



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 033

Wednesday, June 3, 2026

Chair: James Maloney



Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights

Wednesday, June 3, 2026

• (1635)

[English]

The Chair (James Maloney (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.)): I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number 33 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. Pursuant to the order of reference of March 24, 2026, the committee will continue its study of Bill C-235, an act to amend the Criminal Code with regard to increasing parole ineligibility. We will proceed to clause-by-clause study in the last hour.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to the Standing Orders. Members are attending in person in the room and remotely using the Zoom application. Sound tests were done successfully.

I would like to make a few comments for the benefit of the witnesses and members.

Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking.

For those participating by video conference, click on the microphone icon to activate your microphone. Please mute yourself when you are not speaking. For those on Zoom, at the bottom of your screen you can select the appropriate channel for interpretation: floor audio, French or English. For those in the room, you can use the earpiece and selected the desired channel.

As a reminder, all comments should be addressed through the chair.

For members in the room, if you wish to speak, raise your hand. For members on Zoom, use the “raise hand” function. The clerk and I will manage the speaking order as best we can. We appreciate your patience and understanding.

Appearing in the first hour, we have, as an individual, Jo-Anne Landolt; from the Office of the Federal Ombudsperson for Victims of Crime, Dr. Benjamin Roebuck, federal ombudsperson for victims of crime; and from the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, Dale Weidman, superintendent, and Simon Authier, legal counsel.

The floor is open for opening statements for up to five minutes.

Before we get going, Ms. Lattanzio has something that she would like to address.

Patricia Lattanzio (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As you know, a notice of motion was filed, and my understanding is that the clerk has distributed the motion in both official languages. It is as follows:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 97.1, the committee request an extension of 30 sitting days to consider Bill C-223, an act to amend the Divorce Act, referred to the committee on Wednesday, February 4, 2026;

That the committee requires additional time to hear from witnesses and complete its study of the bill; and

That the Chair report this request for an extension to the House.

The Chair: Thank you.

Are you all in favour of the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Ms. Landolt, we'll give the floor to you for up to five minutes.

Jo-Anne Landolt (As an Individual): Hello. My name is Jo-Anne Landolt, and I want to thank you for the opportunity to be here today.

On March 18, 2010, my niece, Kimberly—Kimmy—Proctor, 18, was lured, repeatedly raped and then murdered by two of her peers, Kruse Wellwood, 16, and Cameron Moffat, 17, at Wellwood's home in Langford, outside Victoria, B.C. The following day, they transported her body in a hockey bag on a public bus to a local creek, where they staged and lit her on fire.

After three months to the day, Kruse and Cameron were arrested. Six months later, they pleaded guilty, and the statement of facts detailing her horrific murder was revealed. Since the two were youth at the time, their names were withheld until they were sentenced as adults. Due to the two being sentenced as adults, you'd think that my family wouldn't have any parole notifications for at least 25 years, but that wasn't the case. Shortly afterwards, as registered victims, we received letters from Correctional Service Canada stating parole dates: UTA, June 18, 2018; DP, June 18, 2018; and FP, June 18, 2020.

Our family was in shock from Kimmy's murder, and having this notification with dates only eight years later took us by surprise. Even though we knew those were the dates, it still took us back.

We learned that the boys, as we call them, the offenders, were known to police, their school, their peers and the community as being very troubled, and their violent tendencies had been escalating, resulting in Kimmy's murder. They had tried to lure another girl that evening to do this again. Fortunately, she did not accept their invite to come over that night.

Teachers and school officials said they couldn't do anything about their behaviour. Nothing was in place to deal with them. They hardly went to school. They stayed home, smoked weed, played video games and visited inappropriate websites. Everyone basically stood back and watched them spiral out of control.

After Kimmy's murder, I dove into a mode of trying to prevent someone else from going through what happened to Kimmy and trying to spare another family from this nightmare. I started researching school safety programs and found one developed by the Canadian Centre for Child Protection in Winnipeg, Kids in the Know. I circulated around the B.C. Lower Mainland and south Vancouver Island, guest speaking, mainly for the school district's ERASE Bullying training sessions and advisory councils. I was able to help fundraise to purchase the program, bringing it into multiple schools. Our family helped develop Kimberly's law, with federal and provincial points of prevention and accountability for troubled youth. This spearheaded the risk assessment protocol that was implemented in B.C. schools and the safe care act, which proposes a mandatory counselling and treatment program for youth who pose a risk of self-harm, violent behaviour, drug addiction and/or sexual exploitation. The act has been presented numerous times in the B.C. legislature, and we are optimistic that, in some form, it will be put in place for youth to receive the help they need.

