



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 019

Tuesday, December 9, 2025

Chair: Jean-Yves Duclos



Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

Tuesday, December 9, 2025

• (1100)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC)): I call this meeting to order.

It's a pleasure and an honour to be here with you. Welcome to meeting number 19 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security.

To begin this morning, we're resuming debate on the motion moved by me on Thursday, December 4 and on the amendment moved by Ms. Acan. Both the motion and the amendment have been distributed to members by the clerk via email.

Is there any further debate on the motion?

Madame DeBellefeuille, you have the floor.

[Translation]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to ask for the committee's unanimous consent to wipe the slate clean and start from scratch with the motion I tabled, the one that all parties have been able to discuss. We could then try to come to a consensus on my motion.

I don't know if there's unanimous consent.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Before we go to Ms. Acan, I have to canvass the room as to whether there is unanimous consent. Just so we're clear, Madame DeBellefeuille, are you asking for unanimous consent to consider the motion that you put forward? Is that correct? Oh, sorry, Madame, are you seeking unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment?

[Translation]

Claude DeBellefeuille: I'm having trouble understanding you, because I'm hearing the French and English interpretations at the same time.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Okay, we'll suspend for 30 seconds, please. Thank you.

• (1100)

(Pause)

• (1105)

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Madame DeBellefeuille, when we left off, I was seeking clarification on your proposal for unanimous consent.

Could you summarize it one more time, please?

[Translation]

Claude DeBellefeuille: There was a lot of discussion at the last meeting, because we may not have all been prepared to see how we were going to anticipate the debates on the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-8. I then moved a motion, and all parties received a copy. I move:

That the Chair be instructed to invite the Minister of Industry to appear before the committee as part of its study of Bill C-8 no later than Friday, January 30, 2026;

that the analysts provide the committee with a summary of the recommendations received by the clerk, either during committee proceedings or in the form of briefs, on the day of the Minister's appearance;

that the deadline for submitting amendments be set at 48 working hours following the Minister's appearance;

that the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-8 begin only after the Minister has appeared;

that the committee devote the number of meetings necessary to complete the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-8 and that the committee do not proceed to other committee business until the clause-by-clause review is concluded.

Mr. Chair, I thought this motion brought together all the wishes of the committee members around the table to make it possible to keep working on Bill C-8. I was hoping there would be a consensus. I need unanimous consent so that we can use this motion as a basis for discussion, rather than following a motion that deals with a procedural formality, such as the motion you tabled and that Ms. Acan amended. As needed, I would probably subamend or amend it myself, depending on the context.

You're the boss, so I shared my proposal with you to facilitate our discussions—

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): No, the committee is the boss here. If I understand it correctly, to be clear, Madame DeBellefeuille is seeking unanimous consent to substitute her motion that has been distributed for the motion that was put forward and subsequently amended.

Are we all on the same page there? Okay.

Do we have unanimous consent to do so?

Ms. Acan, go ahead, please.

Sima Acan (Oakville West, Lib.): Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

I believe that we can all move forward with Madame DeBellefeuille's motion, as she has the option. It includes my amendment and, with her motion, I believe that we can all agree. For that reason, I would like to have unanimous consent from the floor to withdraw my amendment, so we can move forward with Madame DeBellefeuille's motion.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Ms. Acan is seeking unanimous consent to withdraw her amendment. Is anybody opposed?

(Amendment withdrawn)

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Now we also have the main motion on the floor. Ms. DeBellefeuille, as I understand it, is seeking unanimous consent to replace the motion, and I don't think we need a withdrawal if that's the case.

Yes, Ms. Kirkland, do you want to intervene?

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Yes, I'm happy with what is here. I would suggest a friendly amendment to Madame DeBellefeuille's motion—

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): I'm sorry. If I may interrupt, I believe we have to deal with the UC motion first, Ms. Kirkland.

Rhonda Kirkland: Oh, I see.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): To be clear, we have a motion on the floor. Ms. DeBellefeuille is seeking to substitute her motion for the motion on the floor. Do we have unanimous consent for that?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): We are now on Madame DeBellefeuille's motion, which is before the committee.

Ms. Acan, you had your hand up earlier. Do you still seek the floor?

• (1110)

Sima Acan: No. I raised my voice. Thank you so much.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Thank you.

Is there any discussion on this motion?

Ms. Kirkland, go ahead, please.

Rhonda Kirkland: Yes. Again, I would just ask that we potentially have a friendly amendment to remove, in the last paragraph, after Bill C-8:

and that the committee not proceed to other committee business until the clause-by-clause review is concluded

My reasoning for that, if you would like to have it, is simply that we're not sure what may come up, and I would never want to preclude us from potentially dealing also with the recommendations of madam's study, which we have coming up when we return, and potential other business. I don't see it happening, but it may. I just don't want to box us in.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Thank you, Miss Kirkland.

I don't know that we can regard it as a friendly amendment. It is substantial. Would you be moving that amendment formally?

Rhonda Kirkland: Yes.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Okay.

Is there any discussion on Ms. Kirkland's amendment?

Madam DeBellefeuille, please go ahead.

[Translation]

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Chair, this committee usually has trouble working by consensus. Our process has been quite complex from the beginning. I know that the reason Ms. Kirkland would like to remove that small phrase from my motion is to give us more flexibility.

If the amendment were to be adopted.... I see my motion as a test of commitment and honesty. For my part, I want the consideration of Bill C-8 to be done intelligently and as quickly as possible when we come back from the holiday break. Of course, amendments will be proposed, but we know that it won't be a huge amount of work.

I would love to see all the committee members get behind the motion and commit to having Bill C-8 as one of our priorities when we come back so that the committee can move on to other work.

I obviously understand Ms. Kirkland when she says she's afraid that the motion will restrict the committee and give the chair the necessary legitimacy to not convene a meeting.

It's a test of trust, then. If the amendment is adopted, it will mean that we trust each other and that we're simply giving ourselves some flexibility. If there's a problem, the chair will obviously have to convene the committee. There's other work coming up; there's my study, which is at the report-writing stage, and there's Mr. Caputo's study, which will continue.

Personally, I want to trust our team. We had a great experience with the consideration of Bill C-12. This amendment could be acceptable. If the Liberals agree, it could be seen as a friendly amendment so that we can quickly agree on how to proceed with the work surrounding Bill C-8.

