Commission of Inquiry into Money Laundering in British Columbia

Public Hearing

Commissioner

The Honourable Justice
Austin Cullen

Held at:

Vancouver, British Columbia via video link

Monday, May 25, 2020

APPEARANCES

Brock Martland, QC Patrick McGowan

Cullen Commission

Jacqueline Hughes Chantelle Rajotte Cherisse Friesen

B.C. (Ministry of Finance and Gaming Policy

and Enforcement Branch)

Judith Hoffman Ashley Gardner Canada

Ludmila Herbst, QC Catherine George

Law Society of B.C.

Society of Notaries Public of B.C. Ron Usher

William Smart, QC Shannon Ramsay Matthew Palmer

B.C. Lottery Corporation

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

B.C. Government Employees Union

Jitesh Mistry

Robert Kroeker

Christine Mainville Carly Peddle

Robin McFee, QC Maya Ollek

James Lightbody

Chris Weafer Patrick

Weafer

B.C. Real Estate Association

Morgan Camley Carina Chiu

BMW

Megan Tweedie

B.C. Civil Liberties Association

Jo-Anne Stark

Canadian Bar Association, B.C. Branch

Kevin Westell Criminal Defence Advocacy Society

James Cohen Coalition

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introductions	
Opening Remarks	
Witnesses called for the Commission:	
Dr. Stephen Schneider Examination by Mr. Martland, QC	11
EXHIBITS	
 Basel AML Index Overview Report International Legal Initiatives Overview Report Canada Reports Overview Report Financial Action Task Force Overview Report Hansard Overview Report 	5 5 5 5
6 Money Laundering in British Columbia: A Review of the Literature	e 11

Vancouver, B.C. May 25, 2020

THE REGISTRAR: The hearing has now commenced.
MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, I'll just speak
slowly. And I have Mr. McGowan on my screen, so
if I see a nod, hopefully that means he can hear
me. That's what I was hoping to see.

It's Brock Martland as Commission counsel. I think we're now in a position to begin with our hearings.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Martland.

MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, I'll start if I might with a few simple logistical points and then we will move our way through introductions from the lawyers who are attending and participants who are attending, all by Zoom video today. And following that, I understand you may have a few remarks. I have a few remarks before we launch the ship in the water in these hearings. And after that we will then move right away to Professor Stephen Schneider as the first witness.

By way of addressing those logistical points, first of all we want to express our great gratitude and appreciation for the incredible work and flexibility and commitment to the shared cause on the part of all of the participants and our team, a number of whom have been working flat out over the weekend to be ready to do this by video. And we're just exceedingly grateful for that level of cooperation and commitment.

What I plan to do here is to introduce counsel. These proceedings occurring through the video are our best attempt at replicating the courtroom type of experience that we had hoped to have before COVID-19 came on the scene. In a courtroom, counsel would probably spell out their names, et cetera, but the spelling of the names isn't required here. But I do want to work our way through a list of the participants to make sure we're recording who is here in attendance.

First, by way of introducing Commission counsel, for today's appearance it's myself, Brock Martland, and Patrick McGowan. The other Commission lawyers most intensively involved in the overview hearings -- Alison Latimer and Kyle McCleery -- are not actually connected through

 Zoom but are attending and watching at least on the live stream, which, I understand, is or will be up shortly.

What I'm going to do with respect to the participants, I'm going to move through the list in the order of what I circulated on Friday, the general what I call batting order of the sequence of participants, and I'll do that by participant, asking each participant to please have whoever is the speaking lawyer, the lawyer dealing with this witness, to then unmute themselves and introduce both themselves and their team members, anyone else in attendance from their group. And once we've worked our way through that list, then we can move to dealing with the overview reports and a few other things.

So having covered that point, I'll begin, please, with the Province, which is to say the Ministry of Finance and the Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch.

- MS. HUGHES: Commissioner, Jacqueline Hughes, appearing on behalf of GPEB and the Ministry of Finance. And with me is Chantelle Rajotte and Cherisse Friesen.
- MR. MARTLAND: Thank you. I'll ask next counsel for Canada, please.
- THE COMMISSIONER: I wonder if their mikes are muted.
- MS. HOFFMAN: Judith Hoffman. Can you hear me now?
- MR. MARTLAND: Yes.
- MS. HOFFMAN: Sorry. Commissioner, appearing on behalf of Canada is Judith Hoffman, and I have with me Ashley Gardner.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms. Hoffman and Ms. Gardner.
- MR. MARTLAND: Thank you. Next I have counsel for the Law Society of B.C.
- MS. HERBST: Thank you. Mr. Commissioner, it's Ludmilla Herbst, appearing for the Law Society of British Columbia, and with me is Catherine George.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms. Herbst and Ms. George.
- MR. MARTLAND: Next, the Society of Notaries Public.
- MR. USHER: Good morning. It's Ron Usher appearing on behalf of the Society of Notaries Public of British Columbia.
 - THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Usher.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42 43

44

45

- 1 MR. MARTLAND: British Columbia Lottery Corporation. 2 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Smart, I think you may be 3 muted. 4 MR. SMART: Mr. Commissioner, I think I'm unmuted now. 5
 - I'm a little slow with my -- I'm left-handed and I'm using my right hand.
 - THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
 - MR. SMART: Thank you. So it's William Smart for the B.C. Lottery Corporation, Mr. Commissioner, and with me is Shannon Ramsay and Matthew Palmer.
 - THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Smart, Ms. Ramsay and Mr. Palmer.
 - MR. MARTLAND: I have next the participant group of Great Canadian Gaming Corporation and Gateway Casinos.
 - MR. SKWAROK: Mr. Commissioner, Mark Skwarok appearing for Great Canadian Gaming Corporation, and with me is Melanie Harmer.
 - THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Skwarok and Ms. Harmer.
 - I have next the BCGEU. MR. MARTLAND:
 - MR. MISTRY: Hello, Mr. Commissioner. Jitesh Mistry, last name Mistry, M-i-s-t-r-y, for the British Columbia Government and Service Employees Union.
 - THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Mistry.
 - Next, counsel for Robert Kroeker. MR. MARTLAND:
 - MR. MAINVILLE: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner. Christine Mainville and I am attending with Carly Peddle.
 - THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms. Mainville and Ms. Peddle.
 - MR. MARTLAND: Counsel for Mr. James Lightbody, please.
 - MR. MCFEE: Mr. Commissioner, Robin McFee, and with me is Maya Ollek.
 - Thank you, Mr. McFee and Ms. Ollek. THE COMMISSIONER:
 - MR. MARTLAND: The Canadian Gaming Association. didn't think to say this at the outset, but there may be some participants who aren't in attendance, so I don't have an easy way to checklist that myself. But I'll take from the silence we may not have anyone from the Canadian Gaming Association for today's hearing.
 - THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.
 - MR. MARTLAND: The B.C. Real Estate Association.
- 46 MR. WEAFER: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner. Chris 47 Weafer appearing for the B.C. Real Estate

```
1
            Association, and by separate Zoom feed, Patrick
 2
            Weafer appearing as co-counsel.
 3
                         Thank you, Mr. Weafer and Mr.
       THE COMMISSIONER:
 4
            Weafer.
 5
       MR. MARTLAND:
                      Next, BMW.
 6
       MS. CAMLEY:
                    Mr. Commissioner, it's Morgan Camley,
 7
            appearing on behalf of BMW, and with me is Carina
 8
            Chiu, also appearing as counsel.
 9
       THE COMMISSIONER:
                          Thank you, Ms. Camley and Ms. Chiu.
10
       MR. MARTLAND:
                      The B.C. Civil Liberties Association.
11
       MS. TWEEDIE: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner. Megan
            Tweedie, appearing on behalf of the BCCLA.
12
13
            should note that I have two colleagues who will
14
            also be co-counsel with me at these hearings.
15
            However, they're not on right now.
                                                And that is
16
            Emily Lapper and Latoya Ferrell.
17
       THE COMMISSIONER:
                          Thank you, Ms. Tweedie.
18
       MR. MARTLAND: The joint participant group of the
19
            CBABC and Criminal Defence Advocacy Society.
20
       MS. STARK: Good morning, Commissioner. Jo-Anne Stark
21
            here for CBABC.
22
       THE COMMISSIONER:
                          Thank you, Ms. Stark.
23
                     Good morning, Commissioner.
       MR. WESTELL:
24
            Westell.
                      I'm here for the Criminal Defence
25
            Advocacy Society. With me on the brief but not
26
            on the feed today is Mr. Samuel Williams, who's
27
            assisting me.
28
       THE COMMISSIONER:
                          Thank you, Mr. Westell.
29
       MR. MARTLAND:
                      And finally the Transparency
30
            International Coalition.
31
       MR. COHEN: Good afternoon from Toronto, Commissioner.
            My name is James Cohen from Transparency
32
33
            International Canada representing TI Canada and
34
            the project Canadians for Tax Fairness.
35
       THE COMMISSIONER:
                          Thank you, Mr. Cohen.
36
       MR. MARTLAND:
                     Thank you. Mr. Commissioner, there's
37
            one other, I suppose, housekeeping item of
38
            business that I had indicated to participants we
39
            would address early on. Pursuant to Rule 33 of
40
            the Rules of Practice and Procedure for this
41
            Commission, having circulated five overview
42
            reports, received very helpful comments and input
43
            from participants and then revised them, I'm
44
            proposing to have the five overview reports
45
            marked as the first exhibits in these
46
            proceedings. I'll begin, please, with the
47
            Basel -- I may get the pronunciation wrong --
```

1 2 3 4 5	AML, which is Anti-Money Laundering Index Overview Report. My suggestion would be and I'll slow down to let Madam Registrar indicate if I've got this right. But I'll propose that become Exhibit 1.
6 THE	COMMISSIONER: Very well. That will be Exhibit 1. REGISTRAR: Exhibit 1.
8 THE 9	COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Madam Registrar.
L0 L1	EXHIBIT 1: Basel AML Index Overview Report
	. MARTLAND: Secondly, I have the Internal AML Initiatives Overview Report. Mr. Commissioner, I ask that please become Exhibit 2.
L5 THE	COMMISSIONER: Very well. Exhibit 2.
L7 THE	REGISTRAR: Exhibit 2. COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
L8 L9 20 21	EXHIBIT 2: International Legal Initiatives Overview Report
	MARTLAND: Third, the Canada Reports Overview report. I ask that that be the next exhibit, please.
25 THE	COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 3.
27 THE	REGISTRAR: Exhibit 3. COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
28 29 30	EXHIBIT 3: Canada Reports Overview Report
31 MR. 32 33	MARTLAND: Fourth, I have the FATF, or Financial Action Task Force Records Overview Report. I ask that become Exhibit 4, please.
THE THE	COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 4. Thank you. REGISTRAR: Exhibit 4.
36 37 38	EXHIBIT 4: FATF Records Overview Report
	MARTLAND: And the fifth is the Hansard Overview Report. I ask that please be marked as the next exhibit.
12 THE 13 THE	COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 5. REGISTRAR: Exhibit 5.
14 15 16	EXHIBIT 5: Hansard Overview Report
	MARTLAND: Thank you. Mr. Commissioner, before I

 offer a few remarks, I wanted to see if you wish to offer comments as we start.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Martland, yes. On October 18th of 2019, I made some opening remarks at the first public hearing of the Commission. The purpose of those remarks was in part to identify the context in which the Commission was established, to outline the principles governing the conduct of the inquiry, and to summarize the objectives which we hope to achieve through this undertaking. I will not repeat those remarks. They are posted on the Commission website and can be accessed easily.

At the time I made those remarks, no one anticipated that the world would be in the grip of a pandemic when our spring hearings were scheduled to commence. As I noted in a statement issued on April 16th of this year, although money laundering is a significant issue which needs to be addressed, it is important to acknowledge the priority of the health crisis that continues to beset the province, the country, and even the world.

Accordingly, we made the decision to conduct our spring hearings remotely using video conferencing technology, which we hope will provide a suitable substitute for a traditional, in-person hearing.

As a result, in addition to the hard work of preparing the hearings, Commission counsel and Commission staff have been working tirelessly to find and adapt the available technology to ensure these hearings can be conducted fairly and effectively without compromising the need to provide access to the public and media and without prejudicing those whose rights or interests are ultimately at stake.

It is important to emphasize that this is a new departure for a hearing such as this and there are many moving parts which need to be monitored and maintained. If, from time to time, the inquiry is required to recess to address some issue or another, I hope everyone will understand that it is in aid of promoting fairness and effectiveness in the context of a new and unfamiliar process.

I think it is important to acknowledge, as

Mr. Martland has already done, that the participants and their respective counsel have been very cooperative in their willingness to engage with this technology and have assisted along the way in the Commission's attempts to test and make this process workable.

I am now going to ask Mr. Martland to provide some opening remarks as we move into the hearing phase of this inquiry. Yes, Mr. Martland.

MR. MARTLAND: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. I'll be very brief with these remarks. There's one or two further practical items I should touch on. I believe everyone is likely muted, which helps enormously. If there's a reason that counsel needs to interject, or object for that matter, or speak at all, please simply unmute yourself and interject that way. That's what we've put forward as the best way to raise an objection, as one would do in court is to stand and object fairly clearly as opposed to trying to put up a hand or ask a question in the comment box or what have you.

It occurs to me we may also do well as we get familiar with one another to ask if anyone is doing that, to please, maybe for the first few times, state your name and the participant you act for so that we're all familiar with who is raising an objection and what they wish to address us on.

We'll have one or two breaks through the course of this block of hearing. Our hearing times are 9:30 to 1:30, and so we'll simply plan to indicate if there's a need for a break or that's a suitable juncture, and likewise if someone wants to suggest that, they can do so.

Before we move into the first piece of evidence in these hearings, I wanted to simply offer a few remarks about the plans and aims of Commission counsel, in particular with the first witness and with the overview evidence.