I am also part of the Pacific VAC, victim advisory council, where I've met many federal victim ombudsmen, including Benjamin, and I've had great opportunities with the VAC, meeting people and being able to share Kimmy's story. Being involved in these enabled my family to share Kimmy's story and meet many organization representatives and government officials. However, most of all, we are gathering awareness. We are a regular family. Kimmy didn't live a risky lifestyle. If this can happen to my family, it can happen to anyone's, to be honest.

• (1640)

My family has attended multiple hearings—one was just last fall—and we've submitted many victim statements for both of our offenders. These are very difficult. I would never have imagined the stress it would have on us—making statements, putting feelings into words, thinking about what to write and what not to write. Do we just want to submit them? Do we want to read them or have someone else read them for us?

In the beginning, it would take me at least one month to complete one statement. Then I couldn't put myself through it anymore. "Short and sweet" is what I said to myself. Just to submit them until it had to be warranted, I needed to really put my do-all and a big effort into it to stop one of our offenders from being released. I wasn't going to go through the mental strain, going through a month of writing two pages of words.

For hearings, preparing mentally and emotionally, travelling from Vancouver Island to the mainland, with overnight stays, hav-

ing security clearances, listening to the Parole Board and the offenders speak, answering questions, hearing about their behaviour before and after the crime and while they've been incarcerated, and most of all, at these hearings, listening to the details of the brutal murder of my niece.... It is very stressful.

My family attends, not because we think there is a possibility that they will be released but for Kimmy, to be her voice, to let the Parole Board know how much she is loved and missed and how her brutal murder has impacted us.

I've said many times, "Why do we need to go through this stress, the trauma?" It is a waste of time, not only for us but also for our system, and there is the cost factor of those hearings. Our offenders are not at a point in their sentences that they will get any type of parole.

• (1645)

The Chair: I'm going to have to ask you to wrap up quickly, Ms. Landolt.

Jo-Anne Landolt: Okay.

We've heard this from many hearings, so there's no positive outcome. I know it is difficult to understand victims' needs. Even when years go by, for us, it's as though the crime happened yesterday. At times, it is in the backs of our minds, but at other times it is right in our thoughts that we can't shake.

The implementation of Bill C-235, the respecting families of murdered and brutalized persons act, would spare victims from receiving unnecessary hearing notifications, having the stressful task of writing more frequent statements, and attending pointless hearings that retraumatize. It won't take away the pain of losing a loved one to abduction, sexual assault and murder, but it will ease some redundant stress.

My family fully supports this bill and hopes that it will be put forward, protecting other families from the harmful repercussions of hearings.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Thank you for sharing that personal story.

Dr. Roebuck, we'll go over to you for up to five minutes.

Dr. Benjamin Roebuck (Federal Ombudsperson for Victims of Crime, Office of the Federal Ombudsperson for Victims of Crime): I'd like to acknowledge Jo-Anne for her testimony and Kimberly's family and others for working so hard and advocating for this bill to come before committee.

We're on the traditional unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe people. I begin there because this discussion is about more than sentencing. It's about whether families whose loved one's life was taken through violence can encounter justice systems that respond with dignity, safety and care. That question is especially important for indigenous families, who must, too often, fight to have their loved ones seen, named, protected and remembered.

The Office of the Federal Ombudsperson for Victims of Crime receives complaints from victims about federal departments and agencies, including the Correctional Service of Canada and the Parole Board of Canada. We don't review the merits of Parole Board decisions to grant or deny release, but we do review how victims and their families experience the federal parole process and where systemic barriers cause preventable harm.

Bill C-235 responds to real harm. I support action to reduce unnecessary cycles of retraumatization for families affected by these serious offences.

Once parole eligibility begins, families may face mandatory parole reviews every two to five years, sometimes for the rest of the offender's life, and sometimes for the rest of their own. The impact on families is not limited to the hearing itself. It's the repeated cycle of notice, preparation, fear, postponed hearings and renewed exposure to what was done to their loved one.

Bill C-235 recognizes this type of harm. Delaying the first parole hearing may give some families a longer period of stability, safety and distance from a process they experience as deeply painful. What we hear from families is that the harm of parole is not only about timing—although that matters—but also about the experience of the eventual hearing.

We reviewed 60 of our case files, from 2019 to the present, related to the Parole Board of Canada. Families describe the emotional labour of preparing victim statements; the uncertainty when hearings are postponed, waived or changed; the difficulty of arranging travel, work leave, child care, cultural supports or emotional support; the fear when protection concerns are not included in release conditions; the frustration when they don't receive enough information to plan for their safety; and the exposure when the intimate impact of the crime described in victim statements is shared with the offender.