I'll make that commitment. The Bloc Québécois really wants Bill C-8 to be passed quickly when we return from the holiday break. However, I understand Ms. Kirkland's amendment, which seeks to give the committee some flexibility in case there's a mishap.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Thank you for that.

Ms. Acan, the floor is yours.

[English]

Sima Acan: *Merci*, Mr. Chair.

I agree with Madame DeBellefeuille.

We can, as a committee, work together on that clause-by-clause and make a very quick study on that, as the legislation takes priority, especially clause-by-clause.

Raising that amendment could possibly lead to delays. It's a potential. I support Madame DeBellefeuille's motion to say:

and that the committee not proceed to other committee business until the clause-by-clause review is concluded.

I believe our committee will do a fast study and will finish it after clause-by-clause, focusing on this legislation and on this clause-by-clause study, so I would like to move forward with the motion but not the amendment.

Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Thank you.

Is there any further discussion?

Madam Kirkland, please go ahead.

Rhonda Kirkland: My only comment would be that I agree with both of you in some ways. The truth is that it is a matter of trust, as Madame DeBellefeuille has said. I don't see any reason we can't move on with C-8 and continue it. I stand with my thought that it boxes us in when we have that there. We don't know what may arise. Hopefully there's nothing. That would be my wish as well, but why box us in if we don't have to, if this is a matter of trust.

• (1115)

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Thank you.

Ms. Acan.

Sima Acan: Mr. Chair, can we suspend for a short period please?

Frank Caputo: Sure. We will suspend for a couple of minutes. Thank you.

• (1115)

_____ (Pause) _____

• (1125)

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): We are ready to go. I saw a lot of talking, which is good. I hope the discussions were fruitful. Did we come to any consensus?

Go ahead, Madam Kirkland.

Rhonda Kirkland: Yes, so the consensus would be that I would withdraw my amendment—

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): You need unanimous consent for that.

(Amendment withdrawn)

Rhonda Kirkland: I move a new amendment, which would leave everything here as is, but add the words “unless otherwise decided by the committee”.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Okay.

Is there discussion on that amendment?

Dane Lloyd (Parkland, CPC): I love it.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Could we just get a moment here to make sure that our clerk is ready?

My sense is that we have consensus on this.

(Amendment agreed to)

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Now we move to discussion on the main motion.

There's no discussion. I think we can probably move...with a show of hands, given the discussions.

(Motion as amended agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): I think that's what we had scheduled for committee business.

Is there any other committee business to be discussed?

Okay, with that, we will suspend until noon. Thank you.

• (1125)

_____ (Pause) _____

• (1145)

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): I call the meeting back to order.

Thank you to our witness, Mr. Sauv , for coming early and for agreeing to begin early. Welcome back.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and the motion adopted by the committee on September 18, the committee is resuming its study of Canada's ability to remove foreign nationals with a criminal record.

I'd like to welcome our sole witness for this afternoon. From the National Police Federation, we have Mr. Brian Sauv .

You have up to five minutes for your opening statement.

Brian Sauv  (President, National Police Federation): Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the committee.

Good afternoon. My name is Brian Sauv . I'm the president of the National Police Federation, which represents about 20,000 members of the RCMP across Canada and internationally.

While responsibility for removing foreign nationals rests with the CBSA under the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, the RCMP play an essential supporting role.

RCMP involvement occurs in three main areas. The first is identifying bad actors during arrests, traffic stops, criminal investigations and intelligence work. The second is border interceptions, particularly between ports of entry, including those with criminal histories or ongoing investigations. The third is supporting high-risk removals by locating, arresting and securing individuals who pose a threat to public safety.

In RCMP-contract provinces, these responsibilities often fall directly to our frontline police officers. This can add significant workload to detachments that are already facing high call volumes and other policing challenges. It also increases officer safety risks. Individuals avoiding deportation may flee, resist arrest or reoffend. This underscores that immigration enforcement must remain a federal responsibility, supported by dedicated RCMP federal policing resources rather than downloaded onto community police officers.

Today, I'd like to focus on three areas in which federal action could strengthen Canada's ability to remove foreign nationals involved in criminal activity or with criminal records.

The first is dedicated resources and fenced federal funding. The operational reality is that absconder investigations divert frontline police officers from core duties, reducing response capacity and adding workload pressures. Budget 2025's commitment to hiring 1,000 new RCMP personnel is welcome, but to be effective, federal policing must receive fenced, dedicated funding for immigration-related enforcement and intelligence to support the CBSA.

Dedicated federal policing capacity means earlier identification of high-risk individuals, stronger intelligence development, and better coordination with the CBSA, the IRCC, CSIS and all other police services.

The second is strengthening information sharing and updating privacy legislation. Effective removals rely on timely and accurate information. Today, information sharing among CBSA, IRCC, CSIS and the police is inconsistent. RCMP members often receive partial, outdated or incomplete information about a person's immigration status, risk level, removal order or failure to appear. In some cases, disclosure is restricted due to legislative or interpretive privacy barriers—not because sharing is unsafe or inappropriate, but because the rules are simply unclear.

Canada needs real-time, automated data sharing between the CBSA and police systems, including immigration status flags and failure to appear alerts in the Canadian Police Information Centre, as well as clarity in privacy legislation to ensure it supports rather than restricts the timely release of information necessary for public safety.

Bill C-2's lawful access provisions were an important step. Individuals evading deportation routinely change devices, use unregistered phones or hide behind encrypted platforms. This is one tool. Lawful access improvements must be paired with stronger immigration-related information sharing. Without both of these, critical gaps in deportation enforcement will remain.

The third area would be expanding joint task forces and enforcement units. Effective removals of high-risk foreign nationals require coordinated, multi-agency work. No single agency can manage them alone.

Joint task forces allow intelligence to be shared quickly, reduce duplication and ensure that all partners are working from the same intelligence picture. Recent examples, such as the RCMP's extortion task force, show the value of integrated operations. Its work helped CBSA open investigations into 96 potentially inadmissible individuals and directly supported several removals.

• (1150)

The members of the RCMP are proud to serve Canadians. To continue keeping communities safe, we need dedicated federal policing resources, modernized information sharing and stronger inter-agency co-operation.

Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Thank you, Mr. Sauvé.

We'll begin our first round with Ms. Kirkland for six minutes, please.

• (1155)

Rhonda Kirkland: Thank you, Mr. Sauvé. I appreciate you for being here again with us today.