With respect to Professor Schneider's literature review, we are not relying on specific factual assertions or statements that appear, for example, in media reports which he has reviewed and summarized in his literature report. We're not relying on those assertions as they appear in

Professor Schneider's report to establish the truth of the underlying assertion. To the extent there are areas or situations where we need evidence in order to ground a finding of fact, our plan is to move to that and have documents and witnesses and evidence that speak to it. I simply say that it's not -- it may be the case, for example, that something in a media report that is described in the literature review or touched on today is put forward clearly as part of the public narrative and the reporting and the context leading up to the creation of this Commission, but to the extent that's a live issue in our hearings, we won't be saying: There it is, it's in evidence. We'll move to having evidence to resolve those sorts of issues.

Commission counsel's hope is that the literature review will serve as a useful general introduction to the topic of money laundering in the province.

And the other simple point is to state that we're in this present block of hearings in the spring dealing with the overview and introduction to the topic of money laundering. We have a set of hearings scheduled for the fall that move into very specific topics and issues, for example casinos. In addition there's a piece dealing with what I would term the government response question, and those issues will be the focus of far more specific evidence in the course of the fall hearings.

Having offered those few further remarks, Mr. Commissioner, subject to anything else that we need to touch on now, I think we're in a position to have the first witness, Professor Stephen Schneider from Nova Scotia be brought on screen, so to speak, and then affirmed, and we'll begin with his evidence.

THE COMMISSIONER: Great. Thank you, Mr. Martland. THE REGISTRAR: Mr. Schneider, can you please unmute your mike.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm unmuted. THE REGISTRAR: Thank you.

STEPHEN SCHNEIDER, a witness called for the Commission, affirmed.

- 1 THE REGISTRAR: Please state your full name and spell your first name and last name for the record.
 - A Stephen Russell Schneider. The first name is S-t-e-p-h-e-n and the last name is spelled S-c-h-n-e-i-d-e-r.
 - THE REGISTRAR: I'm sorry. Can you speak a little louder. We cannot hear you.
 - A Yeah. It's Stephen, S-t-e-p-h-e-n, and Schneider is S-c-h-n-e-i-d-e-r.
 - THE REGISTRAR: I'm sorry. Your voice tends to drop towards the end, and we really need you to speak to the mike closely.
 - A Very well. It's Schneider, S-c-h-n-e-i-d-e-r.
 - THE REGISTRAR: Sorry, we can barely hear you.
 - A Well -- let's see if I can -- obviously there's some issues here. [indiscernible]
 - THE REGISTRAR: Sorry, we cannot hear you. I could hear you at the beginning but then your voice dropped.
 - MS. MATTERS: Mr. Schneider, we are going to connect to the hearing through a phone call, and we'll call you.
 - A Let me just try to fix my microphone here. Yeah, I think using a phone is a better idea.
 - MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner --
 - THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr. Martland, I think this is one of those occasions which I alluded to in my remarks where we'll have to experience a slight delay before we get on with Mr. Schneider's evidence. I didn't intent to be quite so prescient.
 - MR. MARTLAND: Yes. I was hoping I'd be able to say that never came to pass or at least not right away. I think it makes sense we simply wait here and hopefully the audio is connected in a viable way and then we can move on.
 - THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I think so.
 - MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, I wonder if there may be some logic in our standing down for a few minutes so that we can -- we don't all need to wait [indiscernible] on the line and can try to establish a good connection and test that that's working well and then reconvene. So I wonder if I might, having said there would be one or two breaks, suggest that we take maybe five or so minutes and plan to connect then. I think we'd given some suggestion to participants that if we

45

46 47

were to go to a break, we suggest people ensure 2 they're muted and turn off their camera, but 3 there's no need to disconnect. Indeed, there 4 probably is good reason not to disconnect from 5 this meeting. 6 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Let's do that. 7 everyone will mute themselves and turn off their 8 camera. 9 (WITNESS STOOD DOWN) 10 11 (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED) 12 (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED) 13 14 THE REGISTRAR: Mr. Schneider, I will repeat the oath 15 again. 16 17 STEPHEN SCHNEIDER, a witness 18 called for the Commission, 19 reaffirmed. 20 21 THE REGISTRAR: Please state your full name and spell 22 your first name and last name for the record. 23 It's Stephen Schneider, S-t-e-p-h-e-n, Schneider 24 S-c-h-n-e-i-d-e-r. 25 THE REGISTRAR: Thank you. 26 MR. MARTLAND: So Professor Schneider, I'm sorry for 27 the run-around here. Your audio to my ear sounds 28 quite decent right now and stable, so that's a 29 big improvement. 30 What I'm going to begin with here, and I 31 thought it might be useful for you but also for participants watching and listening. 32 33 begin with your background and experience. I'll 34 be relying -- in the course of leading your 35 evidence today, relying heavily and indeed 36 working my way through in a fairly deliberate way 37 through your literature review. And I plan to really do that in almost totally a sequential 38 39 way, flipping through pages and moving through 40 the topics in the way that you've prepared that 41 report, sir. 42 Two exceptions to that. Number one, I don't 43 plan to cover the executive summary.

I plan to

I'll be

beginning at the start of the discussion at page

begin with page 142, your biographical

information.

Number two, the other exception is I plan to

 Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

So with that in mind, Madam Registrar, I'm hopeful that you might be able to display on the screen the literature review. It's the document -- and maybe just the first page of that.

EXAMINATION BY MR. MARTLAND:

- Professor Schneider, you'll recognize the May 11, 2020, date and then the title, "Money Laundering in British Columbia: A Review of the Literature." That is your literature review prepared for this Commission, is that so?
- A That is correct.
- MR. MARTLAND: I'll ask, Mr. Commissioner, this become the next exhibit, please.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. That will be Exhibit 6.

EXHIBIT 6: Money Laundering in British Columbia: A Review of the Literature

MR. MARTLAND:

Professor Schneider, next I will ask you please move to page 142 because I'll be referring to some of what's described there. And this is in section 11 of your report as an appendix to it. You refer to it as being the relevant expertise and experience of yourself, the penultimate section of your report, the very last section being section 12, the list of references that were used in the literature review.

So by way of explaining who you are and about your experience in this area, you're a professor with the Criminology Department of St. Mary's University in Halifax, is that so?

- A That is correct.
- Q Degrees from, if I have it correctly, Carleton, a bachelor of arts in political science, a master of science degree in international development from the University of Pennsylvania, and finally a Ph.D. in urban and regional planning from the University of British Columbia?
- A That's correct.
- Q And with respect to your background and the work that you've done, particularly addressing money laundering, if you could please provide us with a description of that.
- A How brief would you like that?

- I don't mind if you take some time. I think it's helpful for us to know -- I mean, it may make some sense, as you've done at page 142, to narrate how it is that you came to work in this field. I understand some of that involved work where you were doing research and policy analysis for the federal Ministry of Solicitor General and also working with the late Margaret Beare.
- A Right. Well, I guess my experience in the area began in the late '80s. As a student at Carleton I was very interested in underground economy issues. In my economics classes I wrote a paper on money laundering. And Margaret Beare, who you mentioned, got wind of that and asked me to do some work as a summer student on research they were doing into money laundering in Canada. This was just before the first piece of legislation was introduced to criminalize money laundering.

So our study was entitled "Tracing Illicit Funds: Money Laundering in Canada." Subsequent to that report I continued to work in the issue area of money laundering/organized crime, which included subsequent study that looked at money laundering enforcement, and that study directly led to the establishment of the Integrated Anti-Drug Profiteering Units, which then led to the reformulation of the Integrated Proceeds of Crime Units.

Other responsibilities when I was with the federal government with Solicitor General included providing policy advice, organized crime, proceeds of crime, money laundering issues, to the minister and senior civil servants, coordinating development of training videos for police on proceeds of crime enforcement, representing the federal government in Financial Action Task Force meetings.

When I left the federal government I worked in the private sector for a firm, KPMG consulting firm, which actually -- the front accounting division, and part of my work there was conducting surveys among the financial services sector on money laundering, mostly a victimization survey as it were. We also provided services to firms to help ensure they comply with money laundering, anti-money laundering legislation and regulations.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

Q

When I left KPMG, I joined the faculty at St. Mary's University, and there I've undertaken a number of studies on the subject money And probably the most prominent was laundering. a survey of RCMP police cases, so I provided access to case files, money laundering and proceeds of crime case files for the RCMP, and I conducted a quantitative survey, the goal of which was to really try to understand how the proceeds of crime are disbursed and laundered in Canada according to police investigations or according to police data. So that study is really limited to police-reported perspective on the issue.

From that study I was able to publish a number of peer-reviewed articles, including looking at organized crime and financial crimes in the real estate markets, the securities markets, also looking at involvement of lawyers and legal professionals in money laundering, the incorporation of criminally influenced companies as well.

And of course Margaret and I published a book in 2007 on the subject of money laundering enforcement entitled Money Laundering in Canada: Chasing Dangerous Dollars. And I've also presented a number of papers on the subject at conferences. And I also worked as a consultant to the federal government for a number of years, basically helping to assess and evaluate the Integrated Proceeds of Crime Units. Much of my research were interviews and focus groups and some surveys.

And I also received funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council for research into money laundering as well.

And I think I'll leave it at that for now. Well, that's a very helpful review of your background. And just because you've touched on it, Dr. Margaret Beare passed away last year and is often described as one of the leading experts in the field of money laundering in Canada, a long-time professor at York University in Toronto with both the Department of Sociology with a cross-appointment to the Osgoode Hall Law School. That's correct, yes. Margaret was definitely a

Α trail blazer in the area of -- she was a seminal

figure in in helping to get the original legislation introduced and she'd be able to conduct research and understand the issue better both as a civil servant and as a scholar as well. Q Right, okay. In the courtroom I would be signalled with someone's eyes or passed a note, and in our milieu I'm passed a digital note so I'm looking at those from time to time. understand that my experience that I'm only seeing a phone button and not your face may be a shared experience that other people have. What I'm proposing to do is that we'll still carry on and cover some ground this way, but then at our break make some effort to connect up your video feed as well as the phone connection and maybe have the two running at the same time. your awareness, that's my proposal is that we carry on and cover some ground this way and then circle around at the break and make an effort to fix that up.

A All right. Sounds good.

 Q I have one other question, sir, about page 143. And near the end of the biographical summary that you've set out there, you describe some of the work that you're doing right now researching a book, looking at large financial institutions, how they become implicated in money laundering and other organized financial crimes. Can you tell us -- without this being the sort of late night sales pitch for the upcoming book, I suppose, tell us a little bit about what that upcoming work is.

A Sure. Well, I was asked to present a paper looking at money laundering using the HSBC case study. HSBC was implicated in a major money laundering scandal about 10-12 years ago that involved laundering millions if not billions of dollars in drug revenue including transport of bulk cash across the U.S.-Mexico border.

Essentially once I started in on that case study, I realized that money laundering scandals weren't limited to HSBC. It was among a number of large -- what we call large complex financial institutions, global banks -- Bank of America Boston, a Barclay's, a Swiss Bank. I mean, it touched -- pretty much every major bank had been implicated in some kind of money laundering

scandal in recent years, including quite severe criticism and even fines and other regulatory actions over the lack of compliance measures and anti-money laundering measures being implemented by these firms.

And what I found as well was the problems weren't limited to money laundering. There's a whole host of issues, unethical issues, even criminal offending issues, that were popping up in these firms. And I basically identified eight different types of issues that had come up in recent years among large global banks, from helping counsel and clients evade taxes, capital flights. There was involvement in the 2008 financial crisis, the Libor scandal, manipulating foreign exchange rates, evading American trade sanctions.

So really, when I started looking at the issue of money laundering, it really snowballed into a whole range of other type of malfeasance or even criminal behaviour as well. And so my book is looking at this range of financial crimes, financial improprieties, and again trying to analyze, you know, why this is and in particular looking at sort of the corporate culture of these big banks. So that's the nature of the book I'm writing right now.

- Q That's very helpful. Page 143, just before the list of the books, peer-reviewed articles, other articles as well as conference presentations, you've got a description about doing some work for the RCMP Outlaw Motorcycle Biker enforcement program. I understand you wanted to make some modification or clarification to the way you've described that work?
- Α Oh, yeah. I'm working -- there's no formal contract right now. I work with Sgt. Andy Cook, who's the head of the biker enforcement program, and while nothing has been written as far as a contract, I am engaged in -- he has assigned certain tasks to me as far as trying to work on my own expertise and experience to become an expert witness in that program. I can't go into detail of what he's assigned to me, but the longterm goal is they're looking for not just police members to become expert witnesses. They also want others that can provide more rigorous

empirical data as well. And so Sgt. Cook has recruited me to become an expert witness in the program. And it was initiated, but of course then COVID-19 came along and it kind of upended everything. But so I would say, as far as clarification on that point, I'm working with the RCMP in an informal manner, and specifically with Sgt. Cook, on that issue.

- Q Fair point. And so informal as opposed to -- you described a work in progress instead of something that's moved to the next stage?
- A Well, I mean, there's no formal agreement that I've signed. But as I said -- as I mentioned, I've met with Andy Cook several times and am working on some specific projects with him with respect to the expert witness program.
- Q Right. So now I'll move -- and this will be the, I hope, one dramatic page jump from 143 or wherever I was back to page 8 of your report, please.
- A Mm-hmm.

MR. MARTLAND: And for the benefit of the participants or anyone watching, the literature review that I'm covering in the course of asking these questions has been marked as an exhibit. I'm not sure what the timing if it will be, but once we're in a position to have that posted on our website, we'll do that. These exhibits will be available publicly through the Commission website. But because I think it might be cumbersome for me to try to have our registrar scroll through every single page where I'm asking a question, I don't propose to bring up particular pages on the screen. But just for the benefit of participants to complete the thought, if counsel wanted to do that, they should be able to make that request for a particular page and have something shown if that's needed.

So as I say, I propose to be flipping pages but not asking the Registrar to do that for everyone.