Some families value the opportunity to attend and speak. Others want distance from the process. Different families have different needs. That's why I encourage this committee to view Bill C-235 as one part of a broader conversation, not the whole answer.

- (1650)

If Parliament accepts that the repeated exposure to parole hearings can retraumatize families, then the next question is how to reduce that harm before and after the parole eligibility begins. In

practical terms, as the committee studies this bill, I'd like to highlight three issues.

The first is information. Families should receive clear information early. They should understand registration, parole eligibility, temporary absences, work releases, day parole, full parole and what participation rights exist at each stage. A family should not discover too late that the parole eligibility date was not the first relevant release-related milestone.

The second is time frames. The committee can also consider whether longer intervals between reviews are appropriate in this narrow category of cases, while also safeguarding a meaningful possibility of release.

The last is complaints. Concerns raised by victims about their rights to information protection and participation under the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights need to be supported by an effective complaints process. At its best, accountability helps systems listen and improve. The federal ombudsperson for victims of crime needs legislation or regulatory support to ensure that our office can access the materials relevant to victim complaints about the parole process.

In closing, this is not an argument against the right to parole review. It's an argument for adjusting the frequency and management of those reviews so that the system does not impose needless and foreseeable harm on the people it is legislated to protect.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thanks, Dr. Roebuck.

We will now go to the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police. You have up to five minutes as well.

Mr. Weidman, you look as though you're ready to speak.

Dale Weidman (Superintendent, Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police): Thank you.

As mentioned, my name is Dale Weidman. I'm a superintendent with the Vancouver Police Department. With me is Simon Authier. He's the legal counsel for our department. We're appearing on behalf of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police.

Distinguished members of this committee, thanks, first and foremost, for the opportunity to address you today on Bill C-235, the respecting families of murdered and brutalized persons act. It's a really important bill.

The police's perspective and the police community's interests and efforts will always be directed towards preventing public harm, but if harm should occur, we are committed to doing everything we can to ensure that justice is served and to support victims and their families. The CACP believes in the importance of always being victim-centred and trauma-informed. Consequently, we support efforts to reduce the impact that multiple Parole Board hearings have on families—this was mentioned by the previous two witnesses very eloquently—when loved ones have to speak about these heinous homicides.

The CACP supports Bill C-235 and the proposed amendment to the Criminal Code to provide judges with the discretion to impose a period of parole ineligibility of between 25 and 40 years for offenders convicted of abducting, sexually assaulting and murdering someone in a single incident.

Thankfully, while these incidents are relatively rare, those crimes are particularly heinous, and they have a serious impact, not only on the victim's family but on the whole community. This was highlighted very well by Kimberly Proctor's aunt, who talked about the impact it had on Langford. Denunciation and deterrence should be a primary consideration when addressing these crimes.

The CACP supports the intent of Bill C-235 to ease some of the trauma the families of the victims face during Parole Board hearings. At each Parole Board hearing families attend, they are revictimized by having to relive the brutal details of how their loved ones were killed. While the law does not require the families of victims to attend a Parole Board hearing, it is easy to understand why they feel compelled to attend. Allowing judges to impose up to 40 years without parole eligibility would reduce the number of parole hearings a family might feel compelled to attend to make a victim impact statement.

However, the CACP is conscious of the fact that this bill must strike a balance between the rights of the victims' families and the rights of the offenders. Therefore, the CACP is offering some proposed amendments, which Simon will speak to.

• (1655)

Simon Authier (Legal Counsel, Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police): Good afternoon.

Section 12 of the charter guarantees the right to not be subject to any cruel punishment and to protect human dignity. We had the relatively recent decision in *R v. Bissonnette* at the Supreme Court of Canada, which warned against imposing a sentence on the presumption that the offender is beyond redemption and lacks the moral autonomy needed for rehabilitation. The risk here is that a sentence of life imprisonment with 40 years of parole ineligibility could be perceived as being intrinsically incompatible with human dignity and, therefore, contrary to section 12 of the charter.

The CACP is calling for some amendments to the bill in order to strengthen it and put it in a better position to face any challenges to this resolution. First, we think the provisions should provide some

clarification on the offenders' right to appeal, specifically regarding the right to appeal the ineligibility period. Second, the provisions should provide some guidance on the consideration for imposing periods of ineligibility that exceed 25 years. Perhaps this could take the form of providing some factors that the judge could consider as aggravating when determining what is an appropriate period of ineligibility.

Therefore, we invite the committee to consider amending the bill to straighten it and put it on a better footing for any challenges it might encounter in the future.

Dale Weidman: Thank you, Simon.