From your five-minute testimony, it sounds like we have hundreds and thousands, we're finding out, of foreign nationals with criminal convictions missing in Canada.

It sounds as though you don't believe the current removal system is working and that we need an overhaul of that system, or at least more support.

Can you elaborate briefly on that?

Brian Sauvé: I think every system needs modernization and continuous improvement. I wouldn't say it is not working. I would say it is working, but it's working to its own capacity at the moment. That is obviously not meeting the needs of Canadians.

Rhonda Kirkland: Do you think there's enough collaboration between RCMP and CBSA and that it's capable right now, or is there a way to make that better?

Brian Sauvé: There's always a way to make it better.

I won't speak for our CBSA colleagues, but I would suspect that they would echo our concerns as well, that more ability and boots on the ground to be able to enact inland enforcement and support all of those agencies would be much appreciated.

Rhonda Kirkland: Okay, thank you.

How often do RCMP officers, would you say, in general encounter foreign nationals with criminal records on a regular basis?

Brian Sauv : In my policing experience as a frontline police officer in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, I encountered two during routine traffic stops. However, when I speak to my colleagues who are working border enforcement or border security, they encounter them on a more regular basis, because that's where you're dealing with illegal migrants who are crossing into the country, or dealing with human traffickers who are trying to profit from those who are trying to come into the country.

Rhonda Kirkland: What happens next, once they're encountered? Are they taken into custody? Are they released? What's the next step in the process?

Brian Sauv : From our side of the house, they're taken into custody with us and transferred to CBSA for processing.

Rhonda Kirkland: Are you aware of what happens to them after that point, or is that something I need to ask CBSA?

Brian Sauv : You should probably speak through to CBSA. They would be the subject matter experts on that.

Rhonda Kirkland: Okay.

It seems to me that they ought to be detained until they are removed, to prevent them from vanishing again, but I suspect that's not what is happening.

You did mention they flee, resist arrest and then reoffend. Were you referring to being released and reoffending or...?

Brian Sauv : Should someone be in Canada illegally with a criminal record or with exposure to criminal history, and should they be released on their own recognizance awaiting an appearance, they may reoffend, yes.

Rhonda Kirkland: They are being released then, after they're taken into custody. Rather than being removed, they're being released.

Brian Sauv : It's my understanding, yes. Not all, but some are being released, yes.

Rhonda Kirkland: Perhaps, based on the public safety minister's testimony, those are the addresses he possibly is referring to. When we release them, we have addresses, but who knows where they go after that? We do not know, if we release them.

Do you have any more insight into how Canada reached the point where so many convicted foreign nationals can simply disappear before deportation? Do you have anything more to add on that?

Brian Sauv : No, I don't.

Rhonda Kirkland: Okay. How much danger do these missing individuals pose to the general public, would you say?

Brian Sauv : Without knowing who we're talking about or case specifics, I can't really comment on their propensity for danger, but obviously we do have a challenge with those who are in the country illegally and who have not been properly vetted.

Rhonda Kirkland: I'll just pivot for my last question.

How much time do I have left, Chair?

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): You have one minute and 40 seconds.

Rhonda Kirkland: Perfect. I'll just pivot briefly, because I was made aware that the RCMP recently did a review essentially regarding firearms and recommending that the Government of Canada overhaul the firearm classification system.

I know this is slightly off-topic, but I have a quick question. It's a troubling report, in my opinion, because it feels like it was done in secret. I don't know what consultations were done with regard to that.

I know you weren't prepared to answer questions on that, but if you have anything that you could share with the committee, that would be helpful.

Brian Sauv : When we start talking about guns, I'm a fan of investing in stopping illegal firearms trafficking versus investing elsewhere.

• (1200)

Rhonda Kirkland: Okay. That's good to know.

Do you know the qualifications of the folks in the RCMP who wrote that report?

Brian Sauv : No.

Rhonda Kirkland: You have no idea what's hidden. There are redactions in that report, and quite a lot of them; do you know what that is?

Brian Sauv : No.

Rhonda Kirkland: Okay. That's fair enough. I will—

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): You have 30 seconds.

Rhonda Kirkland: I have 30 seconds. What else can I ask you?

Can the RCMP confidently tell Canadians that the missing individuals will not reoffend?

You cannot. You've already answered that question.

Brian Sauv : I can't tell you that any missing individual or anyone who's been released on their own recognizance will not reoffend.

Rhonda Kirkland: If you were to pick one breakdown point in the process that could be fixed rather quickly, would you be able to name one?

Brian Sauv : The RCMP process is actually fairly expedient. From us—

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Unfortunately, we will have to pick that up later.

[Translation]

Thank you, Ms. Kirkland.

I now give the floor to Mr. Ehsassi for six minutes.

[English]

Hon. Ali Ehsassi (Willowdale, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Sauvé, for coming back once again. I've always found your testimony to be very helpful, very concise and very well considered.

You made three specific recommendations. Number two, I believe, was about stronger coordination among the CBSA, RCMP and police services.

Could you describe how that coordination is currently taking place and what alternative you had in mind, so we can do a better job of making sure that communication is taking place and it's helpful to police services?

Brian Sauvé: Integration works. Whether we're talking about municipal, provincial and federal police services working together on a priority, or if we identify that border security and immigration are an issue, the two agencies responsible for the border in Canada, the RCMP and CBSA, should integrate themselves with respect to inland enforcement as well as deportation, should that be deemed necessary.

It works. You have teams sharing information, very much like we are here. We can all be on the same page and know what's going on with our priorities, our targets and our tasks. It just works, versus having intelligence silos where one particular agency—it could be a municipal or provincial police service or the RCMP—have their intelligence silo, and perhaps they share information, but then they consider whether they need to redact it for privacy considerations because it's going to a different agency. How did they collect that information?

That's where you end up with gaps. Is CBSA sharing information with CSIS? Is CSIS sharing information with the RCMP? Is RCMP sharing information with that triangle? Is that information actionable intelligence? Is it unvetted? Is everybody operating on the same page? Integration works.

Hon. Ali Ehsassi: I don't mean to question what you're saying. I completely agree with you that better coordination and better integration would certainly assist. I think all of us can agree on that.

My question is this: I'll get into intelligence sharing, but to the extent that there is coordination, how is that coordination taking place, and how can we improve that so we have enhanced coordination and police officers can do a more effective job?

Brian Sauvé: That was my misunderstanding. I apologize.

