCLA advocates for a comprehensive and independent review to ensure it is operating properly, successfully and legally prior to considering whether it should be provided with continued support and funding. Any such review should fully consider whether JIGIT is fulfilling a genuine need and whether this unit is the most effective, accountable and rights-protective means of addressing that need. In that regard, the BCCLA has several concerns regarding JIGIT's operations. Chief amongst these concerns is JIGIT's use of both law enforcement personnel and regulatory

investigators to fulfill its mandate. The BCCLA is concerned that the potential for blurring the distinct roles and responsibilities of police and regulatory investigators may result in the infringement of civil rights for members of the public who are subject to JIGIT investigations, as well as potential failures of oversight and accountability.

The BCCLA supports the recommendation for a new independent regulator with clearly defined roles and responsibilities that are fully transparent to the public and is supportive of the creation of the regulator as an independent government agency. The BCCLA is opposed to regulatory investigators being designated as Special Provincial Constables without adequate consideration for the risk to individual civil liberties and the rights of the public who are subject to an investigation.

The BCCLA has long been an opponent of civil asset forfeiture laws, pursuant to which an individual who has not been charged or convicted of a crime can lose their property to the government. The BCCLA has spoken out against the incentives the legislation creates for government abuse and the barriers that ordinary people face representing themselves in civil forfeiture cases.

The BCCLA further submits that the proposed introduction of unexplained wealth orders, or UWOs, in Canada is also deeply concerning. The implementation of UWOs would be fraught with serious civil liberties implications, including an erosion of privacy rights, doing away with the presumption of innocence, and subverting the rights that shield Canadians from unreasonable search and seizure.

The BCCLA is staunchly against the reverseonus scheme under which UWOs operate, which would
permit the Province to exercise coercive state
powers and obtain court orders against people
without evidence of wrongdoing. In addition to
these implications, the BCCLA submits that there
is no sufficient evidence on the efficacy of UWOs
to support their introduction. The BCCLA urges
the Commission to give due consideration to the
grave effects that measures such as UWOs would

47

THE COMMISSIONER:

MR. MARTLAND: Thank you.

1 have on individuals and society. 2 To conclude, the BCCLA recognizes that the 3 possible social and political costs of money 4 laundering, if left unchecked or dealt with 5 ineffectively, are serious. And the BCCLA 6 supports this Commission's mandate and efforts to 7 address money laundering. However, developing an 8 effective AML regime cannot simply reflect calls 9 for more invasive powers, broader disclosures of 10 sensitive, highly prejudicial information, and 11 more resources for policing and FINTRAC. 12 implications for the rights and liberties of 13 Canadians must form a part of the analysis. 14 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms. Tweedie. 15 MS. TWEEDIE: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Martland. MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, I've just been 16 17 looking over our planned schedule, and it occurs 18 to me that the CBA and CDAS aren't here right 19 We were advised that they would be here for now. 20 this afternoon. 21 THE COMMISSIONER: Right. 22 MR. MARTLAND: I thought I would canvass with you 23 whether it made some sense, indeed for everyone, 24 rather than us returning at 1:30 for one 25 participant to address you and then returning 26 again tomorrow to have two more do so, whether there might be some logic in having CBA and CDAS 27 28 return tomorrow along with the other two, so we'd 29 simply adjourn for today, return tomorrow 30 morning, complete the remaining presentations. 31 THE COMMISSIONERS: We've got Gateway at 1:30, is that 32 right? 33 MR. MARTLAND: I believe we've covered Gateway with Mr. Gruber attending at the start of today, so 34 35 that was one of the --36 THE COMMISSIONER: Of course. No, I'm sorry. 37 that noted --38 I think that's hopefully caught up. MR. MARTLAND: -- but I didn't scratch it out. 39 THE COMMISSIONER: 40 MR. MARTLAND: Right. 41 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Yes, that might make 42 sense. 43 I think it does. MR. MARTLAND: So on that note, if 44 we might then adjourn until tomorrow morning,

All right.

Thank you.

 THE REGISTRAR: Order. The hearing is now adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow morning.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO FEBRUARY 26, 2020, AT 9:30 A.M.)