In conclusion, the CACP supports the provisions of this bill and believes the changes to the parole ineligibility would be beneficial to support the families of the victims of the most heinous crimes that can be committed in Canada. We believe the proposed legislative amendments will provide a victim-centred and trauma-informed approach to Parole Board hearings. Clear and concise clarifications could be introduced to strengthen the provisions and secure our commitment to support victims' families.

The Chair: Thank you, gentlemen.

We'll start the six-minute round with Mr. Kibble.

Jeff Kibble (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to all of the witnesses for being here.

Thank you to the members from Vic PD for your input on amendments. We're certainly open to considering those. I think they will come in the line-by-line portion.

I'd also really like to thank you, Jo-Anne, for your courage, sharing your story, being here to support and, most importantly, speaking to the impact of those parole hearings. I know you've been advocating for many years for both education and other law reforms. This ties almost directly to your case, although there were some minor changes. The main focus is helping us best understand the impact this bill will have.

Maybe you could describe in your own words the parole hearing process and what it has meant for your family emotionally and practically. We discussed a few points, but if you could, please share some of those, and then I might remind you of some of the things we discussed.

• (1700)

Jo-Anne Landolt: As I mentioned previously, it took me a long time to write my victim statements so that I could read them in front of the Parole Board, and I felt like I was getting into a bad state, going over and over again and trying to figure out what I should be submitting, so I decided to just submit them. They're not at a point in their incarceration that they would be eligible for parole anyway. To make it easier on myself, I put something into it, obviously, but not my all.

As we discussed before, for one of our parole hearings that we recently attended, we had a notification in September or October for the parole hearing to happen, I believe, in December. It got delayed every few months. Eventually, it happened, but it was a year after our first notification, so we had this roller coaster. We would have a date. We wouldn't have actual, set dates, but it should be in December and then, oh, it should be in February, and then, no, it should be in June.

This happened for a year. It was a year of my emotions going up and down. Trying to get yourself mentally prepared for something was very difficult for me, and I can imagine it was very difficult for my brother and my sister-in-law especially.

As I said, my family lives on Vancouver Island. We travelled to the mainland for the hearings. It's the mental preparedness and going over. At our most recent hearing, there were technical difficulties, so we went into the hearing where Kruse Wellwood was—his back was to us—and there were issues with the audio, so they had to take us out of the room and work on the audio, put us back in the room and then take us back out again. At this point, we wondered if this was going to happen. Were we going to have to come back? Was it going to get postponed? Luckily, they got it figured out, so it proceeded.

Jeff Kibble: I have another quick question.

Please accept all of our deepest sympathies for what has happened to your family, and thank you for being such an amazing spokesperson for your family. I know it has such an impact on them that you've stepped up to a very difficult role.

You've spoken about the timeline and the pressures coming and leading up to the hearing. I apologize if this is too sensitive a question. Without getting into too much detail, how do you feel when you're in the actual hearing, with the offender in front of you, having to relive that and giving that voice for your family member who doesn't have a voice anymore? You have to hear this stuff.

Jo-Anne Landolt: Our offenders aren't taking any accountability. When they were talking about what they did with Kimmy, it wasn't a big deal. It's pretty devastating when you hear that, especially coming from the person who took your niece, your loved one, away like that.

When they're talking, the offender is talking to the Parole Board and discussing things back and forth. It's almost surreal that you're actually hearing the way they're talking about your loved one. There are definitely tissues in parole hearings, as well as gasps and an almost nonchalant way of the offenders talking. It really puts you back.

Jeff Kibble: Thank you.

When we were talking earlier today, you actually received a notification on parole, and I could see your stress level shooting up.

Some people have suggested alternatives to make the parole process better, including attending remotely. You described to me how, during COVID, you had to attend remotely. Could you share if that was better or worse, in terms of the impact on your family?

• (1705)

Jo-Anne Landolt: It wasn't really better or worse. Unfortunately, I did a statement—it was videotaped—and the audio was horrible. I felt that the Parole Board, not being able to see you, too.... They face you when you read your statement. They get the emotions you're going through.

It's very hard when you're videotaping yourself and trying to just talk. It's not the same thing.

Jeff Kibble: Thank you very much for your courage and your compassion, and for stepping up as a spokesperson for Kimmy and your family.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kibble.

Ms. Begum, it's over to you.

Doly Begum (Scarborough Southwest, Lib.): Thank you very much, Chair.

Thank you to both of you.

Thank you to all of you for being here today.

May I call you Jo-Anne? Thank you very much.

I'll start with Jo-Anne. First, I want to echo the words of MP Kibble and say thank you very much for your courage, for being so courageous in being here and sharing with us. In a way, I almost feel guilty. I think I share this sentiment with my colleagues. I almost feel like we're retraumatizing you by asking you to do the same thing and share your story again. It takes so much out of you. Thank you for being so strong. I hope you continue to have that strength to fight in the work you're doing, especially with the VAC.