The example I gave is the RCMP-led extortion task force, which is up and running in British Columbia right now. The RCMP is leading it, using its major crime model. You have a number of seconded CBSA officers in there, and you have some municipal police services, such as the Abbotsford and Surrey police departments, working in there, and it is working extremely well.

From that perspective, the lesson we can learn is when that works and as it works, whether it's a combination of a provincial and a federally funded agency or otherwise, let's expand on that and move it to higher-priority areas or high-threat areas, whether they be Toronto, Montreal, Halifax, Calgary, etc., so that when we see something is working well, we can make it a fully functioning unit.

• (1205)

Hon. Ali Ehsassi: You would advise that we use the same model that is being used currently for extortion.

Brian Sauvé: Yes, I'd advise a similar one.

Hon. Ali Ehsassi: That's about people going on secondment and working very closely together.

Brian Sauvé: Yes.

Hon. Ali Ehsassi: Okay. Thank you.

Now we'll go to the next issue that you have identified, which is information sharing.

In your testimony, you said that there are some safeguards, and those safeguards are there for privacy considerations. More specifically, if we are to make recommendations, what are some of those specific safeguards that you think we can possibly do away with?

Brian Sauvé: One of the challenges and what I was alluding to in my opening remarks was that when they aren't working in the same room together, there are challenges with the sharing of information, due to privacy considerations. That's when you end up with those silos that are not necessarily sharing a fulsome intelligence report with another agency. If they're all in the same room, coordinated and integrated, then the intelligence and actionable material that they receive is received by the entire team, all the agencies working together.

Those are the challenges that we see with information sharing between agencies outside of coordination or integration.

Hon. Ali Ehsassi: As long as they essentially work in close proximity to each other, hand in glove, it's not a concern, whereas, if they have to use channels of communication, then that prohibits better information sharing.

Brian Sauvé: It does.

My experience with integrated teams is that everyone comes into one standard. For example, CBSA, Abbotsford Police or Vancouver Police will come into an RCMP team, and they will work under the RCMP standard. That means everybody is working to the same security classifications, etc.

Hon. Ali Ehsassi: It's all about integrating those teams.

Brian Sauvé: It is, yes.

Hon. Ali Ehsassi: Excellent. Thank you very much.

[Translation]

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Thank you, Mr. Ehsassi.

Mrs. DeBellefeuille, you have the floor for six minutes.

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Sauvé, the committee heard from representatives of the Canada Border Services Agency, or CBSA, before your appearance. We asked them how many officers were assigned to removals at the CBSA. We were told that there were 350 of them and that about 200 investigators could take part in the investigations.

On your end, do you know if the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, or RCMP, has a set number of officers assigned to the border services removal team?

Brian Sauv : That's a question for the RCMP. I'm not sure of the exact number of RCMP members in that role.

Claude DeBellefeuille: You may not know the number, but do you know if there's a specialized team somewhere in Canada that supports officers assigned to removals?

Brian Sauv : An extortion task force has been set up in British Columbia. That's the only team assigned to the immigration program. There's also the integrated border enforcement team, whose membership has fluctuated over the years based on various security priorities. Since security is a high priority for the government these days, the team has grown. Those teams deal with border security for arrivals to Canada, not for departures.

Claude DeBellefeuille: The RCMP can't tell us whether there's a special team that assists officers assigned to removals or investigators, then. Maybe we'll ask the commissioner.

In southern Quebec, where I'm an MP, there are a lot of illegal crossings. An active criminal network helps immigrants illegally cross from Canada into the United States or from the United States into Canada. We know that there's an integrated team in that region, where the S ret  du Qu bec, the RCMP and the CBSA are working together to try to get their hands on that network.

Am I mistaken?

Brian Sauv : No. There's indeed an integrated team that ensures security at the border. Its mandate isn't only to enforce the law within the country, but also to ensure border security for people who enter Canada illegally. It also handles human trafficking from the United States into Canada.

• (1210)

Claude DeBellefeuille: A smuggler was recently charged and has been incarcerated for 75 days. He was sentenced and will be imprisoned for four months. That person entered Canada illegally, is incarcerated and will serve his sentence.

For the people listening to us, can you explain to us what will happen when he gets out of prison? If I understand correctly, your job was to help the Canada Border Services Agency arrest that person and put him in prison. After his time in prison, will you also have any responsibility in that matter? Will all the responsibility lie with the agency?

Brian Sauv : After that, it's the responsibility of the agency, but also of the Correctional Service of Canada. It depends on the length of the sentence. The responsibility then lies with Quebec, first the S ret  du Qu bec and then Quebec's municipal police services.

Claude DeBellefeuille: This national, who is an illegal immigrant, is currently imprisoned for four months. After his time in prison, will the S ret  du Qu bec, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or the Canada Border Services Agency take over to ensure that he leaves the country?

Brian Sauv : When he gets out of prison, it will be up to the agency.

Claude DeBellefeuille: Okay.

Brian Sauv : If the agency lets him go on his own or if he doesn't report to the authorities, it will come back to the S ret  du Qu bec as a priority.

Claude DeBellefeuille: Are you made aware of smugglers who have been removed and suddenly return to Canada and continue to carry out illegal smuggling? For example, does the agency inform you when a smuggler has returned to Canada with another identity or name and is still illegally smuggling? Are you in close enough contact with the agency to be informed of that?

Brian Sauv : The integrated team we were talking about earlier—the S ret  du Qu bec; the Canada Border Services Agency; U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or CBP; and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police—has that information. If someone who has been removed from Canada after serving in prison returns to engage in human trafficking, among other things, that information will immediately be sent to the integrated team.

That said, some always come back.

[English]

Criminals like to evade.

[Translation]

They evade law enforcement. They always find new tricks, and Canada is a fantastic place to be.

[English]

That's why everybody wants to be here.

[Translation]

Claude DeBellefeuille: It's a sieve.

Brian Sauv : That's right.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Thank you, Mrs. DeBellefeuille. Your time is up.

[English]

With that, we will move on to Mr. Au for five minutes, please.

Chak Au (Richmond Centre—Marpole, CPC): Thank you very much for the presentation. I agree with most of your recommendations.

Let's begin perhaps with the issues about identification. Right now, I want to know if there is one central place where police officers can access information about a person who's in front of the officer as to whether or not this guy is wanted. Is there one single place where you can get information?

Brian Sauv : Yes. That's the Canadian Police Information Centre. We call it CPIC.