Q So I'll begin if I might, then, at page 8 in the introduction. And what you have there, Professor Schneider, is a description about what this literature review is and, more broadly, what a literature review is. Could you explain that, please. The concept may not be one familiar to

17
Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the Commission

everyone.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 Α Well, a literature review, again, is basically concerned with describing and analyzing a particular topic based on a comprehensive understanding of the extant literature, the literature on a particular topic. So it is a summary of what's been written and published on a particular subject. It's meant to give a reader a comprehensive understanding of the issue and how it's interpreted through the literature, how -- it's really assumed that the author has assimilated all or a majority of the seminal works -- but not just seminal works, but really all the relevant work pertaining to the field under study. So literature reviews should enumerate, describe, summarize, assess, clarify and critically analyze the existing works on a subject. The literature -- it's primarily descriptive. It's really there to document what the research or the state of the art of the publications on a particular topic is, but at the same time the literature review provides the writer with the opportunity to critically [indiscernible] and even to synthesize some of those sources as well, which I've done in this report to some extent.

And so analysis is, for example, taking a particular compendium of issues and being able to analyze them as a whole, collectively. And it's also about critically analyzing the sources as well, so being able to, you know, critique the state of the art or the research, critique particular literature within that review as well.

And so in the case of this literature review, I try to again rely primarily on Canadian sources, and there is, again, given that the literature review is meant to focus on B.C., there's not a lot of, you know, published literature, especially scholarly literature, on the topic specifically with respect to B.C. The other factor as well in doing this literature review is that, you know, this is fairly recent. These issues have come to the fore in the last four or five years, I guess, certainly into public view in those last years. And so because of that there is not a lot of academic research on this. Certainly we have seen some important

reports come along which have been cited in my literature review. But because of this as well, I've had to rely a lot on the news media, which is something typically you don't do in a literature review. But again, given in criminology, especially in the area of organized crime and money laundering, there tends to be a reliance on the news media simply because it fills the void of the academic research.

So in this literature review that I conducted, it's meant to provide a balance of scholarly research, of reports that have been written, the news media as well. And so I've been able to hopefully coalesce all this information into a literature review that is both descriptive of money laundering in general, conceptually, theoretically, also trying to apply theories and concepts to Canada and B.C., but with particular focus as well on the situation in B.C. that has arisen over the last four or five years, although the current issues, you know, go back further than that.

And so -- so really this literature review, as you mentioned at the very beginning, is not -- it's really to provide an overview of the issues, and in some cases I did get more in depth on issues like the so-called Vancouver model and, you know, what some of the recent reports in the news media have identified as the major issues surrounding the problems that the Commission is identifying, including the major -- you know, the suspected or alleged offenders that have been involved, the techniques they're using.

So part of the report does focus on the so-called Vancouver model. And because there is not a lot of information on that, a lot of that was gleaned from the news media, from reports done by Peter German, FINTRAC as well, FATF. So that portion perhaps goes a little beyond what a literature review is meant to do. But in trying to get a grip on, you know, what the so-called Vancouver model is, and it's a very unique kind of laundering operation -- money laundering operation that sort of headquarters in Richmond, if I can put it that way. I tried to make an effort to provide a greater understanding of not just the literature but the issues that the

Commission is facing as interpreted through the literature.

So I went perhaps -- there's -- more analytical than I would usually do in a literature review. But at the same time I was trying to make a contribution to better understand the unique situation that British Columbia has with respect to the issue of money laundering and organized crime.

- And you mentioned what I take to be the paucity of purely academic writing about money laundering activities specifically in B.C. Is it the case that to some extent the counterbalance to that, to obtain the information or the commentary that you can means that this report has more by way of reliance, for example, on news reports than otherwise would be the case?
- Α Well, again, I -- I try to balance -- I mean, my goal is to -- if I'm going to make a particular point is try to triangulate my data. So that is to get information from various sources. much try to avoid making arguments and backing up evidence based solely on one report or one type of media, whether that's a report or an academic paper or news media. So I'd like the literature review to be seen as -- you know, as a balance of information from various sources where I try to corroborate sources, corroborate information based on these various sources. So to some extent, yes, there is a heavier reliance on news media in this report than I generally would do. But at the same time, there's, you know, again a strong reliance on the report that Peter German and his associates wrote, obviously because that was focused on British Columbia, the B.C. -- the report on money laundering through B.C.

And at the same time, there's a number of reports at the federal level through FINTRAC, Finance Canada, that look at Canada generally but also have some specific information on B.C. And of course the information on Canada generally is obviously relevant to British Columbia as well. So my goal was to be able to, like I said, triangulate the data so I was able to take information from different sources, compare and contrast, and try to present a consensus based on the different sources that are in the -- that

I've documented in the review. 0

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

If I could ask you a question drawing on page 9 of the report, the literature review, and have a look, please, if you have that at hand, the second paragraph. And I'll just read it out, about halfway through, or a few lines down, you say:

> Most scholarly literature reviews attempt to maintain a high level of quality and precision by ensuring only the most reliable and rigorous sources are included, which means the sources should be published and peer reviewed. However, other sources such as unpublished documents or reports (the grey literature) as well as the news media and non-fiction books may [also] be included, especially to fill any voids in the scholarly literature. Regardless of the source, a literature review must ensure all sources are subject to a critical analysis. This is especially true of government, law enforcement, or private industry reports or press releases, which may be biased or deliberately vague, as well as the news media.

If you'd just help us understand, when you talk about -- I quess that's quarding yourself against the risk of something that is put out by whoever it may be where you need to approach that with critical eye. What are thinking about or describing there, please?

Α Well, first and foremost, I mean, the issue of money laundering, like crime in general, organized crime specifically, is one that is obviously not amenable or not conducive to the kind of research, especially scientific research we can do in other disciplines. Obviously by its very nature, it's secretive. We're very much reliance on data and information provided by law enforcement and other government agencies, and it has to be critically analyzed. You know, as I mentioned, we tend to have to rely on the news media when we're accessing public sources, whether because there's a lack of scholarly resources or a lack of access to police data as

 Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

well. So in all -- any type of literature that you analyze, you have to be able to critically analyze the source of the information, the veracity, the accuracy, which is often difficult to do because you don't have that -- often you don't have a benchmark against which to compare the veracity or accuracy of that information.

So that -- you know, the literature review is, I guess, the best attempt I have made to be able to critically analyze the sources and the information that's provided, certainly at some point by excluding information that I felt simply was not accurate or was not based on rigorous methods as well.

But for me, the issue of money laundering -again, because it is inherently secretive, as I
mentioned and because of the lack of academic
research -- certainly there was a reliance on the
news media. But as I mentioned, efforts were
made to be able to critically analyze the news
media, look at it holistically as well, to able
to determine and compare it to other sources,
whether it's Peter German's report or reports
from FINTRAC.

So I'm not sure if I'm answering your question or not. But I think, again, the important thing to remember here is that, you know, this report that I wrote is based on public sources and so there's going to be inherent limitations of writing a report on money laundering, organized crime, when you primarily are relying on public sources. And so I think that's, you know, a really important caveat that one should keep in mind when reading this report. And at the same time, you know, not to make too many excuses, but this report was written during rather extenuating circumstances, not necessarily referring to COVID-19; more to try to home school my oppositional nine-year-old. But...

So again, when you're reading this report, I think there -- for those in industries or law enforcement that have access to other sources of data that aren't public, they may take issue with some of the points I've raised or arguments. There may be sources in here that some may feel should be omitted, for example.

But again, it gets back to the point I made

 Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

earlier in that I very much try to avoid relying on any one particular source to make an overarching argument or analysis. And so again, my goal in writing this review was to be able to access as many sources as possible -- or as much literature as possible from as many sources as possible with the eye to basically trying to corroborate data from different sources to reach a consensus of the literature.

- Thank you very much. Please turn up page 11.
 Under the third segment of this or portion of the document, you have a heading of "Conceptual Overview."
- A Yeah.
- Q You go on in the start of that discussion to comment about there being no reliable estimates of the amount of revenue produced by illegal activities in Canada, but you say little doubt that narcotics trafficking and other organized criminal conspiracies generate billions of dollars of money annually. Then you have a quotation from your book. The 2004 citation is to your book, a review of the RCMP cases.
- A Right, report, that book, yeah.
- Q And so it is maybe in the obvious questions category: Why cash?
- Well, cash, again, continues to be the accepted Α mode of payment in the criminal underworld, whether it's street level drug trafficking or bookmaking or gambling, especially when you talk about consensual crimes, so drug trafficking, you know, bookmaking, people smuggling, prostitution. Cash is the -- continues to be the accepted mode of payment, and often is in small denominations. So it's not unusual to have multi kilos of cocaine or marijuana being purchased with \$20 bills, stacks of \$20 bills. Twenties and 50s tend to be the dominant denomination within the underground economy. And so because cash is primarily used in the criminal economy, not to mention the underground economy, it basically is a challenge to be able to -- for the drug trafficker or the criminal offender to use this cash without attracting a large amount of suspicion.

And so this is why the, quote, the so-called money laundering has arisen as a particular

tactical imperative of criminal entrepreneurs and drug traffickers and organized crime, is that in order to enjoy the fruits of their labour, they need to be able to take that cash and try to convert it into a form, an asset, that's less suspicious, all the while trying to hide the illegal source.

But again, we shouldn't get too caught up about, you know, what constitutes money laundering or not. I guess we'll talk about that a little later. I mean, really what we are concerned with is the ability of criminal offenders to be able to continually use the proceeds of their criminal activities, whether to reinvest back into the criminal activities or to be able to enjoy the fruits of their labour. And again, while cash continues to be the source of payment in the underground economy, increasingly -- especially if you want to purchase, you know, big ticket items, cash is obviously, in the legitimate economy, looked at rather suspiciously.

So again, the whole point of money laundering to some extent traditionally is to convert cash to a less suspicious asset in order for the criminal offender to enjoy it.

Of course there's other types of crimes, especially economic crimes, commercial crimes, where cash is not produced and that money is still being laundered. But what we've been primarily concerned with is drug trafficking, which continues to be primarily a cash-based business.

I wonder as you sort of look forward, if two different recent developments might cause you to think differently about the role of cash in the sense of printed currency bills versus other means of transferring value, as that being something that might change over time. I'm thinking here about, first, virtual currencies, Bitcoin and the like. Secondly -- which is a very recent phenomenon and hard to measure how big the impact will be -- but in the COVID era, where people are often asked not to be passing paper bills between each other but doing everything with cards and other ways to pay for things, do you see those kinds of trends as

Α

 Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

pointing in any particular direction with respect to the importance of cash?

Oh, absolutely. Certainly not just, you know, cybercurrency like Bitcoin, but being able to do any kind of -- use any kind of digital currency. So certainly a lot of attention has been paid to Bitcoin and cybercurrency, and we have seen -- there are cases where it's -- we haven't seen a case where, you know -- at least we haven't seen a significant amount of cases where digital currencies like Bitcoin, cybercurrencies are being used in drug transactions. There have been some cases, but we still see it's largely a cash-based business.

With that said, there are cases where Bitcoin and other cybercurrencies have been used to launder cash, the proceeds of crime, to convert cash into Bitcoin.

We've also seen online a number of platforms, including multiplayer games, that have basically invented their own currency that are used within the context of that game, but at the same time do have value attached to it. So these currencies are used to purchase, you know, particular products within a game or allow to, you know, advance to another level.

And there's a section of the literature review that looks at one of these multiplayer games called Second Life and how it's created its own currency and the potential for that currency to be used as a laundering mechanism as well.

So without a doubt, when you're talking about non-cash alternatives, you can break it down into economic crimes like stock market fraud or insider trading or market manipulation, where it really is done primarily digitally. All the transactions are digital, and the frauds are digital. The money is stolen from people -- for example, the fraud is usually a wire transfer or an account transfer. And so you have that issue of proceeds of crime that are already in an electronic format, whether that's a bank account or, you know, a securities brokerage account.

And the second, as I mentioned, is the onset of cybercurrencies like Bitcoin. And then the third would be, as I mentioned, you know, these virtual currencies online that are used as part

of gaming as well.
So all of the
keep your eye on a

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42 43

44

45 46

47

O

So all of these are definitely issues to keep your eye on as far as potential for laundering money, and the challenges in trying to detect the proceeds of crime, especially when they're in electronic or digital format.

But certainly from my experience, even

looking at recent drug trafficking cases, cash continues to be the currency of choice in drug deals, whether again you're at a street level, a five-, ten-, twenty-dollar transaction up to multikilo where you're talking, you know, millions of dollars. So cash is still a primary form of currency in the underground economy. Thank you. You mentioned in the course of one of these recent answers the difficult question of how to define or how to understand what money laundering is, and with a view to trying to see what your literature review has to say on that question -- I'll welcome you to disagree with the way I'm describing it if you see it differently. But I sort of read your report as having a few different ways of explaining or describing money

First of all, if I can look at page 11, the third paragraph down begins: "To benefit from drug trafficking and other profit-oriented illegal activity..." Do you see that -- Yes.

laundering as you understand it.

A Yes. Q -- paragraph?

A Yeah. And then you say:

...criminal offenders may engage in a series of financial transactions designed to convert cash into a less suspicious asset, disguise the true origins and criminal ownership of illicit proceeds, while creating the perception of a legitimate source.

And you say:

Such financial transactions are commonly referred to as money laundering.

Q There's a first -- A [indiscernible]

 Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

Q And then you go on -- this isn't contradicting or giving a different view of it, but I think more by way of elaboration about what you're describing in the next paragraph:

ML [money laundering] is an operational tactic employed by cash-intensive criminal entrepreneurs and groups to maximize their ability to use and enjoy the fruits of their illegal activity without attracting suspicion and/or government enforcement.

And you go on to talk about the concepts of money — the point being that money laundering isn't part of what you would call the "revenue centre" for the business but rather a "cost centre." Could you please help us understand what you're describing with that characterization?

A Sure. I mean, criminal organizations, you know, are not that much different in many ways from legitimate corporations. For example, you have revenue and you have expenses. You have certain expenses, certain, you know, line items that have to support your revenue stream, whether that's, you know, again product manufacturing, warehousing, sales, accounting, you know, legal, everything. And it's the same with criminal organizations.

So when I look at money laundering, I look at it within the context of other types of tactical imperatives that criminal groups use or criminal entrepreneurs use to be able to sustain their criminal activities. Corruption is one of those. We know that corruption like money laundering doesn't produce revenue -- in fact it's an expense -- but it's there to support the revenue-generating activities.