I can't imagine what you, your brother and your sister-in-law have gone through and are continually going through. I really appreciate your willingness to help us with this bill. There are times when the intention of certain laws that are passed does not really have the same effect.

I feel that when we talk about victim statements, there are times when we speak of them as if the perpetrator is listening and maybe feeling a sense of guilt or rethinking it, except that with what we're doing, the victims are reliving it and being retraumatized by sharing it over and over. I really appreciate what we're hoping to do with this, and I appreciate MP Kibble for bringing this forward.

Looking back at your experience and your family's experience, what do you wish parliamentarians better understood about the impact these crimes have on victims' families? That's if there is anything that you would like to share.

Jo-Anne Landolt: Do you mean the impact the crimes have had or the hearings and sentences?

Doly Begum: I mean the probation, but first, the crimes and then the process.

Jo-Anne Landolt: Well, obviously, your world is turned upside down. Nothing is the same, and I'm speaking as an auntie. I'm not speaking as a mother or a father. I can't imagine how that would be. On every holiday and every occasion, there's someone missing.

In our case, with it being a high profile case, it was in the news quite a lot. There was a lot of talk. Victoria is now a larger city, but it's not.... We've been there for decades and generations. We know a lot of people, and there was a lot of talk and stuff.

As I said before about our offenders, too, knowing that their violence escalated, it's just unbelievable, it really is, to hear that that no one did anything to these monsters, and they just were allowed to murder somebody the way they did. It's very traumatizing, and it's something that you'll never outlive. It's always there.

Ultimately, as you were saying, I don't mind speaking about this. I mean, yes, obviously I'm emotional, but I said very early on after Kimmy died that something good has to happen from Kimmy's death. We need to make it happen, because no one can die in that brutal manner and have nothing positive come from it—there has to be. Someone can't die like that for nothing.

Doly Begum: Thank you. I hope we are able to do something positive today here and going forward as well.

For my next question, I'll ask Mr. Roebuck, and maybe you will want to chime in as well, Jo-Anne.

Dr. Roebuck, victims and families understandably want Parliament to act, and I hope we're able to do that with this legislation. At the same time, Parliament has a responsibility—which you touched on in your testimony—to have legislation that is legally sound and able to withstand any court challenges. You talked about having dignity, safety and care.

From your perspective, how important is it that we get both of these things right when we pass this legislation?

• (1710)

Dr. Benjamin Roebuck: I have great respect for the need to balance, but I sometimes have a reaction to that word, because when we talk about balancing, we're often not actually fully unpacking the experience of survivors.

What we hear is very similar to what Jo-Anne has shared: that once the eligibility date starts, it's normal that hearings are post-

poned. We had a complaint from a family that also meets the criteria of this bill: They had seven parole hearing postponements in two years.

For the whole time, they're experiencing post-traumatic stress symptoms and they're preparing ritual ceremony in their community, and then it's moved and moved. The impact is unfathomable.

If we talk about balancing, the families are saying, “Can you consider this? What does it look like to balance our interests in this conversation?”

Doly Begum: Thank you very much.

I know that I have about 30 seconds left.

To follow up on that—because I want to make sure we get it right—if Parliament can preserve the objective of this bill, Bill C-235, while also improving its legal durability, transparency and ability to withstand any challenge, would that generally be in the best interests of the victims and their families?

Jo-Anne Landolt: I feel that it would, definitely. It would give some families a sense of their new normalcy. I can't say that everything's going to be fine. It's always going to be in the back of your mind, obviously, and mentally and physically impactful on you, but I believe that it would help families heal somewhat from their tragedies, mentally and health-wise as well. It's physical and mental.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Begum.

Dr. Benjamin Roebuck: I think sentencing is often the focus of measures to support crime victims, but the actual process, from start to finish, is within Parliament's purview, and there's a lot more work to do to have a process that's safer and preserves fairness for both sides.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Fortin, you have six minutes.

[*Translation*]

Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Roebuck and Ms. Landolt, thank you for being with us.

I don't even have any questions for you, Ms. Landolt. Words cannot express how I feel about what happened to your niece. I'm not the only one. Everyone must tell you how awful, senseless and unacceptable it is. No parent should ever have to go through that.

That said, obviously we can't turn back the clock and prevent what happened to your niece. All we can do is try to make the justice system effective, and ensure that it prevents as many ordeals like yours as possible, that it deals with cases like these fairly—that may not be the right word—and effectively, and that it always punishes those who have committed such crimes.