Chak Au: Okay. How is this related to the information in the CBSA's possession?

Brian Sauv : Well, when CPIC information is not updated in a timely fashion, that has an impact on law enforcement operations across the country. If someone is arrested on a domestic violence charge and is facing a first appearance, that information, with those conditions or release conditions, needs to be updated to CPIC in a timely fashion, so that other law enforcement agencies or other police officers who might encounter that individual can enforce those conditions. It's really speed and the ability to update CPIC.

Chak Au: Right now, how fast is that being updated?

Brian Sauv : The platform probably deserves a renewal. I think it's very old software.

• (1215)

Chak Au: Okay. Very good.

Again, in an operation, assuming that a police officer encounters a person, is it automatic that the RCMP officer would check on the person's status as to whether or not he's wanted or whether there are any outstanding deportation warrants?

Brian Sauv : I mean, assuming we... We are assuming—let's start there. The assumption is that the person I stopped on the side of the road is going to be honest with me and give me their true identity. That's the first assumption. Assuming that we're dealing with the true first name, last name, date of birth and some physical characteristics, I can be accurate in my results search from CPIC. However, we're talking about folks who are not necessarily honest here, because they are trying to evade arrest. They know they are being sought for deportation or that they've missed an appearance, so it might take a bit longer to figure that one out. Then, we get into challenges of lawful detention and how long I can hold someone roadside for a motor vehicle act offence.

Obviously, identity is a challenge. It is one of the core tenets of being able to hold someone at the side of the road. However, it becomes more challenging, from a police officer's perspective, to work through pictures, physical characteristics and all of those things to ensure you're dealing with the right person.

Chak Au: In other words, even if the person is wanted and he's in front of you, sometimes you cannot really identify that this is the guy who has to be arrested and detained.

Brian Sauv : I'm saying that sometimes it takes longer. Sometimes you might even have to go to the extent of taking that person into custody and asking for fingerprints to get to that point.

Chak Au: Again, if you have that person and you've identified he is the guy who's wanted and has a deportation warrant, what's next? Would you keep the person for as long as you need, or do you need to pass it on to CBSA for further action?

Brian Sauv : It gets passed on to CBSA. We would take that person into custody, they would be brought into our cells, obviously, and then CBSA would be notified. It is their deportation warrant, so we would transfer custody to them and they would take care of them.

Chak Au: Usually, how long would it take for the transfer?

Brian Sauv : It depends on where you are. If you're in a major centre, it could be within hours. However, if you're in Fort St. John, or Cold Lake, Alberta, it might be the next day or two days.

Chak Au: Has it happened before that, due to administrative or policy restrictions, you have to release that person before they can be handed over to CBSA?

Brian Sauv : The RCMP wouldn't release unless CBSA authorizes the release.

Chak Au: Do you have the authority to keep the person as long as needed?

Brian Sauv : Yes.

Chak Au: Now, you talked about the identification issues. How do you see that Bill C-8 could address those issues?

Brian Sauv : Bill C-8...? You have me. There have been so many C's during the last couple of weeks.

Chak Au: I mean the one that we're talking about, Bill C-12.

Brian Sauv : Oh, it's Bill C-12. I'm sorry. I was confused there for a second.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): I'm sorry, Mr. Sauv , but we'll have to pick up on Bill C-8, Bill C-12 and other such bills after the next round, because we are proceeding to Dr. Powlowski for five minutes, please.

Marcus Powlowski (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, Lib.): Thank you.

Mr. Sauv , am I right that, for border security, if it's a formal border crossing point, it's CBSA, but in between, that's RCMP. Is that right?

Brian Sauv : Yes. That's correct.

Marcus Powlowski: Does the RCMP have all the same powers and the same jurisdiction with respect to, for example, checking to see whether someone has a work permit, as CBSA would?

Brian Sauv : Well, you wouldn't be crossing between ports of entry if you're authorized to be in the country.

Marcus Powlowski: If you're what?

Brian Sauv : If you're authorized to be in the country—i.e., if you have a work permit—you would cross at a lawful port of entry.

Marcus Powlowski: There is, say, in northern Ontario—Rainy Lake and Lake of the Woods—the remote access program. You can cross there. You're supposed to have a work permit. If the RCMP were to stop them, is that the kind of thing they could have the power to ask for? Could they say, "Well, let's see your work permit"?

Brian Sauv : Yes, we could ask to see the work permit. We could even get on the phone or radio to CBSA to confirm.

Marcus Powlowski: Now, this is a problem I've been dealing with, because, as you may know, my riding goes from Thunder Bay to the Manitoba border. There's a large area of territory there. Lake of the Woods and Rainy Lake are immense. There are tons of bays and lakes. The RCMP had one boat, which occasionally went back and forth there. CBSA may or may not have had one boat. We tried to work on this, and hopefully we got somewhere.

We've talked about coordination. Treaty 3 has boats already. Natural Resources and the province have boats. My guess is that they have two or three boats. If there were more overlap of jurisdiction, then, you would think, we could do a better job, not only of protecting the border but also, for example, making sure people weren't overfishing.

Should it be and is a sharing of responsibility something that occurs? It would seem to me.... I don't think the RCMP stop a boat in Canadian waters and see a whole bunch of fish and say, "I think you're over your limit of fish here. How many fish do you have?" However, Natural Resources enforces fishing limits. Is there that cross-jurisdictional ability to deal with something that is not formally in your jurisdiction, and should there be?

• (1220)

Brian Sauv : As long as all agencies are rowing in the same direction, we can accomplish the goal. If the resources to patrol the waters are owned by Natural Resources Canada, and CBSA and the RCMP need added resources to patrol the waters, a pilot can take those folks out on a Natural Resources boat. While you're there, you now have a crew with the authority to enforce everything that Natural Resources enforces.

Marcus Powlowski: This isn't your particular jurisdiction, but we were told that the CBSA refuses to go on the boats of some other agency, like the RCMP or Natural Resources. Do you know if that's really the case?

Brian Sauv : That I don't know.

Marcus Powlowski: To your knowledge, if the different agencies aren't working together and coordinating and jointly enforcing the rules, it's not because of any legislative impediment to doing so; it's more just lack of coordination.

Brian Sauv : It's lack of coordination, lack of will. Perhaps it's lack of manpower or lack of clear priorities to be able to do so.

Marcus Powlowski: Speaking of that, we don't have enough RCMP. The RCMP is looking for more people for that region, to do a lot of the border patrol.