Intelligence gathering. We know that the outlaw biker gangs are active in gathering intelligence on police and government employees, and that is an expense.

So money laundering -- and there's a lot more of these, you know. Criminal groups have to obviously be involved in production and distribution. So when I look at money laundering, it's not there to produce revenue for the criminal group or the criminal entrepreneur.

Q

Α

It really should be seen as part of, as I mentioned, a cost centre or as an expense, as a tactic that's used to support the revenue stream. And it's somewhat unique in that it's really very specifically focused on the goal of allowing the criminal groups to enjoy the benefits of their revenue.

At the same time, money laundering can also be integrated into the transfer of funds internationally, you know, from a country where drugs are sold back to the source country to be able to pay for the drugs as well. And that is a critical part actually of the whole Vancouver model that we talk about.

So first and foremost, money laundering is -- it's an expense. If you actually make money off of laundering drug money, that's an added benefit. But really, to avoid suspicion, you actually would like, you know -- if you're, you know, laundering it through a casino, for example, and you're gambling some of the drug money, you actually lose some of that money to make it look legitimate. But it's not considered a revenue-producing stream as in big drug sales or gambling, things like that. It's there to support the overall organization.

really there to help the criminal offenders actually enjoy the benefit of their revenue, to be able to spend it without suspicion.

And at the bottom of page 11, I have a question that comes out of that last paragraph. You say that within the criminal milieu, ML has taken on a life of its own, and you go on to say that's in part because of increased efforts by governments, law enforcement, private sector firms and professionals who are trying to combat it.

But it's unique, as I mentioned, that it's

Could you help us understand what you describe there?

Well, certainly the common narrative is that we've seen money laundering become in many ways a cottage industry. It's not only part and parcel of the sort of tactics a group or an individual may use to launder the proceeds of crime, but we now see criminal entrepreneurs who basically are consultants -- call them specialists or professional money launderers, whatever term you

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

want to use -- specialists that are there basically to help other groups or help their own criminal group launder the money. We first really saw it with the Colombian cartels in the '80s. I mean, they were producing so much revenue, billions and billions of dollars in cocaine revenue, that again was all in small denominations -- that they had specialists, that they had almost separate divisions that were responsible for transporting cash and laundering that cash.

And with reference to that paragraph, certainly as law enforcement and government legislation has focused on the proceeds of crime as a way to combat organized crime and drug trafficking, many of the criminal entrepreneurs, criminal groups, have become more sophisticated and more determined to be able to hide their assets from law enforcement.

So 50 years ago, you know, before we had any legislation in place on money laundering, you know, the bad guys really didn't have to worry about the police going after their assets because generally speaking we didn't really have the laws that allowed the state to forfeit the proceeds of crime. But as soon as those laws were introduced that gave the powers to police to seize and forfeit the proceeds of crime, specialized enforcement units, anti-money laundering regulations, the role of the private sector in anti-money laundering -- I mean, all of this has put more pressure on the criminal groups and entrepreneurs and money launderers to be even more surreptitious, to be even more sophisticated, to be even more attuned to the need to be able to hide their illicit assets.

So really, money laundering now is about not only trying to enjoy the fruits of your labour, you know, without attracting suspicions from banks or the real estate industry or auto dealers, but obviously you want to be able to hide that money from law enforcement, from the government, so they're not forced to forfeit the proceeds of crime.

So the argument is that as money laundering legislation and enforcement, proceeds of crime enforcement, has ramped up in recent years,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

that's put more pressure on the bad guys to launder their proceeds of crime in order to ensure that it's not seized by the state.

Q I'm on to now page 12 and looking at the heading of "Definitions," I think you've already -- I've referred you to a few passages in which there is some explanation or definition of the concept of money laundering. In this series of points under the heading of definitions, you have a definition from FINTRAC, one from Peter German's report, also the Criminal Code description or definition of money laundering. We see there the concept a few times of legitimacy, the appearance of

A Correct.

Α

legitimacy.

Q What do you mean by that?

Well, it's effort to ensure that not only the source of the funds are seen to be legitimate, that instead of a source of funds being viewed as drug trafficking, that they are viewed as legitimately derived, whether from an investment or a job or, you know, a loan. And it's also in many ways to legitimize the criminal offender as well because you want, again, not just the source of the funds to appear legitimate but the criminal offender to appear legitimate as well. So I mean, that's -- you're not simply trying to hide the proceeds of crime. You're trying to legitimize it. So you're trying to create the perception that the funds that have been derived from criminal offences actually have been derived from legitimate offences. And again, that is not only to avoid suspicion, but it's also a means to counter criminal forfeiture of the proceeds of crime as well, or even civil forfeiture, if you can be able to argue convincingly that the funds that are subject to, say, a forfeiture order -criminal forfeiture order if those funds are in fact legitimate and the onus of proof on the Crown to prove that they're illegitimate or illegal, there's extra onus on the offender to make sure that there is the guise of legitimacy created around that source of funds.

So it's not -- I mean, it's an essential part of money laundering theoretically. Conceptually it us not just to hide the source but also to create the guise of legitimacy as

well.

 And if I move down on page 12, you have a section where you describe the objectives of money laundering. You refer to your 2004 study of the RCMP files -- and you refer to yourself in the third person:

According to Schneider, "A comprehensive money laundering operation satisfies three essential objectives: (1) it converts the bulk cash proceeds of crime to another, less suspicious form, (2) it conceals the criminal origins and ownership of the funds and/or assets, and (3) it creates a legitimate explanation or source for the funds and/or assets."

And in relation to that third point, you say a few sentences down: "The third objective, while less frequently satisfied in most ML operations, is no less important..." You go on to then describe it as convincingly creating a legitimate front or alibi. And so maybe you can help us with your meaning or the thoughts behind using an analogy to a criminal law alibi, or a cover, a front.

A Yeah. The term "alibi" was actually a word that Peter German used in one of his reports. But again, I think it's important to keep in mind that, you know, a lot of -- you know, when criminal offenders disburse the proceeds of crime into the legitimate economy, it doesn't always satisfy these three objectives.

The one that may be most difficult, the one objective to reach, is that creating the legitimate explanation for the source of the cash or asset.

But you know, again, this is conceptual. But if you truly wanted to satisfy, you know, the money laundering objective, the -- you know, the really three goals that you're shooting for -- obviously your first goal is to be able to convert all cash into a less suspicious asset. You want to get rid of suspicious cash. You want to -- and it's not just enough to conceal the criminal origin because then you're still leaving yourself vulnerable to having those criminal

origins unconcealed, whether it's through a criminal investigation or a suspicious transaction report.

Truly what you want to do to not just avoid suspicion but also to avoid any kind of government interdiction of that cash is to create that legitimate explanation. And it's particularly important, again in sort of common law countries, in the criminal courts in Canada, where the onus of proof is on the Crown to prove that the source of funds are actually criminal or illegal in nature. And again, as I mentioned before, the onus or the importance of creating this legitimate explanation is not just to avoid suspicion. It's also to avoid government forfeiture or another interdiction through the criminal courts.

- Q It's really a way of sort of scrubbing off any remnants of the fingerprints, isn't it, that through deliberate steps or transactions, any trace evidence that can link the person to the criminal activity or link the money at least to the asset, the wealth, to the criminal activity is what the person is trying to get rid of?
- Α Well, yes. Yes and no. I mean, again, concealing the criminal -- obviously you want to conceal the criminal activity, and you can do that -- you don't have to necessarily do that through creating legitimacy. You can conceal criminal activity or a criminal source through what's called layering, and that is, you know, transaction upon transaction upon transaction through numerous financial instruments or commercial sectors to try to basically obfuscate any kind of paper trail between the asset or the funds and the criminal source. So that is in itself an important step in the process or an important objective. But again, on top of that, to really truly satisfy the process, it's not good enough just to conceal it. You want to have that legitimate source.

I mean, some examples of creating a legitimate source -- I mean, the most common, you know, is setting up a shell company or even a real company that produces legitimate revenue. You would like a company that in its normal line of business produces cash, you know, like a bar

 Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

or a restaurant, and you commingle your drug proceeds with the cash from the legitimate and then you deposit into a commercial bank account. I mean, that's a typical example of creating legitimacy. You're not -- you are concealing the criminal sources, but more importantly you're creating the guise of legitimacy. And there's various techniques to use to create that legitimacy. But certainly trying to claim the proceeds of crime as legitimate revenue from a legal business is certainly one of the most predominant ways to try to create this facade of legitimacy.

- Q And in terms of the sort of outcome of the money laundering enterprise and measuring the success from the point of view of the perpetrator or people doing it, I take it that the gold standard -- you've got a quote here -- I'm looking at the top of page 13 -- from McGill economist Tom Naylor. At the top of page 13 you quote him, writing: "Money is not truly laundered unless it is made to appear sufficiently legitimate that it can be used openly..."
- A Exactly, yes. Yeah.
- MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, I think -- I don't want to take so many breaks necessarily all the time, but we've covered a bit of ground here, and it may be to our advantage if we make an effort to see -- the audio quality seems, in my observation, good for Professor Schneider thus far. Our hope had been also to have the video feed. And so I wonder if we take a break, that might give us a chance to try to see if there's a way that we can continue, I presume with the same audio, but add the video component to it.
- THE COMMISSIONER: All right, we'll do that, Mr.
 Martland. I think we'll take 15 minutes. I make
 it 11:03 right now. So about 15 minutes from now
 we'll resume. And again, I would ask everyone to
 mute their microphone and turn off their video in
 the interim. Thank you.
- THE REGISTRAR: The hearing is now adjourned for a 15-minute break until 11:18 a.m.

(WITNESS STOOD DOWN)

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED)

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the Commission

(PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED)

 THE REGISTRAR: Thank you for waiting. The hearing is now resumed. Please ensure you are muted unless you are speaking.

STEPHEN SCHNEIDER, a witness, recalled.

MR. MARTLAND: Thank you. I have an indication I can't turn my own video on, so we've now done a switcheroo. We have a visible witness. I expect that that will be fixed up momentarily. There we go.

Professor Schneider, I think we now have you appearing as well as being heard.

- A I believe so. Well, it was working five minutes ago. Here we go. I think I can fix that. Once I start it -- and they actually want me to go back to audio only. There we go.
- MR. MARTLAND: Well, that audio connection seemed a bit like what we had earlier on.
- A How is it now? Am I coming through clear now? MR. MARTLAND: Yeah, it's okay. It was a bit better on the phone setup, I think. But we've got you visually, so that's a great help. That's good. Good.

Okay, well, let's start out this way, and then if we -- and I welcome others who know more than I do to suggest that we should add the phone in or do something different for the audio. But otherwise I think I'll simply go ahead with my questions. And thank you for your patience and everyone's patience because no sooner did the Commissioner predict that we would have little glitches and hiccups as we got under way, then that happened. And I think that's a given as we all try to put this many participants online at the same time to run these hearings. On the other hand, I think we are all here and it looks like we'll be able to do this.

EXAMINATION BY MR. MARTLAND, continuing:

 Q So let me return, please, to page 13 of the literature review, Exhibit 6. And you had touched on layering but we haven't gotten into a

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the Commission

description or discussion about the phases of money laundering. And in this portion of your report, Professor Schneider, you refer to -- you describe there being five phases to money laundering. And just to list them out, and they're there under the heading of "3.3 Phases in the Money Laundering Process." In order to satisfy the objectives of money laundering, the process entails five phases:

(i) placement, (ii) layering, (iii)
justification, (iv) integration, and (v)
extraction or repatriation

We'll return to this, but I take it it's fair to say that this is one way to characterize it as being five stages. Equally on other occasions it's put as being three or even sometimes two or, I imagine, four different phases to the money laundering process?

A Yeah. There's no universally accepted conceptualization of how many phases or steps there are. I came up with a model years ago. Others have come up with a model. I included the OECD model as a graphic on the subsequent page.

So what I did here really was, I felt at this point, all the models, including my previous one, were deficient, and there was a few more concepts that had been introduced by other scholars. And so I basically looked at the existing models and then built this one based on the literature.

So a couple of points to remember, that first of all, like I said, there's no universally accepted model of the phases. Number two, you can actually look at these as not necessarily sequential phases but more a function, because in many cases they don't always occur sequentially or systematically like this.

And let me know if my audio is not coming through, if you can't hear me.

So basically -- I'll go through this very quickly, again with those two caveats of mine.

The first phase would be placement, and this again is generally referring to cash placement. So this is where illicit cash is introduced into the legitimate economy. And generally the most

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

- 1 common -- I'm being asked to wear a headset.
- 2 MR. MARTLAND: Thank you.
 - A Yes. Now I need to find the headset. Let me --
- 4 MR. MARTLAND: Yeah. No, and that's fine. I think 5 that might well boost the quality.
 - A Yeah. Well, let me see if I can find it.
 - MR. MARTLAND: If you want to turn off your video feed --
 - A Yeah.
- 10 MR. MARTLAND: -- for a moment and look, that's fine, 11 or whatever you like. But yeah, we don't mind 12 waiting because that's helpful.
- 13 A Yeah. I'm going to do the absent-minded.
- MR. MARTLAND: Yeah, great.
 - A Okay, I'm going to try something [indiscernible]. Okay, that was that. Can you actually hear me now?
 - MR. MARTLAND: Yeah. I think that's pretty decent.
 - A Okay, that's better?
 - MR. MARTLAND: Oh yeah, that's good. We just need you to direct airlines onto runways and we'll be set. That's great. Good. No, with the mike close, that seems to be improving the quality of things. That's super.
 - A Okay. All right.
 - MR. MARTLAND: Good work. There we go.
 - A Okay. So --
 - MR. MARTLAND: And thank you for flagging that because I think that is an improvement.
 - You were starting in to describing the five phases that you described in the review. Why don't you carry on with that.
 - A Okay. So first phase, placement. Again, this usually refers to when the illegal cash, illicit cash enters the legitimate economy. So this whole process really is about cash entering the legitimate economy. So this leads to some [indiscernible] like not all monies laundered [indiscernible] the economy and not all these crimes [indiscernible] cash.