This may be a little naive, but above all, my hope is that they can be rehabilitated, especially young people. I remain hopeful that these individuals have enough humanity to be rehabilitated. I don't work in rehabilitation; I'm not an expert on rehabilitation, but I think there are people who can make that happen. I don't know whether Kimberly's killers were able to be rehabilitated, but listening to you, I get the sense that they weren't.

This bill would extend the period of parole ineligibility to between 25 and 40 years. To be honest, when I think about that, I'm not so sure the situation will be any different after 40 years versus 25. I think we need to focus more on rehabilitation. If someone isn't rehabilitated after 25 years, it's hard for me to believe that they will be after 15 more years. Nevertheless, we do what we can with what we have.

I'll leave it there, Ms. Landolt. You can have the floor if there's anything you'd like to add to your remarks. Perhaps you could tell us your views on rehabilitation. With all the suffering you and your family have endured because of Kimberly's death, do you still believe criminals can be rehabilitated? Maybe not, and you're perfectly entitled to say, no, you don't think so. I would like to hear your thoughts on it, though.

• (1715)

[*English*]

Jo-Anne Landolt: The answer is no, definitely not.

I don't even call them “people”, because they're not people. They're monsters. They're evil. They're not treatable. The court documents prove that. I believe, if it was 25 years of intense therapy, possibly. We also heard about castration. We heard multiple things. I can't even think of it all off the top of my head, but the amount of therapy that could possibly treat these two is not comprehensible. It's not able to be done. We have seen it. It's been 16 years. We just had a hearing late last year, and there was no accountability. They're both pointing fingers at each other, but they were both masterminds in this. There was no one leader. They both planned this. It was a perfect storm. That's what the police officers told my brother and sister-in-law. They met in school at a very young age and manifested into what they became. They said that if that girl had come over after Kimmy's death, she would have been murdered. They were serial killers in the making. These people cannot be treated.

There are certain offenders who are not treatable. These two are a perfect example of that. There are obviously more, like Clifford Olson. I grew up when Clifford Olson was doing his murders. I remember being scared to go out of my house because of it. There's also Paul Bernardo. There are multiple different murderers out there who are not treatable. It's just in their makeup. We need to put these people behind bars. That's where they belong, for the safety of our communities. I do not want our offenders let out. I'm telling

you that if they are ever let out, you'd better be watching them, because they will reoffend. I guarantee it.

[*Translation*]

Rhéal Éloi Fortin: I'd like to use whatever time I have left to ask you the same question, Mr. Roebuck. If you have anything to add about rehabilitation, please go ahead.

[*English*]

Dr. Benjamin Roebuck: I think this bill is quite narrow in scope regarding the restrictions it aims to introduce. Within corrections, there are many different risk assessment tools and evaluations that are used that could suggest whether a parole hearing is even merited. If you have people who you know are not accepting responsibility, who intend to cause harm, it's difficult to see a path forward.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fortin.

We'll now go to the five-minute round. We're going to have time for one person from each party, starting with Mr. Lawton for five minutes.

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to all the witnesses, in particular Ms. Landolt, and I mean no offence to the other witnesses.

It's incredible, the courage and clarity you've provided on something that is very personal to you and your family but, as we've heard in testimony from Mr. Kibble, also applies to other families. Not all of them have an advocate like you, so I think I speak on behalf of this committee for how grateful we are, and how in awe we are of what you have done here.

In the 15 years since you lost your niece, could you reiterate how many times you have had to appear before a parole board?

• (1720)

Jo-Anne Landolt: I was hoping this wasn't coming up, but both of our offenders have gone before a parole board. Cameron, I believe, has been at a parole hearing only once. Kruse has been two or three times, I believe. There are paper hearings. With the parole hearings, there are also ETAs for personal development. With Cameron, I believe, it was only once.

Andrew Lawton: At the risk of putting words in your mouth, is that too many to count?

Jo-Anne Landolt: Yeah.

Andrew Lawton: There have been too many for you to remember how often you've had to relitigate and relive this.

You said very eloquently, in your testimony earlier, that every time it takes a little piece of you to do it—basically, the amount of effort that it takes digging into that part of your life.

When you've gone through this, has there ever been a thought in your mind that the parole application will be successful? Has that ever even been a question?

Jo-Anne Landolt: No.

Andrew Lawton: It is really serving no purpose. The offenders know this. We've heard from other witnesses, and I've seen research on this. We had one witness at our last meeting talk about how offenders literally "get off". Those were the words on this.

Is that something you felt as well, that they almost enjoy that process and the effect they're having on people like you and your family?

Jo-Anne Landolt: For sure.

With my statements, I have obviously provided some personal information, but there is information I have not provided, because I don't want them to feel gratification. They do feel gratification. If they are hurting somebody, that's what they want to do. I don't want them to know how much that has hurt our family. I've obviously said it in a nutshell, but I haven't dived into the details regarding the hard feelings.