I know that three Thunder Bay police force officers applied to join the RCMP, and the process was so onerous that they all decided to give up on it. This was despite the fact that the RCMP seems desperate to get people, and these were people who were going to stay in the area.

Are the requirements for officers transferring to the RCMP too onerous? It would seem to me that they are.

Brian Sauv : Any police officer recognized under a police service act in Canada can actually come over as an experienced police officer, assuming they've shown good character and good reputation in their current service. We do those background checks. It's

my understanding that there's a three-week training session at Depot, and they could be deployed across Canada now.

There has been a reluctance to move experienced police officers directly into federal policing roles now, because we have a lot of members who have been doing their time in Manitoba or Yukon or the Northwest Territories who want to go to those roles. A lot of experienced police officers have come over; however, there is a reluctance to bring them directly into those federal roles.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Thank you, Mr. Sauv  and Dr. Powlowski.

[*Translation*]

We'll now go to Mrs. DeBellefeuille for two and a half minutes.

Claude DeBellefeuille: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Sauv , this isn't your first visit here at this committee. You have told us on a number of occasions that what was hindering the work and effectiveness of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police was the allocation of your resources to the new priority. However, your current human resources, which comprise around 18,500 officers, haven't increased much, and the government's priorities are shifting.

The maple disruption 2025 initiative to fight fraud and cybercrime was announced today, so a team is focused on that. You also had to set up a team to respond to the government's priority of fighting extortion in British Columbia and ensuring border security, mainly in the south.

What would you like to see so that you can be more active when it comes to intercepting nationals and having them leave the country? Given all these new priorities, shouldn't there be a team dedicated to the issue of criminal nationals who are still in Canada? Should this issue be a government priority?

• (1225)

Brian Sauv : In terms of federal policing, I think so. Maple disruption 2025 is an existing team that has announced a new project to combat fraud, cybercrime and so on. It isn't really a new priority for that team. It's a new project that was just announced. I read a publication about it this morning.

Claude DeBellefeuille: Yes.

Brian Sauv : When it comes to nationals, immigrants and so on, a team will be dedicated to that task. The government's priority is to move in that direction. The government is going to give us all the tools we need for success.

Claude DeBellefeuille: That's right. From what I understand, you aren't getting the political signal you need to devote significant resources to the whole issue of immigrant nationals who are wanted criminals. You're only getting the political signal needed to make it a priority.

Brian Sauv : That's right. I have to say that the RCMP's involvement in that operation is really limited. It can involve arrests, intelligence or managing an integrated team. When someone is arrested, it's the Canada Border Services Agency that handles their file. We don't touch the file after that. Even when someone was crossing at Roxham Road, in the Swanton area, for example, we read them their rights then referred them to the Canada Border Services Agency. We had finished our task at that point.

Claude DeBellefeuille: Yes, we—

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Thank you, Mrs. DeBellefeuille. I'm sorry, but your time is up.

Thank you, Mr. Sauv .

[English]

Now we will go to Mr. Lloyd for five minutes, please.

Dane Lloyd: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You're doing an excellent job.

Thank you to our witness for being here today.

Mr. Sauv , we've heard previous testimony about the need—that we need more RCMP officers, that there's an overload of work. How important is it for RCMP officers to have facilities to train with their firearms?

Brian Sauv : It is a basic requirement of employment to be able to carry and use a firearm. I would say that the more training facilities we have access to, the better.

Dane Lloyd: Are government-owned facilities widely available to all RCMP members across the country?

Brian Sauv : Well, I was in Iqaluit a little while ago, and they just got out into the back 40. I've also spent most of my career in the Lower Mainland of B.C., and there's a very professional facility at the PRTC in Chilliwack, so the varying degrees are there, from—

Dane Lloyd: That's not a government facility; it's a private facility that you use.

Brian Sauv : Do you mean the Pacific Region Training Centre? No, it is a government facility. It's the former CAF—and still currently quasi-CAF—facility.

Dane Lloyd: Okay.

What I'm getting at is that, you know, I've received information from the South Okanagan RCMP. They say that they do not want to see the Penticton Shooting Sports range closed down. They say that they use that facility for training. Did your organization... You might know that this committee just voted—possibly at our last meeting—to call on the government to not divest that facility or the land that the facility is based on. Do you have any thoughts on that?

Brian Sauv : I would support more training facilities for our membership all across the country, so that our members don't have to rely on gravel pits, farmers' fields or permission from neighbours to be able to go out and do pistol, shotgun and carbine training.

Dane Lloyd: Thank you.

I noted in previous testimony on other related issues that there's been a lot of evidence that visa requirement changes made by the government in the past 10 years have exacerbated the problem of

foreign nationals with criminal records. We had the president of the CBSA and other witnesses here at a recent meeting, talking about how it's almost as though they are trying to empty the bathtub with a bucket, but the bathtub is continuing to fill up almost as fast as they are able to drain the bucket. Obviously, you said that the RCMP is widely involved in these removals.

Have you noted that visa requirement changes have led to spikes in those with criminal records in Canada?

Brian Sauv : I haven't noted that, but obviously Canada has seen, over the last eight years, a large influx of immigrants. When you increase the number of people coming in, commensurate with populations across the world, you're going to increase all types of folks.

• (1230)

Dane Lloyd: Do we essentially need to screen out people who are high risk from coming into the country in the first place? If we don't have visas, is that removing a critical safeguard?

Brian Sauv : That I can't comment on. I don't know.

Dane Lloyd: At a previous meeting, I raised a bulletin that the criminal investigators for the CBSA were sent. In that bulletin, it said that, following the adoption of Bill C-75, which introduced the principle of restraint, criminal investigators are asked to take into account the least onerous measures and the least restrictive measures in cases that they're involved with. Is that something that RCMP members received direction on as well?

Brian Sauv : Do you mean with regard to day-to-day operations with the RCMP, or specifically...?

Dane Lloyd: I mean for immigration cases.

Brian Sauv : Well, again, with immigration cases we have very limited involvement. It's more or less arrest, enforcement and passing off to the CBSA. If there is an arrest, it's sharing with another agency.

Dane Lloyd: Your members would go out there and do the dangerous work of arresting these high-risk.... You said that it's mostly in high-risk situations that your members are involved. You're handing them over to the CBSA, and then the CBSA is sending a directive to its investigators that they should be applying Bill C-75 rules, which involve the least restrictive measures necessary. What does that do to the morale of RCMP officers who are putting their lives on the line to apprehend these high-risk people?