So placement is where the cash actually enters the legitimate economy. It's considered obviously the first stage. The most typical kind of cash placement is simply making a cash deposit into a bank account. That's certainly not exclusive. Also you can purchase big ticket items with cash. You can buy a car. There are

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

situations where you could buy a car. There are situations where people buy homes with cash. But generally speaking, what you want to do is you want to place the cash in the economy through a deposit, whether a bank -- we've seen situations where other quasi banking institutions, like money servicing businesses and casinos have been used in this manner. But generally speaking, the vast majority of illicit cash that enters the legitimate economy is through a bank deposit in Canada [indiscernible].

- MR MARTLAND: If I can just interrupt you there. I've just seen a note that some people are having despite the headset some problems hearing well. I don't know if pushing that mouthpiece even close to your mouth is one possible solution or if we should move back to the --
- A Well, let me just --
- MR. MARTLAND: -- first mike.
- A Give me one more minute here.
- MR. MARTLAND: Thanks, yeah.
- A It may actually still be --
- MR. MARTLAND: It might be off the computer. I didn't actually personally detect is as being -- I think under the mute button there's a popup window depending on which version of the app you have that then has select a microphone, select a speaker.
- A Right.
- MR. MARTLAND: Maybe if you try toggling over to something different there.
- A Yeah. Okay, how's that?
- MR. MARTLAND: That seems good. Yeah. I don't want to overstate it or I'll curse it. But yes, why don't you try that out.
- A Is that better?
- MR. MARTLAND: No, it seemed to drop off again. I'm sorry?
- A Can you hear me?
- MR. MARTLAND: Okay. Yeah. I think our best course is just if you can pretend you're in a very echoey courtroom and we're asking you to speak loudly. and we'll do our best to push on through that.
- A Okay. Can you actually hear me through the mike, or is it coming through the computer?
- 47 MR. MARTLAND: I think it may be the computer, but I'm

frankly guessing. When you go to mute and the little button up, does it say computer versus headset for the talk one, mike, select a microphone?

- A No. It says -- okay, I'm getting a slew of emails from your tech people as well --
- MR. MARTLAND: I know.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46 47

- A -- so I'm trying to --
- MR. MARTLAND: So am I and I've just turned off all -- and I'm trying to ignore them all. I know what you mean.
- A Yeah, I'm -- microphone. I'm on headphones. Switch to phone. I'm just going to test this out. Test, test, test.
- MR. MARTLAND: It seems okay right now.
- A I'm just going to plod on here.
- MR. MARTLAND: Okay. Sorry to interrupt you. Please
- No, that's okay. That's all right. So layering Α is the next phase. Layering is basically about conducting numerous transactions to create that distance between the asset that the cash eventually turns into, whether it's an account or a physical asset like a car or a house, and you want to create distance between that and the illegitimate source, the criminal source. And so ideally what you want to do is you want to create layers between the asset that is used [indiscernible] the proceeds of crime and the criminal source. And generally layering is conducting as many transactions as possible, and this could be something as simple as account transfers to wire transfers. The most consummate type of layering is where you do numerous transactions over numerous kinds of financial or commercial vehicles [indiscernible] different account executives.

[indiscernible] is, you know, Peter German
calls [indiscernible] wash cycle [indiscernible]
--

THE COMMISSIONER: Professor Schneider and Mr.

Martland, I find a bit of the audio very uneven
and I expect others are experiencing it
similarly. I wonder if we ought to go back to
the telephone while having you on camera. Unless
I'm a minority of one, I expect others are
experiencing what I am.

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

- MR. MARTLAND: So Professor Schneider, before the break you were by phone. And your setup with the phone, that seemed to be a good audio feed. Was that like headphones into a mobile or a landline, or what was your --
- A No, I was just on speakerphone on my cell.
- MR. MARTLAND: Okay. I think if you were to -- if you're content to reconnect to that phone line, mute your computer audio, and I think that's probably our best course here.
- A Yeah, I'm dialing right now.
- MR. MARTLAND: I appreciate that. Thanks. Here we go. I'm not going to read it out online to help you. I'm glad he's muted because we don't get Jimi Hendrix at the Monterey Pop Festival that way, the feedback loop.
- A Okay. You're going to have to ask your tech people to send me the password.
- MR. MARTLAND: I'll do that. That's great. Mr.
 Commissioner, I know all of this is a bit stop
 and go, but I do think -- maybe I'm a bit of an
 optimist, but I think we're moving in the right
 direction. If we have Professor Schneider keep
 this video feed but have it muted and then if we
 take a five-minute break to then ensure that he's
 connected to the phone for the audio component, I
 think that's our best way to get the two things
 working at once.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I agree. I think we have to get it so that people can hear. So let's take five minutes.
- MR. MARTLAND: Thank you. And I think they'll be sending him the password. Thank you.
- THE REGISTRAR: The hearing is adjourned for five minutes until 11:38 a.m. Please mute yourself and turn off your video.

(WITNESS STOOD DOWN)

(PROCEEINGS ADJOURNED) (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED)

THE REGISTRAR: Thank you for waiting, and the hearing is now resumed. Please ensure you are muted unless you are speaking.

 Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

EXAMINATION BY MR. MARTLAND, continuing:

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

- Q Professor, thank you --
- A Okay, how is the volume now?
- Q It is -- I almost don't want to tell you it's okay right now. I don't want to curse it. We can see you and we can hear you. Those are two pretty good ingredients here.
- Yeah, well, seeing me may not be the best option, though. Anyway, so as far as the five phases are concerned, we talked about placement layering. Justification is similar to the legitimacy and justification is basically a phase or a function in which the offender tries to create a legitimate guise for the proceeds of crime, so they try to justify the revenue or the assets, so hence, the term "justification."

"Integration" refers to basically integrating your transactions within the legitimate economy, and so that they become literally embedded in the legitimate economy, to contribute to the legitimacy of the proceeds of crime.

And the final is what's called extraction/repatriation, which is basically getting the money back into the hands of the offender so they can enjoy it. So, again, there's no, again, universally accepted model. This one and this five-phased model is what I put together based on a synthesis of the literature, including some of the newer ideas. Justification was a fairly new idea. And also, you don't necessarily have to think of this as, again, a unilateral process and that different phases or different functions can occur at the same time. So, for example, you know, justification, integration layering are all often combined by conducting a number of transactions. Say that involves a loan-back technique from a shell You're both layering. company. You're justifying through getting this so-called legitimate revenue from a shell company, and you're doing a number of transactions, so you're integrating the economy.

So, I think the important point is to not necessarily look at this through a linear process, or even as phases, but look at these as

 Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

each individual function within the laundering process that satisfies the objective. Again, with the key objective of obviously getting the proceeds of crime back into the hands of the offender, repatriate it back to the offender.

So, in many cases, we'll see some of these functions overlap with one another and not necessarily always occur in this order. So, for example, you know, if you do a cash placement into a bank account under the guise of a legitimate revenue, say, a company you open, and that satisfies both the cash placement and the justification function.

So, but there you have it. That, again, is what I view as sort of a synthesis of the most up-to-date sort of conceptual thinking on the phases or functions in the money laundering process.

Q And in your report, the literature review, that is, from pages 13 onwards, you've got a quite fairly detailed discussion about these different phases and about some of the -- including things that people have written about different aspects or different phases in the money laundering technique. I don't propose to read all of that, but this is part of what is before us all for our benefit. I'd like to take you to -- maybe just looking at page 16, you've got a comment in the third paragraph just above this visual in the literature review where you comment exactly as you did earlier:

There is no universal agreement on the number of phases or the specific substance of any one phase...

And then you've got something from the OECD that puts it as I think dividing this broadly into two parts, dividing integration process into two parts, you say?

A Right. Again, they -- you know, they -- they use different terminology. The term "placement," "layering" is the same. Integration, justification. And they break integration into two parts, justification and investment. "Investment" is the term they use and "repatriation" is the term I use. But, again, I

 Q

think the important thing to remember, regardless of, you know, what name you apply to a certain phase or function, is that, you know, like the objectives of money laundering, to truly satisfy a consummate money laundering process, you want to be able to, you know, place the proceeds of crime into the economy. You want to conduct a number of transactions that create the distance between the laundered asset and the source of the funds. You want to be -- at the same time, integrate your transactions within the legitimate economy so they're truly embedded, buried in the legitimate economy, which contributes to their legitimization.

Justification, again, is as much a goal as it is a function or a phase, because one of the goals, as we mentioned, in money laundering, is creating this air of legitimacy. And, you know, ultimately it's about getting the money back into the hands of the offender, to either enjoy the fruits of his or her labour or to reinvest that money back into further criminal activity.

- You described developing five phases as a description of the process here. Is the five-phase description something that's really your own analysis or is that something that you drew from others -- if others put it that way; it's a five-phase process?
- Well, it's based on the literature, so it's a Α synthesis of the literature. Some -- again, there's some newer concepts introduced in the last few years that have not been integrated into the older model. So, yes, mine is, again, a -you know, my own creation of sorts, but always be based on the literature. And, you know, this is, you know, a systematic model sort of evolving over the years, like a lot of different, you know, concepts, an academia or a -- and so, yeah, it's more or less it's based on the literature, but I've really expanded it to make sure that each of these functions are conceptually distinct from one another. Because in some of the models, People were using the they weren't distinct. term "integration" to mean multiple things. so I tried to flesh it out, create a little broader model, one where each of those phases are quite distinct conceptually.

 Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

- Q And is it fair to say that the three-phase, the placement layering integration, is that like a commonplace way of describing phases of money laundering?
- A Yeah. Yeah, those -- those are some of the core concepts, yeah.
- Q Mm-hmm, mm-hmm. If we look at page 16 and onwards, you've set out some critiques of the conceptual models, as well as definitions of "money laundering." I don't need you to go into great detail, but do you want to touch on what some of those critiques involve?
- A Sure. Well, I guess, number one, it assumes that the money laundering is occurring through the legitimate economy, and not all money laundering occurs through the legitimate economy. As I go into detail later in the report, there are underground fund or value transfer systems. There is different ways that you can transfer laundered money without going the legitimate economy. Certainly the legitimate economy is the ideal, but it's not something that is universally acceptable when you're laundering cash. So, again, the model assumes that you're laundering it through legitimate economy.

Another critique is that assumes that the form that the proceeds of crime take is cash and the cash is being placed in the legitimate economy. Again, not all crimes produce cash per se. If you're looking at commercial crime, stock market crime, you know, marketing, mass marketing frauds, a whole range of crimes, the cash -- or the proceeds of crime is not necessarily cash.

Now, with that said, so the problem, too, is that say a stock market fraud, the proceeds of crime is already in the system, so it's already in the system as the fraud, and you basically launder the money the same way that you, say, defraud people through a mass marketing fraud. So, in some cases, the illicit funds are already in the legitimate system or already in the system in a digital electronic format.

You know, again, this is like the objectives of money laundering. In practicality and reality, you know, most people laundering money are not this consummate. They're not getting to satisfy each and every one of these phases or

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

0

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

functions. As I mentioned before, there's a misconception that these phases operate in a sort of unilateral sequential manner, and they don't always do so, so in some cases I think they're better referred to as functioning phases. of those different functions is not necessarily part of sort of a systematic process. And I'll leave it at that, but it's still, again -- I think, you know, a fair -- if you look at each of these as a function as opposed to a phase, I think they are -- still cover -- they're quite applicable to most cash-based criminal offences, like drug trafficking. But, again, not every money launderer or someone dispersing cash is going to use every single one of these functions. And I think it's around page 18 or so that you comment a little bit about, I suppose, the spectrum of sophistication, the different levels of how professionalized and how sophisticated or complex the people -- the conduct may be at different phases?

A Right. I mean, through my own research, and other research as well, and drug intelligence estimates, you know, there is, again, a wide spectrum or grades of vergence in the sophistication of money laundering from -- you know, even some of the -- even some of the more sophisticated money launderers still have to deal with transferring cash and still like just to pack cash into suitcases and transport that way.

So I think you need to avoid the mindset that somehow big sophisticated criminal transnational criminal groups, whether it's the -- you know, the Hells Angels or the Colombian or Mexican drug cartels, you know, use these highly sophisticated systematic phases. fact, you know, one of the best ways to launder money is just to pack up cash and smuggle it out of the country. And so -- so, yeah, even the most sophisticated criminal groups tend to try to use what works best for them or what leaves the least amount of paper trail, and cash smuggling is often that. And we saw that with, you know, the Mexican drug cartels, and we've seen it with the Vancouver model to some extent, and with the Colombian drug cartel.

So, even the most sophisticated criminal

 Stephen Schneider (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the Commission

groups will tend to use functions that leave the least amount of paper trail, especially moving money internationally, which could be cash smuggling. But, again, when I was working with the RCMP and observing some of their undercover operations, you know, you would have some street level heroin dealers come in with, you know, hockey bags full of cash, and -- and then the RCMP would -- would launder it for them. And for the same time, you see the same amount of sophisticated, you know, big similar organizations, you know, physically transporting cash as well.

So you run the real gamut. You have some that are quite rudimentary that don't satisfy all the money laundering objectives, they don't satisfy all the phases, and then you have the more sophisticated ones which will get into very sophisticated kind of money laundering. Your transfer systems and setting up, you know, corporate hierarchies in tax-saving countries. But, again, the sophistication of the group doesn't necessarily mean that they are not going to resort to basic sort of handling of cash and transferring of cash.

- Just to pick up on something you just described in painting a bit of a picture of the spectrum of how sophisticated people may be. You made reference -- I just want to avoid anyone taking a snippet of suggesting the police are laundering, the one doing the cash laundering. But what you were describing there was an undercover sting operation where the police are simply going to the criminals and serving as the, I guess, service provider in an undercover scenario designed to see if they're engaged in a crime?
- A Yeah, back in the '90s, the RCMP set up the street level currency exchange businesses and put the word out in the streets that they were laundering money, and there was cash. I mean, it's a good point brought, there was cash coming in from the street level dealership. At the same time, the Rizzuto family, which was a major -- the mafia family in Quebec and Canada, was also had their lawyers bringing in cash. You know, if they can -- if you can find a reliable source to launder your cash, a third party professional

money launderer, then they'll use that. But it gets back to, again, at a point of, once again, this is a cash-based industry, drug trafficking, gambling, and ultimately you need to get that cash into legitimate economy; even though there are limited amounts of ways to launder illegitimate economy. But -- I'm sorry, I'm rambling on this one. But, yes, it was an undercover operation that the RCMP set up years ago to launder drug money. But we got a very informative observational research to see that the -- the types of ways that proceeds of crime were being laundered. And, again, the real sort of reliance on cash and the cash economy and the real desire to get rid of that cash, whether you're a street level trafficker or, you know, the Rizzuto mafia family.