They also receive our statements, so they can read them at any time, and that bothers me. It takes you aback that they can actually go through and read this stuff. They even try to control the hearings, and they also attempt to control the Parole Board.

Andrew Lawton: Have you felt, in the course of the last 15 years, I guess, that victims are not front and centre in the system? Is the system itself not concerned predominantly with the effects on victims and their families?

Jo-Anne Landolt: No. I've been told that the prime outcome is to release offenders. They want to treat them and have them go out into society. That's what it is. It's not about us.

The Parole Board does acknowledge us. It understands the trauma and respects that we are present. It has said that. It understands that it's very difficult to be there, to read or submit statements, but ultimately, the goal is to release offenders.

Andrew Lawton: When you say, "they", you're referring to the system. You're referring to the government, basically.

Jo-Anne Landolt: Yes. The system is broken.

As I said before, I don't want to see these two released. It's not in the best interest of any woman, any female, in Canada if these offenders are released. It's taking lots of taxpayers' money for these hearings. It's not warranted. I've said that. Why are we doing this? It's ridiculous that there's a date—a scheduled hearing. They have paper hearings. There are dates set when they are sentenced. It's regardless of how well they're doing.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lawton.

Ms. Lattanzio, you have five minutes.

Patricia Lattanzio: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I too want to thank the witnesses for being here today, and particularly you, Mrs. Landolt. I know sharing this publicly yet again is not easy. In your opening statement, you said that something positive ought to come out of this. Know that your presence here today, helping us do this work, is positive in itself. Thank you again for that, and thank you to your family.

The justice system comes out only with a decision. In your opinion, if a decision is motivated or if reasons are provided, does it give you any more confidence in the system, rather than just having a decision saying whether parole is awarded or not? Is the reasoning behind a decision important for you?

• (1725)

Jo-Anne Landolt: I never want them to be paroled either way.

In terms of reasoning, you hear how they are in parole hearings. Things come up all the time as to how they are now and what was happening when they were younger. We get information at parole hearings. I believe the Parole Board knows they're not at a point where they could be released. I don't really even think they're....

Do I feel there should be a reason? Ultimately, I don't feel they should be released, so any reason is....

Patricia Lattanzio: If a decision were motivated, do you feel it would reinforce confidence in the justice system, because we would understand the reasons?

Jo-Anne Landolt: Yes, I understand that. If they have reasons, they obviously know what's going on and what these offenders are really about.

At the last hearing we went to, they said, "You know, you're not fooling anybody. You say one thing, but then you turn around, answer a question and contradict yourself." They can see through the offenders, which is nice to know, because offenders will sometimes put a mask on when they're in front of a parole board, saying what they want to hear. "Sometimes people mess up." That's what our offenders say. They messed up. They say, on paper, that they're ready to get out, but their actions and words aren't saying that.

Okay. I hope I answered that satisfactorily, in terms of what you're planning to....

Patricia Lattanzio: My next question is for you, Dr. Roebuck.

We've heard during this study that supporting victims and ensuring that there are strong legal safeguards are, somehow, competing objectives.

What is your opinion on that?

Dr. Benjamin Roebuck: I'd like to say that I believe firmly in rehabilitation but that there are signs of progress when that is happening.

We have to give more space to considering the needs of victims and survivors in these processes, but we also need to have fairness in the procedure. Fairness has to be applied all around.

Patricia Lattanzio: Speaking of fairness, is it fair to say that legislation designed to support victims is ultimately strongest when it is both responsive to victim concerns and structured in a way that reduces the risk of future legal uncertainty?

Dr. Benjamin Roebuck: Yes, and that's why I'm inviting the committee to see this as part of the conversation and then to consider all the different ways that survivors are affected by the parole process, like postponements.

Patricia Lattanzio: Based on your experience in advocating for victims, would you encourage parliamentarians to adopt reasonable amendments that strengthen the legal framework of the bill, even those amendments that do not change the core objective of this bill?

Dr. Benjamin Roebuck: Yes. The bill has to be safe from constitutional scrutiny, and that's what's in the best interest of victims. If there are procedural amendments to pass it in a more effective way, then that's in the interest of victims.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Lattanzio.

Mr. Fortin, you have two and a half minutes.

[*Translation*]

Rhéal Éloi Fortin: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Roebuck, I'd like to give you a chance to talk a bit more about rehabilitation. Please go ahead.

[*English*]

Dr. Benjamin Roebuck: In our work, it's clear that there's overlap between serious victimization and serious offending. We have to believe that survivors have ways to recover. I think that's different from the matters of this case, and I think that this conversation is fairly narrow in scope to a broader conversation on rehabilitation.