Brian Sauv : I think I'm on the record at a number of different committees, talking about the challenges our members, and police in general, face with repeat violent offenders generally in Canada. Some of those are definitely illegal in Canada.

Dane Lloyd: I knocked on the door of an RCMP member in the last election. He said he arrested a drug dealer who was out the same day, a few hours after being arrested.

Have you seen any cases of RCMP members being involved in apprehending high-risk criminals who had immigrated here, who were then released in short order?

Brian Sauv : There's nothing recent that I can comment on, no.

Dane Lloyd: Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Thank you, Mr. Lloyd.

[Translation]

We will now go to Mr. Ramsay.

You have five minutes.

Jacques Ramsay (La Prairie—Atateken, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[English]

Mr. Sauv , I will continue the discussion you had with Mr. Lloyd.

Ms. Kirkland tried to make you say that when the RCMP detains an individual, he will be released right after. The honest truth is that you don't know what will happen after you've turned the individual over to the CBSA. Isn't that so?

Brian Sauv : The RCMP, or the police of jurisdiction, will do the arrest and transfer custody. Whether that custody is to a court of jurisdiction or to another agency, a sheriff or the CBSA, the release of that individual relies on that other agency, whether it's a Crown counsel arguing detention or not, or the CBSA arguing detention or not.

Jacques Ramsay: They will expel them and send them away. Yes. Okay.

Ms. Kirkland also asked you about the gun buyback program. You said you were a fan of stopping illegal arms. Well, aren't we all? This doesn't mean that you're against the buyback program, does it? I haven't seen a position from the National Police Federation that they're against the buyback program.

Brian Sauv : No. Our position from 2020, which was renewed in 2024, I believe, is that in Canada, the majority of homicides and gun crimes were committed by illegal guns coming up to our borders from the States, so we support investments in combatting illegal firearms trafficking coming up from the United States.

Jacques Ramsay: Yes, that is the majority of all homicides. At the same time, we can say the majority of mass murders are done with tactical military guns. Is that correct?

Brian Sauv : We're lucky in Canada that we haven't had very many mass killings. However, in the ones that I've been apprised of, they were illegally obtained, yes.

Jacques Ramsay: You said that, obviously, Canada is a very sought-after country for immigrants to come to. Mrs. DeBellefeuille said the borders were a sieve, and you said, "*C'est  a.*"

I would like to give you the chance to correct your statement. I don't think the CBSA is doing such a poor job. I think it's doing a great job, and I don't think our borders are a sieve.

• (1235)

Brian Sauv : Maybe I misunderstood.

Jacques Ramsay: I thought so.

Brian Sauv : I may have misunderstood, or maybe I commented inappropriately.

Our border is quite secure, and the members of the RCMP and the CBSA do a fantastic job daily, ensuring that Canada is a great place to live. They do a great job of it.

Could they have better tools at their disposal to be even more effective? Yes, but we're not there yet.

Jacques Ramsay: We're trying to hire more people.

On the subject of information sharing, in Bill C-12, clauses 28 and 29 in part 5 give the IRCC lots of means to improve communication and the sharing of information. Would you agree with that?

Brian Sauv : Bill C-12 needs a bit more work in certain areas, but it is definitely a great start in improving the integration and information sharing among law enforcement agencies and other Canadian agencies.

Jacques Ramsay: By "more work", I presume you are alluding to lawful access.

Brian Sauv : I think that one is out of Bill C-12.

Jacques Ramsay: It's coming in Bill C-2.

Brian Sauv : Yes.

Jacques Ramsay: Thank you so much.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): You have another 40 seconds, if you wish.

Jacques Ramsay: Do I?

Well, I'll mention another declaration from Mrs. DeBellefeuille about the "*signal politique*" not being there in terms of removing illegal immigrants.

I think your position on this is that, because of your limited involvement in this, you haven't seen whether there was or wasn't "*un signal politique*".

I submit to you that, of the 20,000 people who were removed last year, 9,000 were people under warrant.

Brian Sauv : From our perspective, if you'll indulge me for 15 seconds, a "*signal politique*" from my side is shifting priorities for the RCMP with limited resources.

What would be nice to see is a "*signal politique*" or a political movement to sit back and say that this is something we want you to do, and here are the tools and the resources to make you effective doing it.

That's versus next week, it's money laundering; the week after, it's border security; the week after, it's fentanyl; and the week after, it's this.

[Translation]

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Thank you, Mr. Sauv  and Mr. Ramsay.

Mrs. DeBellefeuille, would you like the floor for two and a half minutes?

Claude DeBellefeuille: My goodness, you're being very generous with me, Mr. Vice-Chair! If this continues, we're going to elect you as chair.

[*English*]

Jacques Ramsay: I just want to say that you're doing a good job, Mr. Vice-Chair.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Chair, I'm going to use these two minutes to give Mr. Sauvé the opportunity to make the most important recommendation related to our study. In other words, it's a matter of looking at how we could intervene more quickly to neutralize foreign criminal nationals.

Mr. Sauvé, if you have a recommendation to suggest to us, I'll let you describe it.

Brian Sauvé: In budget 2025, the federal government committed to hiring 1,000 Canada Border Services Agency officers and 1,000 RCMP officers. The budget also provides for investments in modernizing technology and equipment, which will serve to ensure border security. The work really starts at the border. We need a secure border. We're on the same page about reducing illegal crossings.

Those 1,000 Canada Border Services Agency officers and those 1,000 RCMP officers will have new tools and new technologies to fulfill their mandates. It's about strengthening intelligence sharing, because our priority is to secure the border. That way, we're going to remove all the malicious individuals who are in Canada. We're making that a priority and will be reporting on it about twice a year.

• (1240)

Claude DeBellefeuille: I have one last question for you.

Are you in favour of the RCMP's request for satellite stations, especially for officers working at the southern border in Quebec?

The RCMP is asking for satellite stations so that police officers can be closer to the border. Stations are often far from the border, which poses a challenge in terms of travel. In the context of the current study, do you think it would be beneficial to encourage the creation of satellite stations so that it's possible to intervene more quickly?

Brian Sauvé: I couldn't agree more.

I think my colleague Mr. Bédard talked about this last time we appeared before the committee. In the Beauce region, for example, there are 470 kilometres of border that have to be secured, all along which satellite stations would be really welcome.