 Q Right. So if I can move you, please, to page 19 of the report, and we're going to be moving shortly into a discussion about predicate offences, but before doing that, just above, do you see in page 19, just above the subheading in the middle of the page, reference to a 2015 report issued by Finance Canada which identified -- and you write:

...[it] identifies four criteria that can help assess the extent to which the disbursement of dirty money constitutes ML and the relative threat posed by a particular ML operation...

Do you want to describe a little bit about those criteria and what the intent was of developing -- I'm not asking you to speak to the intention and developing them, but how you make use of those in your work?

A Well, this was essentially a threat assessment model that was created by Finance Canada using four criteria, and so they use it essentially to assess whether a money laundering threat is high intensity or low intensity using the four metrics. And it's -- I placed it in this particular section because it also speaks to some of the metrics on how to measure the diversity of sophistication within a particular criminal group or entrepreneur or money laundering operation in

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

particular, so -- and, again, the four criteria they have is, you know, sophistication, that's the extent to which the criminal groups or threat actors have the knowledge skills and expertise to launder the proceeds of crime. Again, not a lot of criminal groups, entrepreneurs have that. It's not just sophistication, it's the capability to do it.

Again, when you look at, you know, the Colombian cartels from the '80s and '90s, or some of the Mexican drug cartels today, are even -you know, the -- some of the criminal groups that we've seen operating in Vancouver of late, they have really nurtured a specific capability, functional capability to launder money. And, again, this is what I spoke to earlier in that given the need to -- given more enforcement attention, given the need to hide suspicious assets from the private sector, which now is deputized basically to identify proceeds of crime, there's been a concerted effort to develop this capability. And certainly one of the most significant threats in the universe of money laundering right now are criminal offenders or groups that have emerged specifically to launder money. And that you could argue is a foundation of what happened in Vancouver through -- as we saw from the criminal investigations and through the Vancouver model.

Scope, again, this is not only the scope of the amount of money being laundered, but the scope to which the criminal offenders use a whole range of different sectors. If you just, say, deposit cash in a bank and just use a bank, that's not particularly a significant scope. But, again, the more sophisticated or more consummate money laundering operations transcend one particular sector, let alone one particular type of financial transaction or a financial aspect. And, again, the proceeds of crime refer to the scope of the money that's being laundered. So, number 3 is about the scope of the sectors being used and number 4 is really the magnitude or the scope or the amount of money being laundered; again, the assumption being that the more money that needs to be laundered, the more sophisticated you're going to be, which is not

always the case, as I mentioned earlier.

But this is -- was, again, a good threat
assessment model that Finance Canada developed to
try to basically model and assess inherent
threat, risk of threats of different criminal
actors in money laundering operations.

Thank you, and in the course of that answer, you

- Thank you, and in the course of that answer, you touched on the notion of individuals or organizations whose sole purpose is the money laundering as opposed to, I suppose, the main task is the money laundering as opposed to off the side of the desk or as an adjunct to other things they're doing. Is that --
- A [indiscernible].
- O Go ahead.
- A Sorry.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42 43

44

45

46 47 Commission

- Q I was going to ask, is that what -- we sometimes hear a term "professional money launderers". Does that describe that or describe something a bit different?
- Α No, it describes that. I mean, you know, there's been emergence of what's called the third party money launderer. So, traditionally it was if you're in a criminal group, then your function or one of your functions was to launder money or to transport cash. And now we're seeing the emergence of groups in recent years that -- whose sole purpose is to launder proceeds of crime or transfer cash. One of the first was connected actually to the Rizzuto family in Montreal, called the Caruana-Cuntrera family, and they were a wing of the Rizzuto family, and that was they were basically targeted through Project Omerta, which is an RCMP Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit operation about -- geez, over 20 years ago now. But I would also say this is characteristic of the subjects of E-Pirate and E-Nationalize and it's the whole sort of Vancouver model revolves around professional money laundering. I don't want to -- I'm not sure if I can mention names. I've mention names in my literature review. But basically Silver International, Silver Investments International, is a money service business that seemed to be set up solely to facilitate laundering money. And so they were laundering money -- as for -- for Mexican individuals connected to -- based on the

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

literature -- connected to Mexican drug cartels, to various organized crime groups.

So -- so my understanding, based on the literature, is that when you look at the so-called Vancouver model, it really revolves around a group and an informal money service business that was set up solely, almost exclusively to launder money for their own purposes, but for other groups as well.

- And we will get into some of those questions, because you've got some discussion of that in your report. But, again, just to be clear, that's -- I mean, maybe I can ask you right now. When you describe that sort of activity on the part of Silver International, or other -- I assume you're not an undercover officer doing that investigation here. What's the source of that?
- A Literature. Everything else -- I'll try to differentiate, you know, between my own research and my work with the RCMP and based on literature, but --
- Q Yeah.
- A -- you know, too much -- any reference I make is based on the literature in the literature review.
- Yeah, that's helpful to know. Thank you. And so I'll move next, please, on page 19 to the discussion about predicate offences. You've got the first heading there about Canada, and you say:

In Canada, the prosecution of the criminal offence of ML requires proof that the money or assets in question are the proceeds of a specific predicate offence (e.g., drug trafficking, theft, fraud, extortion...

-- and so forth. Do you want to -- you've got some reference to the 2020 U.S. Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs and their characterization. Do you want to comment about the national level? And if it's helpful to do so, as I look on to page 20, you have this table that comes from a 2015 Finance Canada report, I take it?

A Right, right, and what's interesting about that is you'll notice that the -- the predicate

 Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

offences that Finance Canada considers very high a threat are primarily commercial or economic crime offences, so capital markets fraud, commercial trade fraud, mass marketing fraud -- Right.

- Q Right.
 A -- and mortgage fraud, and the argument here is that -- is one that I made earlier, is that the proceeds of crime are already embedded in the legitimate economy more or less, and they're not in a cash form, which is what makes them such a high threat. Again, the argument always is, is that the most difficult stage for the money launderers is introducing cash into the legitimate economy. That's where they're most vulnerable.
- Q Mm-hmm.
- And most of the regulations that have been put in place, the anti-money laundering regulations that private sector firms have to adhere to, really revolve around the placement stage. Not exclusively, mostly.
- Q So things like the 10 -- the cash limit before someone -- an institution might have to report a suspicious transaction be an example of that?
- Α Exactly. Large cash transaction recording and suspicious -- yes, suspicious transaction recording. 10 -- obviously, the cash transaction reporting requirements of the legislation revolve around cash placement. So, in this case, what you have is many of these offences don't produce cash, they produce -- if it's mass marketing fraud, you're basically asking your victim to send in a cheque or to wire transfer or do an account transfer or an Interac transfer. that's why these type of commercial crime offences are rated such a high threat, because the proceeds of crime are in a non-cash form, and in some cases they're in electronic form. like I mentioned, if it's a securities fraud, it's often very difficult to delineate between the predicate offence and the money laundering, because the techniques are similar. When you are trying to manipulate markets and manipulate a trading account, in the same time you're layering and you're integrating, you're justifying. in a lot of those commercial crime predicate offences, Finance Canada is seeing those to be

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43

44

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the Commission

1 particularly high, because they're non-cash. 2

Q Right.

And that makes it more -- makes it easier to integrate the proceeds of crime and launder it, and it makes it more difficult to detect the proceeds of crime as the -- into legitimate economy. I mean, they're really -- again, if you don't have the cash to start with, that makes the laundering just so much easier and more efficient.

Now, obviously drug trafficking is in there because that --

- I wondered, just because you're taking us into that chart, and I --
- I said I wouldn't do this, but I wonder MR. MARTLAND: if our registrar might try to bring up the Exhibit number 6, the literature review, and the table that shows at page 20. That may be about page 23 or 24 of the PDF version. I can't remember quite how the pagination breaks.
- Α Page 20.
- MR. MARTLAND: Oh, she's quick. Look at that.
- Α [Indiscernible].
- Q Yes, you see that, and we may see if we can get a big bigger view of it, but the middle of that, the Table 1, it's entitled "The Money Laundering Threat Ratings of Different Predicate Offences". That's what you were just describing, Professor Schneider?
- Right, right. Yeah, right. Α
- 31 Okay. 0
 - Α And if your registrar wants to share, I can also post my PDF online as well and control it, but that's up to you. So if --
 - I think we're -- I think we'll let her do the Q sharing, but let's carry on. If there's something you want to see, though, don't be shy to ask her to display that. I'm not quite sure how all that works. I think our general rule is she's the one sharing screens.
 - Α Yeah. So can we --
 - So we see -- so you were -- you were commenting on drug trafficking as in the list in the very high threat rating, but then --
- 45 Α Right.
- 46 -- what you described as being sort of commercial 47 crime-related activity, a lot of it showing up in

that first highest category.

A Exactly, and so drugs, because, you know, there's so much -- I mean, it's such a prolific industry that produces so much cash. Tobacco smuggling, the same. It's a very large underground industry in this country, so it produces a large amount of cash and tends to be laundered. And then you see the third party money laundering as well, so -- but I won't get into detail there, but I just thought it's a very salient point to make that, you know, while you have drug trafficking and gambling and tobacco smuggling, it's still a cash-based business.

We have, you know, some would argue, many criminologists would argue that commercial crimes, economic crimes, produce far more proceeds of crime than drug trafficking, and so that -- whether it's securities fraud or mass marketing fraud or whatever -- and, again, so it's not only the volume of the predicate offences and the volume of the proceeds of crime that's generated from commercial criminal offences, but it's also the fact that, again, it's in a non-cash form and it's already integrated into the system that make it a particular high -- particularly high money laundering threat.

- Q Before I ask her to take it down, is there anything else you wanted to comment on? I don't plan to march through all of the more detailed descriptions that you've got in the following part of the report, but any particular things you'd like to draw our attention to from that table?
- A Again, I would like to reiterate, you know, the point I just made. You know, we talk about proceeds of crime, we tend to focus on, you know, organized crime, like drug trafficking, prostitution and tobacco smuggling and people smuggling and gambling, but even though I'm loathe to try to estimate the scope of any kind of crime, you know, certainly we do not pay sufficient attention to the type of commercial crimes that occur in society, the impact that has on society and the amount of proceeds of crime and money laundering that accompany these economic crimes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

It's getting a little off topic here, but it's a continued source of frustration for I think a lot of victims, especially when they get, you know, defrauded and realize that there's not even a hope of having that investigated. But again, we focus a lot on drugs, but the amount of commercial crime in this country, the amount of resources that's dedicated to combatting it, means that we have -- we can say that commercial crime probably produces more proceeds of crime than drug trafficking and a lot of these organized crimes combined, in my opinion. And so that is why these economic crimes are such a threat to Canada, a money laundering threat specifically.

- Q Mm-hmm. Is that out of step with your take on the public's perception about what money laundering usually describes? I mean, there's sort of a public cliché of -- in our country -hockey bags, in other countries, duffle bags or what have you, but sort of the Ozarks, the Netflix series or something of the money hidden under the floorboards and literally put through a washing machine. You're describing something quite different.
- No, you're right, we do have -- you know, again, Α we have conceptions of crime as being, you know, sort of street level B & E artists, a street level drug dealer, and you know, these things, and organized crime. Canada's never been very good at addressing what a lot of criminologists believe is [indiscernible], that amount of, you know, commercial crimes, economic crimes, not only committed by fraudsters, but committed by legitimate, you know, corporations and, you know, private businesspeople, and it just simply -- you know, sometimes drug trafficking is sort of lowhanging fruit for police. Economic crime investigations, financial crime investigations, can be very complex. They don't have the expertise. They don't have the resources. know, and just look at how many insider trading charges have been laid in the last few years or, you know, market manipulation. It's just -again, I'm going to go on a tangent here, but it's -- I think my point is that you're right, we can't -- when we think of serious crimes that

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22 23

1

have significant impacts on society, we just can't think of drugs, we have to also look at economic commercial crimes as well. And the same with money laundering. We can't just think and sort of be stereotypical sort of drug dealers with bags of cash, we also have to think of more sophisticated, you know, corporate entities that are engaged in unethical and criminal activities and, you know, fraudsters as well.

Thank you.

- I don't think, Madam Registrar, that I MR. MARTLAND: need that display anymore, but that was helpful, and I think that worked pretty well, which was nice to see. It's a relief.
- Let me turn, please, to page 22 of the report, and we then -- in your literature review, you move out of speaking nationally, but rather, then focusing on British Columbia, and you refer to what Peter German wrote in his 2018 report, the first of two reports, to the effect that, in his view:

"... the most lucrative crimes in Vancouver are related to illegal drug sales" implying...

25 26 27

24

Α "Implying".

Q Go ahead.