• (1730)

[*Translation*]

Rhéal Éloi Fortin: Ms. Landolt told us that rehabilitation isn't possible for Kimberly Proctor's killers. When I look at what happened, I tend to agree with her. Although I do believe in rehabilitation, I do think there may be people who can't be rehabilitated.

Would you agree that rehabilitation isn't always possible? If so, what do we do with those people?

[*English*]

Dr. Benjamin Roebuck: My answer would be that if there are no signs of rehabilitation, if there are no signs of progress, if there's high risk and if there are clear indications that they're not going to be changing their behaviour, we have to consider the impact on victims.

Rhéal Éloi Fortin: The impact...?

Dr. Benjamin Roebuck: The impact on the victims of such—

[*Translation*]

Rhéal Éloi Fortin: I understand. We agree on that, but I don't think we can give the victim's family any real comfort. What they've gone through is unimaginable.

What do we, as a society, do with people who commit such heinous crimes, especially in their youth? Do we throw in the towel? We used to have the death penalty. That took care of the problem. The death penalty doesn't exist anymore. I'm against the death penalty, so I'm not complaining. Nevertheless, what do we do? These people continue to live, so do we keep them behind bars their entire lives, or do we throw in the towel? Is there anything that can be done for those people? I don't know. I'm not an expert. I'm a lawyer, but rehabilitation, sociology and all that isn't my specialty.

[*English*]

Dr. Benjamin Roebuck: I don't think I can give a satisfactory answer in the time we have.

[*Translation*]

Rhéal Éloi Fortin: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

The Chair: I want to thank all the witnesses for taking the time to be here, particularly you, Ma'am, for sharing this very difficult personal story.

Committee, we're going to suspend for just a few minutes.

• (1730)

(Pause)

• (1740)

The Chair: Welcome to the second hour of the meeting. We'll proceed to clause-by-clause consideration of the bill.

With us to answer technical questions, we have, from the Department of Justice, a couple of familiar faces: Joanna Wells, senior counsel and team lead, criminal law policy section; and Erin Kelly, legal counsel. Thank you for joining us again.

We will jump right in. I will start with clause 1.

I apologize. The amendments up to G-4 are dependent on the approval of G-4. Based on my discussions earlier, I believe we have unanimous consent to start with G-4 and then go back to the beginning. Is that correct?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(On clause 4)

The Chair: This is part of clause 4. Shall G-4, moved by Ms. Lattanzio, carry?

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 4 allowed to stand)

The Chair: Members, we're now voting on clause 1. Shall clause 1 carry?

(Clause 1 agreed to)

The Chair: G-1, moved by Ms. Lattanzio, proposes new clause 1.1. Shall G-1 carry?

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: G-2, moved by Ms. Lattanzio, proposes new clause 1.2.

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(On clause 2)

The Chair: Clause 2 brings us to G-3, moved by Ms. Lattanzio. Shall G-3 carry?

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 2 as amended agreed to)

(Clause 3 agreed to)

(On clause 4)

The Chair: We are now on G-5, moved by Ms. Lattanzio. Shall G-5 carry?

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 4 as amended agreed to)

The Chair: G-6, moved by Ms. Lattanzio, proposes a new clause 5.

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: That takes us to G-7 and proposed new clause 6, moved by Ms. Lattanzio.

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall the short title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the bill as amended carry?

(Bill C-235 as amended agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the chair report the bill as amended to the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the committee order a reprint of the bill as amended for the use of the House at report stage?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: That takes care of that.

Before we adjourn, we have the budgets for Bill C-231 and Bill C-235, which were previously circulated. Does everybody agree with these budgets? Can we adopt these budgets?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Thank you.

● (1745)

[*Translation*]

Rhéal Éloi Fortin: Do you know what we'll be working on come Monday?

[*English*]

The Chair: I'm sorry, Mr. Fortin. Can you repeat that, please?

[*Translation*]

Rhéal Éloi Fortin: I don't want to get ahead of you, but before you adjourn the meeting, I was wondering whether you had a sense of what we'll be doing on Monday.

[*English*]

The Chair: I'm happy to answer that question after the meeting. I'm not in a position to answer it right now.

Mr. Baber, do you wish to speak?

Roman Baber (York Centre, CPC): Unfortunately, Mr. Kibble had to leave. On behalf of Mr. Kibble, I just wanted to thank everyone here for allowing the swift passage of this bill.

Thank you to the government for working with us.

To the officials, thank you very much for your very competent work and figuring out the mechanics as to how to make it happen. Thank you again.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Baber.

I will echo those comments and thank all the committee members too, for being so efficient with this bill.

On that note, I will adjourn the meeting.

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>