Claude DeBellefeuille: Thank you, Mr. Sauvé.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Thank you, Mr. Sauvé and Mrs. DeBellefeuille.

[*English*]

For the committee's benefit, we started at 11:49. We are currently at 12:41, so we have eight minutes. I'm in the committee's hands here as to whether we finish up. We've heard a great deal of testi-

mony, because we had only one opening statement. We could have four minutes apiece and use most of our time, or, obviously, the chair has to entertain a motion to adjourn. I'm in the committee's hands here.

Would you like four minutes each?

Okay. I'm not sure who from the Conservatives will be going ahead here.

It's Mr. Au. Thank you.

Chak Au: This is a question I want to ask.

You talked about needing more resources and more support for the enforcement force. The government talks about hiring more RCMP and CBSA officers. However, at the same time, the minister has confirmed that there will be a 2% cut to both the RCMP and CBSA budgets. How will this play out?

On the one hand, you need more, but at the same time the government is telling you that it's going to cut 2%. What is your response?

Brian Sauvé: The responsible government spending initiative, I think it is, will cut 2%, meaning \$98 million over three years, for the RCMP. Members have asked me about that as well. They come and say, "Well, how are we going to cut \$98 million and hire at the same time?" That's a quandary.

In my discussions with the commissioner, with the RCMP, their 2% has been solely focused on meeting the administrative challenges they face within the national headquarters area by amalgamating numerous policy centres into one policy centre and being more strategic with the deployment of their resources in an administrative capacity. I've had a commitment from the commissioner that the 2% will not impact operations at all.

I know there have been some impacts to operations over the last five months as they awaited their funding envelope from budget 2025, but now that the funding is in place, I'm still following up with the commissioner to ensure that none of those operations are frozen.

Chak Au: Also, in your presentation you mentioned the high risk for your officers in carrying out those duties. Can you elaborate on that and how these types of issues can be addressed?

Brian Sauvé: Let's just start with a traffic stop, for example. Police officers have no idea who's in that car, whether it's the driver or any of the passengers. That's where your risk is heightened. One of the most dangerous things a police officer can do is a traffic stop, whether it be in broad daylight at Portage la Prairie on Highway 1 or in the middle of the night in Surrey, B.C., or New Glasgow, Nova Scotia.

You need to have accurate information and have resources available to you. It might be as simple as backup, the ability to have another police officer available to you within a reasonable time frame to support you should something go south.

Chak Au: Do you think you do not have that kind of support at the present moment?

Brian Sauv : It depends on where you are. In some places in Saskatchewan or Manitoba or Nunavut or the Northwest Territories, or even across New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and British Columbia, backup might be an hour away.

Chak Au: You also mentioned that in some areas there's a very high number of people on warrant. It seems like the Toronto area is one of those districts, so again, what do you see as the problem? Why is it?

• (1245)

Brian Sauv : Obviously, Toronto has a municipal police service, the Toronto Police Service, which does a fantastic job of serving Torontonians, and Toronto is surrounded by a number of other municipal police agencies. With a lot of police services being able to bring support, you could end up in a more favourable situation if you require assistance, and then there's the OPP as well. However, in larger geographical places such as Manitoba, you're surrounded by a lot of small communities, and it can be easier to hide in a smaller community than in a larger centre.

Chak Au: Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Thank you very much, Mr. Sauv  and Mr. Au.

[*Translation*]

It's now the Liberals' turn.

Ms. Acan, you have the floor for four minutes.

[*English*]

Sima Acan: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Sauv , Canada is the only Five Eyes partner lacking comprehensive lawful access legislation, a gap the National Police Federation seeks to resolve through the provisions still contained in Bill C-2, parts 14 and 15.

When investigating sophisticated cyber-enabled threats and organized crime networks operating abroad, how does the absence of parity in lawful access capabilities hinder the RCMP's ability to efficiently co-operate and share with allies, such as the U.S., real-time intelligence that will be immediately relevant to enforcing deportation orders against criminal foreign nationals?

Brian Sauv : From the operational perspective, I'm sure you've had some great witnesses from the RCMP to speak to that. From our perspective, what we see is that we get slower. In this information age, in 2025 and 2026, I don't think anybody—in Canada, at least—predicted how quickly things would meteorically explode.

At our last committee meeting, Dr. West was speaking about IP addresses that can be alive for just minutes, versus hours, weeks, months or years. I've spoken to criminals who use burner phones and ditch the phone, or the subscriber information is not accurate. If we were able to access that information in a timely fashion to be able to work with our Five Eyes partners or across to the United States, for example, we could be a valued partner. However, if we can't get it in a timely manner or it no longer exists, all of a sudden we aren't such a valued partner.

Sima Acan: Thank you so much.

Part 6 of Bill C-12 strengthens the information sharing between IRCC, CBSA and federal and provincial police partners.

Given that inadmissibility based on security grounds requires robust intelligence, how significantly does improved inter-agency co-operation enable the RCMP to provide early actionable intelligence necessary for CBSA officers to make efficient inadmissibility determinations, thereby safeguarding the integrity of Canada's entry and removal system?

Brian Sauv : I think it's extremely important. That goes back to when Mr. Powlowski and I were talking about integration and inter-agency co-operation. From the border security perspective, I've had the opportunity to speak to a number of my colleagues in New York and Vermont, their state trooper associations and U.S. Customs and Border Protection. When working together, they work extremely well, even though we're talking about different nations sharing information. Police officers—law enforcement officers—on the street will get the job done and work extremely well together.

It's when it goes up to the agency higher-ups that they start to question how much information they can share—if they have to leave in page 2 or if they have to take it out or cut out that paragraph. That's where it becomes challenging.

Being able to share is great.

Sima Acan: You would agree that the steps in Bill C-12, also complementing Bill C-2, would be an example of resolving those silo issues.

Brian Sauv : Yes, and I'm not a fan of silos unless I'm in the Prairies.

Sima Acan: Do I have more time, Mr. Chair?

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): You have 20 seconds.

Sima Acan: I'll pass.

Thank you so much for the opportunity.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): Thank you.

Thank you very much, all of you, for a very efficient meeting.

We've come to the end of our scheduled business. At this time, we need either a motion to adjourn or consensus to adjourn.

Mr. Ramsay proposes a motion to adjourn.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Vice-Chair (Frank Caputo): All right. That's carried.
Thank you.

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>