28 29 I would certainly tend to agree with that. 30 again, you know, the difficulty in trying to 31 compare, you know, drug trafficking to, say, 32 corporate crime, or sex crimes, it's very 33 difficult to do. But, you know, B.C. is unique 34 in that it has its geographic location, close to California, which meant it's been a major conduit 35 36 for cocaine coming in from Mexico through 37 California, obviously [indiscernible] Pacific 38 Rim, and so you're dealing with now drugs from 39 China through the Port of Vancouver. B.C. has 40 its own very vibrant domestic drug production. Obviously, the marihuana industry that dates back 41 42 to the '80s. Vancouver is also a centre for 43 synthetic drug production as well. So you have 44 the consummates of all these factors. You've got 45 the Hells Angels there. You've got the Chinese 46 criminal groups. You have the largest addict 47 population per capita in the country. You know,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39 40

41

42 43

44

45

46 47

all these factors sort of come together to suggest that, you know, drugs would be the most lucrative type of criminal activity in B.C. But, again, I say that, you know, without really, you know, being unable to do any kind of regular assessment of the proceeds of crime. certainly tobacco smuggling as well -- you know -- but, you know, again, B.C. is unique as well now because of its relationship with China, trading relationship as well. The Port of Vancouver is, you know, one of the most significant conduits for not just drugs, but counterfeit goods, counterfeit cigarettes as well, so -- so I would say that, you know, B.C. is relatively unique in Canada in that aspect of a geopolitical location and ties to California and to China, and as well as just sort of homegrown drug industries, that certainly I would venture that, you know, drug trafficking is probably the most significant predicate offence

Q Okay. I'll move, please, to page 23. You have a heading about the "International Sources of the Proceeds of Crime in Canada". And could you tell us a little bit about international placement, International Sources of the Proceeds of Crime in Canada"?

and money laundering is concerned.

as far as generating cash and proceeds of crime

Well, you know, Canada has long been accused of Α being a very attractive destination for proceeds of crime generally than elsewhere, and that's particularly with respect historically to what we call the Cosa Nostra in the United States. mafia families, the New York mafia families, Buffalo mafia families had significant sales throughout Ontario and Quebec. The Rizzuto family used to be a wing of the Bonanno family till they became their own family. Ontario was under the thumb of the Stefano Magaddino in Buffalo for years. And so much of the money laundering being done in Canada was tied to the proceeds of crime coming from the U.S., or the American mafia families would set up criminal operations in Canada and produce revenue here, launder it here, and send it back to the U.S. So, historically, Canada's relationship with the mafia families in the U.S. made it particularly

attractive to money laundering.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47

And as we move through the years, the intervening years as well, what you've seen is Canada has also seen -- our financial system is seen as quite sophisticated, quite stable. have a stable protocol -- you know, a political economic system, so that is attractive to proceeds of crime. Our banks are -- have always been seen as very attractive vehicles for international money laundering. The fact that our -- we have a centralized banking system where, you know, six banks basically dominate the industry, is very attractive. The fact that they have international correspondent banks and the fact that Canadian banks had a very strong presence in the Caribbean where a number of very strong secrecy laws were enacted, that contributes to their attractiveness.

And Canada has also become a transit country for drugs as well, so we're now not just a destination country for cocaine, we're also now a transit country, especially since Mexican drug cartels have sort of taken over from the Colombian drug cartels. So when you are transiting cocaine through Canada, you're also transiting the cash through Canada as well. And people are probably surprised to know the sort of infiltration that some of the Mexican drug cartels have made into Canada, not only for selling cocaine, but also for laundering money here as well. So there's a number of reasons, again, that Canada has been a particularly attractive destination for proceeds of crime internationally.

- Q At page 24 of the report, at the very bottom of that page, you have "Case Study", and this is the first of many case studies that you have included in your literature review. By no means will I be covering all or even most of them, but maybe if you can just help us understand, without getting into the details of this one necessarily, what are -- what are these case studies, how have you used them in the course of preparing the literature review?
- A Well, the case studies are generally there to provide some illustrations of, you know, the descriptive and, you know, conceptual elements as

 well, so I -- it's a technique I've used in different kinds of researching reports I've written for the government, and so throughout are a number of cases. Whether these are cases provided to me by police, cases I've documented in my research, cases from the news media -- FINTRAC has been a very good source of cases. So the cases come from a number of different sources. But, again, they're there to try to be illustrative of some of the points and concepts that are being made throughout the reports, and -- but this case study is a fairly recent one and it's fairly --

Q Yeah.

- -- you know, I mean, it's self-explanatory. But it shows, again, how Canada was being used by some of the eastern European criminal groups and how these criminal groups used various different ways to get their money into Canada, through banks and the shell companies and so on and so forth.
- Q Yeah, so let me just pick up on the comment you made about a number of the case studies on your own research. And as I look through them, I think a whole bunch of them trace their lineage to the 2004 review of RCMP police files that you did. Is that a fair comment?
- Α That's a fair comment, yes. Again, because the literature review was based on public sources, I was not able to use any cases that I may be aware of that are ongoing. I couldn't obviously go to the RCMP and ask them to provide me with cases, so -- so there's a limited -- there's a limited number of sources that provide sufficient detail on money laundering cases, and -- but I was able, other than my studies, to rely -- again, like I said, FINTRAC had some positive reports that have a lot of details and cases which are relied on. The news media, as well. And some of these cases may be seen as being dated, as well. My study came out in 2004. Most of the cases were from '96 to about 2002. Having wrote a book on, you know, the history of organized crime in Canada, that old saying, "The more things change, the more they stay the same, " is applicable to money laundering as well. A lot of the techniques that were used, you know, in the '80s, '90s and early

2000s are still being used today. If it worked before, it still works in many cases, so -- so some of the cases may seem dated, but at the same time, there were some very illustrative cases in the '70s and '80s that are as applicable today.

- Q And in terms of the RCMP file review that you did leading to the book in 2004, I mean, it seems to me the fact that you're citing a number of those as examples now suggests that you think those are really valuable ways to have insights on the real world, things that are happening, the real world techniques and such?
- Α Yeah, I -- exactly. The period in which the case took place is less important than the ability of the case to exemplify a particular laundering technique or a point that was being made, and what I really tried to do, of the cases, from my 2004 study, was to identify those that were not only representative of money laundering today or a particular point I was making, but that they were British Columbia And not every -- I couldn't find a B.C. cases. case or Vancouver case for every point I was trying to make, but that was -- particular emphasis was trying to use a case that took place in Vancouver or B.C.
- At page 26 of the literature review, you discuss the movement of funds and what's described here as capital flight and other sources of illicit funds coming into Canada and into British Columbia, in particular, from the People's Republic of China. And maybe as a bit of a preface to that, on page 26, just above, you have -- you quote Peter German in his second report in 2019. Just to situate this, I'll read out what you've quoted Dr. German as saying in the 2019 report:

"Large amounts of unsourced foreign money flow through Vancouver daily. Most of it is presumably legitimate in origin. Much of it may not be. Due to Vancouver's orientation to the burgeoning markets of Asia, China figures prominently in this flow of money. But money also flows north from Mexico and Latin America, and west from Europe and the Middle East. Allied to much of the dirty

1

money and that which seeks to avoid currency controls are OC groups."

3 4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Α

So, with that as the predicate, do you want to describe this header, the -- what you've described here as capital flight -- in particular from the PRC, People's Republic of China? Well, this is something that is fairly new in -in the context of money laundering. I became fairly tuned to this idea of calculating capital flight when I was in the process of writing this book on looking at different types of crimes and unethical behaviour by the big banks, and realizing how many large corporate groups and professionals out there that facilitate capital flight. You just have to read the Panama papers to look at how huge tax evasion and capital flight is throughout the world today. Certainly the greatest source of capital flight today would -- again, based on the literature, would be And, again, this is unique, because in China. many cases the -- the source of the funds is legitimate. These are individuals that produce -- you know, perhaps a legitimate businessperson in China -- that want to get that money out of the country. And of course, as documented in literature, there's a limit to how much money you can transfer out of China.

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

So the source of the funds is legitimate, but there is an illegal transaction occurring in that the money is being speared out of China illegally. It's not adhering to the currency limits that the Chinese government has stipulated, so -- so to me this was an important issue, for a number of reasons, primarily because, based on my understanding of the literature, that capital flight was part of this whole Vancouver model in that the -- the professional money launderers in this case, that were based out of Richmond, were basically operating what's called informal value transfer systems, getting cash -- not physically the cash, but the value that an individual -- the Chinese national wants to transfer to Canada. And then that money was provided to him or her through drug proceeds, so --

45 46 47

So the capital flight, in and of itself, is

a problem in B.C. There's also the argument made that it's invested into real estate as well, which led to inflated prices. But it was all tied up into the so-called Vancouver model in that -- for a number of reasons, but one of which was that the individuals that were laundering the drug proceeds were also facilitating the capital flight, these informal money service businesses or professional money launderers, or whatever you want to call them.

It's important, as well, because B.C., Vancouver in particular, is obviously the central destination for much of the capital flight. I would say Australia, United States and B.C. It's the sheer volume of cash that's apparently leaving China illicitly, billions, if not trillions of dollars over a particular period of time.

So, capital flight is significant from China for B.C. and money laundering for a whole host of reasons, but not least of which is that it's inextricably part of the so-called Vancouver model and contributed to investments in the real estate market and was being intermingled with drug proceeds of crime and -- and also exemplifies the use of informal value transfer systems, which is one of these underground money laundering systems that has been around for centuries as a transfer system, a value transfer system that is being increasingly used for laundering the proceeds of crime, as well.

- And can you comment about the -- is there a challenge in separating out the money laundering component of that? In other words, to the extent that there's money moving from China or other countries to Canada, how does one separate out what portion or which money within the mix of all of the money ties to criminality as opposed to families relocating or wealth being moved across borders, for whatever reasons?
- A Yeah, that's a good -- it's a good point, and I probably don't have a very good answer for that. The one thing that I did fail to mention as well is that certainly some of the cash in China, the source is criminal in that it's government corruption, financial crimes, as well. So it's not just legitimate funds that are being

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 illicitly speared out of the country, there's also illegal funds as well.

Again, I think as far as money laundering is concerned, you know, in Canada, I'm not sure if these funds would constitute the proceeds of crime, because if it's a legitimate source in China and if it's being transferred out illegally, that's considered a proceeds of crime, therefore it's being laundered. But, again, I think this is where we need to get away from this sort of definition of whether something constitutes money laundering or not. I mean, the question is the extent to which, you know, (a) the capital flight from China is contributing to further crime in B.C., such as drug trafficking, is it contributing to the use of these informal value transfer systems and [indiscernible] the systems, which also are used for drug trafficking, transferring drug cash.

So, in and of itself, capital flight can be seen as a problem in B.C. as it's invested in the legitimate economy and inflating housing prices. It's a problem certainly if the capital or the cash being transferred is, from a predicate standpoint, corruption or drug trafficking. again, it's particularly pertinent, I think, because it's parcel and parcel of the whole Vancouver model and it's a significant part of the informal value transfer system, which really emerged as a key part of laundering the proceeds of crime. And not just laundering the proceeds of crime, but getting the proceeds back into financing more drug purchases, illegal drug purchases. So I'm probably not articulating that particularly well. But, again, capital flight is, from what I see of the literature, a critical part of the Vancouver model that has made it so significant and unique in many cases.

And I guess, as I think about that whole set of things that you're describing, it seems to me very difficult for all of the separation between — it's one thing to say here's someone convicted of a corruption or an offence in China or there's some other proof on the scales to tie him to criminality, and then say that's — there's an easy example of proceeds of crime, and if that's then moving across borders into Canada and into

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

the real estate or some other market, that seems an easier proposition, but is it a murkier proposition to call that money laundering or the proceeds of crime, or it's simply money moving here? Perhaps contrary to local restrictions over currency control, or currency movement, but not -- it's a question of proof not tied to criminal activity?

A That's a very good point, and for me, as far as British Columbia is concerned, it's less about semantics of whether it constitutes money laundering and more about that it bolstered and contributed to money laundering of the drug proceeds, for example. And it was money bolstered by professional money launderers.

So, capital flight, again, may not necessarily be laundered, by strict definition of the term, if there was no criminal predicate offence, but the capital flight fed into a broader system that not only supposedly increased inflation in the housing market, but more importantly, became an integral part of the whole money laundering system that has become known as the Vancouver model.

And so it really -- the whole point after a while was that drug money and capital flight were called comingles, and transferred using the informal value transfer systems and laundered using casinos and real estate. So -- so, in and of itself, you know, you can argue that the capital flight is being laundered, or not being laundered, based on semantics of a sort. But from my understanding of the literature is that it became an integral part of a broader system that supported money laundering, that supported a professional money laundering system, and also bolstered drug trafficking.

- Q In terms of literature that you rely on to discuss some of this -- I'm looking at pages 27 and 28, Peter German's second report in particular -- one of the authors is Naheem, and I think you've quoted her or his paper at some level in discussing this; is that fair?
- A To some extent. It's brief.
- Q Yeah.
- A And, but again, there are, again, not a lot of scholarly literature on, you know, these specific

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

issues of capital flight into B.C. and how they feed into the money laundering system. You know, again, what I was trying to do is identify some rigorous peer-reviewed articles that try to, you know, corroborate or contradict the sort of popular narrative that came out of the literature in Canada, including news media and Peter German's report. And certainly there is no shortage of reports and studies that looked at illicit money flows from China, including those that come from financial crimes, and so that was the intent of including articles from Naheem, and from Cheng, as well --Mm-hmm. Α -- that you can look at and acknowledge, you know, the very large scope of financial crimes in China, and obviously a great deal of government

China, and obviously a great deal of government corruption in China, as well, and that money often is laundered internationally.

Q I'll move ahead, please, to page 29, under the

Q I'll move ahead, please, to page 29, under the heading of "Criminal Organizations Posing a High Money Laundering Threat to B.C." You write under that heading:

Widespread and sophisticated money laundering is often associated with transnational organized crime.

You've mentioned B.C. being the:

... home to two of the country's most significant... threats: English-Canadian onepercenter motorcycle gangs and Chinese organized crime.

You write that:

Mexican drug cartels have also recently emerged as a significant drug trafficking and ML threat in B.C.

And you've touched on some of this already, so I think the next few pages discussing Chinese organized crime, is there anything specific you'd like to add to your comments you've already made on that?

A You know, again, probably the two most

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41 42

43

44

45

46

47

significant organized crime threats in B.C. would be the one-percenter motorcycle club, the Hells Angels in particular, and also, you know, Chinese organized crime, to use a very vague sort of I mean, the Hells Angels are a very specific organization. And you refer to Chinese organized crime, you're really referring to a very sort of a loose network of a lot of different smaller groups, professionals, triads. The term "big circle boys" was used in some of the articles, the media articles. The term is sort of antiquated now. "Big circle boys" refers to, again, some ex-Red Army guards that came over that were released from [indiscernible], you know, cultural re-education camp in Hong Kong. They came to Vancouver and Toronto, and they sort of really personified the kind of network approach to organized crime that a lot of different groups -- we always think of organized crime as this hierarchy of organizations, but in fact, it's more of a networked kind of a honeycomb cell structure, and the -- in the Big Circle Boys, these ex-military men really expanded that in Canada. They moved away from a tightknit organizational, you know, hierarchical loop to a very loose network of cells and individuals that may be, you know, professional criminals, they could be professional businesspeople, they could launder a triad and use the resources of a triad. You know, and they would have cells everywhere and they would come together for one time and then to stand and then come together for another, and they'd use different people in different concepts.

So it's really what is referred to as the networked approach. And my point there is that they tend to fly under the radar, you know, drive Harley-Davidson motorcycles and there's a big, you know, sort of patch on their back. But I always argue that this loose network probably poses a greater threat than the Hells Angels, because it's a much more sophisticated operational structure, the networked approach. And, again, you saw that very much in, you know, the recent years of money laundering. It was, you know, these core professional money launderers that had a network of criminal

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the Commission

alliances. And, again, not just within the Chinese community. I certainly, you know, want to get away from any kind of insinuation that crime is based on, you know, race or racialization, and the Chinese -- the professional money launderers worked with anyone that was willing to provide cash.

A little off topic here. This section is not the strongest section in the report, simply because it doesn't have a sufficient amount of information, in my opinion, on sort of a history or overview of money laundering done by these different groups. So there's an inference here that Chinese organized crime, the Hells Angels, now some of the Mexican cartels, are constituting some of the biggest drug trafficking organized crime threats to B.C., and by extension, they would also pose a significant money laundering threat, as well. That's an inference in there you may not want to draw, but this is a section that's indicative of relying exclusively on public sources --

- Q Mm-hmm.
- A -- not always getting a sufficient amount of information to be able to justify the argument. But, you know, again -- no, I'll leave it at that.
- Q Okay, and so on -- and on the Mexican drug cartels, at page 35 you quote then RCMP Superintendent Cal Chrustie. I think, in turn, he's being quoted in a Vancouver Sun report in 2016 to the effect -- and just to give you the reference here, I'm on page 35, second paragraph. And the quote attributed to him by the newspaper:

"We know that transnational organized crime networks in Canada have criminal business relationships with Mexican cartels..."

Is that -- you go on to then quote from a book called *Hunting El Chapo* in which a former U.S. drug enforcement administration agent talks about the Sinaloa cartel and the volume of business that seemed rather staggering is described in that book, engaging Canada.

A Right, and certainly that would be one of the more emergent threats to B.C. and -- and has in

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

it the mergence of Mexican drug cartels. I mean, and this has long been known that, you know, cocaine fetches a much higher price in Canada than it does in the U.S. Even though we're a much smaller country, the profit potential is actually a lot greater in Canada for the Mexican cartels. So they actually saw Canada -- the Sinaloa cartel, which was headed by El Chapo for years, really saw Canada as a great marketplace to traffic cocaine.

And, again, B.C. is particularly vulnerable because with the Colombian cartels, they would use planes or motherships to transport the cocaine to Canada. With Mexico now, now that Mexico is the major conduit for cocaine in North America, it's mostly through land transport. it'll come through the United States, and then either into British Columbia or to the east coast, to Quebec, something that has a direct -you know, an easy highway transport link. B.C. has been particularly vulnerable to cocaine coming in from Mexico. And the argument, as well, is that, again, the amount of cash produced by cocaine sales in Vancouver and Lower Mainland and B.C. and Canada generally is probably a lot greater than lot of people anticipated. And a lot of it doesn't necessarily get laundered in Canada. Again, their goal is to get the cash out as quickly as possible back to the United States and back to Mexico or to Colombia.

But certainly if you look back historically, the Colombian cartel [indiscernible] had cell managers and cells in Canada that were involved in money laundering, and -- but with the Sinaloa cartel and Mexican drug cartels, it seems less about laundering the money in Canada than basically getting some quick sales and bundling up that cash and getting it back to Mexico as quickly as possible. So I don't have a lot of information on the extent to which the Mexican drug cartels are laundering money in Canada.

And the same with the Hells Angels. You know, the best I can come up with was we know that a lot of their members and associates invest in businesses. But that doesn't necessarily mean they're investing proceeds of crime. Even with the Chinese criminal groups -- the case I relied

 Stephen Schneider (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the Commission

on I think was a French case so -- so this section, again, the point was to try to identify three of the most high-level high-intensity threats to B.C. and make an inference that, you know, these -- because of the amount of drug trafficking they do in the province, they're also laundering the money there, which may not necessarily be the case.

Q Thank you. I'm going to move, please, to page 36. The heading is -- it's in section 6 -- "The Nature and Characteristics of Money Laundering". You say:

This section summarizes the literature that is concerned with describing and analyzing the characteristics of ML generally and Canada and B.C. specifically.

And just by way of a bit of a preview of the parts that follow, or description, you say the section is divided first, common ML methods and techniques, broken down where you can, by the five phases of the ML process, economic sectors that are being used, the professionals being used, and then discussing ML in the informal or underground economy. And so why don't we work our way through that? I'm just checking, we've got around 45 minutes remaining, and unless I have someone unmuting to say otherwise, I'd suggest we carry on till 1:30. Does that sound okay with you, Professor Schneider?

- A That's fine, Brock, yeah.
- Q Great, okay. And so let's have a look, please, over to page 37. And as an example of one of the case studies from your 2004 report based on the RCMP file review, the heading there -- maybe you -- maybe without me trying to fill the blanks, why don't you tell us a bit about what the discussion is and then what that particular case study speaks about?
- A Well, maybe, Brock, what I'll do is just give a really broad overview of this section --
- Q That sounds fine.
- A -- because really the crux of the report -- and we're not going to -- perhaps we can just talk about the common money laundering methods or techniques today and the rest later. So, I've

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38 39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the Commission

> broken it down into four sections that try to highlight some of the dominant characteristics of money laundering. So, certainly the first dominant characteristics are the type of methods and techniques used. So, regardless of the sector, there's some techniques that are specific to a sector. Obviously, you know, money laundering through a casino is going to be fairly But at the same time, there's methods unique. and techniques that are explicitly used to launder money that are almost universal to, regardless of what sector use, whether that's used with nominees, with front accounts, with smurfs and structuring. So, to understand money laundering, one needs to understand the different kind of methods and techniques that are commonly used, and what I've done is try to break those down by the different phases, you know, what kind of techniques are used in the placement phase, what kind of techniques are used in layering, and so on and so forth.

> So, in the -- in the very first section, I try to give an overview of some very common universal methods and techniques, and then when I get into the subsequent section, which is looking at different economic sectors, then I talk about some of the techniques that are specific to those sectors.

> So, once I talk about the money laundering techniques and -- methods and techniques, then I look at how the proceeds of crime are laundered through different economic sectors, trying to focus on those that we perceive to be the dominant destinations for the proceeds of crime, whether it's banking or real estate, casinos, the motor vehicle industry, insurance. So there I discuss, you know, why are these sectors particularly vulnerable, you know, which ones are predominantly used, what kind of particular products and transactions are used in these sectors, what kind of laundering techniques and methods are used. So in that section it's really trying to identify which sectors are the most vulnerable, why are they vulnerable, what are the money laundering methods that are used in those sectors, and as importantly, what are the legitimate transactions and assets and products

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

that are used to launder money in those sectors.

The next section looks at different
professionals. Obviously, there's been a lot of
controversy surrounding the involvement of
lawyers, wittingly and unwittingly in the launder
of money, and also whether or not they should be
included in the money laundering regulations.
But certainly in my research, and a lot of the
research conducted in money laundering, is that
professionals, like lawyers, are certainly seen
as a great asset in laundering money to the
legitimate economy, wittingly or unwittingly.

And then the final section is, again, looking at money laundering in the informal or underground of criminal economy. And, again, you can say that, you know, maybe 80 percent of the proceeds of crime is laundered through the legitimate economy simply because you want to legitimize proceeds of crime and simply legitimate economy, commercial financial sectors have the tools and the products and the expertise in a transaction that are conducive to money But we've seen in recent years, you laundering. know, the growth of specific types of criminal and underground methods that are either explicitly used to launder money, like corruption and internal conspiracies, or are centuries old systems, like these informal value transfer systems, that are very conducive to money laundering. So, informal value transfer systems, by its very nature, operate in the informal economy and have become very attractive to money launderers, and again, is a so-called critical component of the so-called Vancouver model.

But if you like, I can -- if we have enough time today -- is talk a bit about some of the common money laundering methods and techniques and perhaps get into the other latter three sectors, sections.

- Q Yeah, I think -- I think let's carry on in that vein. And so I take it that might take us into the discussion of placement that starts on page 37. But whether you want to track the report or simply speak on the subject the way you've outlined, I'm fine with either.
- A Sure. I mean, again, money laundering methods and techniques again refer to specific types of

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

transactions or strategies or operations that are explicitly about laundering money. So, and this — the contrast is to, you know, legitimate transactions like — like, you know, making a cash deposit into a bank account or buying a property or, you know, transferring account or doing a wire transfer, these are all legitimate transactions that are abused for money laundering. In contrast to that, there are specific types of methods and techniques that are used explicitly to launder money.

So, "method" is basically a broad type of strategy to launder money, and then "technique" is a term used sort of a different way that you can launder money within that broad umbrella of that method. If that makes any sense.

Q Okay, mm-hmm.

You know, again, when I'm talking about specific money laundering methods, I have cash deposits there. Now, that obviously is not an explicit money laundering method. I include that there in the placement simply because it's the most predominant way to get the proceeds of crime into the legitimate economy, and so I wanted to be sort of up front.

So, depositing cash proceeds of crime into a bank account in particular, but also, you know, setting up an account at a casino or a money server business, or a brokerage account, or any kind of quasi financial institution. But certainly in Canada, the vast majority of this gravitates towards the big six banks. The money launderers tend to gravitate towards the big banks, as well. And you want to get your cash into the system, then -- then account deposits, so setting up a savings or a chequing account or a commercial account and depositing the cash is the -- really the most predominant sort of placement method out there.

Structuring and smurfing is very common. I'm not going to go into detail on all these, but again, structuring --

But what -- but those are two that you have mentioned before, and I think most of us who have done some reading about this now know about smurfing and structuring, but why don't you please define what they are so we're clear about

it?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30 31

32 33

34 35

36 37

38

39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

Α Structuring is simply, again, the act of dividing or parcelling a large financial transaction into a smaller transaction, to avoid suspicion, and also to avoid reporting requirements. So, in Canada, if you're a reporting entity to FINTRAC, you have to report any cash transaction over \$10,000, so structuring is basically trying to structure your transactions so they come under that threshold. And, again, so -- and smurfing is simply where you involve a lot of different people doing those -- those small cash deposits or small cash transactions. So smurfing and structuring go hand in hand. You don't necessarily need smurfing. You, as the individual, can make, you know, 10 deposits of \$9,500. But when you have a lot of cash in a big criminal organization, you tend to need a number of people to be able to do the structure or structure a transaction, so -so the term that came up years ago was "smurfing". If you're an individual that's hired or used to structure deposits or structure transactions, they refer to that as a smurf or smurfing. But that's -- you know, it's very common now since Canada introduced legislation that requires financial entities and others to report cash transactions. So, presumably, again, I can't -- I can only say this -- and it's only not based on evidence that, you know, generally we see structuring increase whenever there's legislation or laws introduced that have a cash reporting threshold.

Right below that is "Cash Smuggling".

Again, which is, again, a very predominant technique, and we see this a lot, not just with drug money, but again, specific to B.C., a lot of the capital flight -- not a lot, but certainly a proportion of the capital flight is being smuggled out of China in cash, and that's smuggled into Canada. So I think I discuss later on in the report some findings from the Canada Border Service Agency that document the amount of cash that's coming through the Vancouver Airport, most of it from China.

But again, as I mentioned earlier, notwithstanding the very sophisticated means we

 have to move proceeds of crime around internationally, cash smuggling is still a predominant technique used, primarily because it leaves really no paper trail, if you're successful. And the same routes you smuggle drugs into the country, you use to smuggle the cash out, if you're a drug trafficking organization. So, cash smuggling is still a significant issue to move money around, whether you want to call that money laundering or not, but it's -- you know, it's integral that you get the cash from your destination country where the drugs are sold back to the source country where the drugs are being purchased. And cash smuggling is, again, something that's still used predominantly. And the whole capital flight from China has an extra wrinkle for B.C., because of the large amounts of cash supposedly coming into Canada being smuggled out of China into B.C. through the Vancouver Airport and other -- other entry points in the Lower Mainland.

So that's some of the techniques used with placement. Cash deposits, structuring and smurfing, cash smuggling. And cash smuggling can also be used for laundering money so you can move cash around different countries. So, as far as layering, integration and justification is concerned, again, these techniques, I've lumped together because there's significant overlap between these three sorts of techniques used. You know, when you conduct a number of transactions, or layering, you're also integrating them into the economy. At the same time, you're trying to justify the legitimacy of the proceeds of crime.

So, some common ways to layer, integrate, most of these have to do with layering. The first is what's called refining, and that's simply exchanging cash, small denominations of cash into larger denominations. But that's really your next step after the cash placement.

If you're -- if you want to be able to hang on to currency, the cash currency itself, and not have it enter the system, what you do is you want to be able to convert small denominations, 20s and 50s, into larger denominations, which at some point where it's 500,000 dollar bills -- and now

those have been discontinued -- basically they set on \$100 bills. And, again, this is germane to the Vancouver model to B.C., because we saw, based on the literature, what the literature says, the news media in particular, that much of the drug money being laundered through casinos and being lent out to private mortgages were small denominations, \$20 bills. And so there's certain instances where, as part of this laundering operation, they were converting \$20 bills into \$100 bills, through banks, through money service businesses, and even through casinos, according to some news media reports.

So, refining is important because you want to take a large, hefty, voluminous, very heavy stack of \$20 bills and you want to convert that into a larger denomination, primarily because it's less -- it's easier to transport and generally less conspicuous. And there's a general affinity for drug dealers to be able to purchase drugs and \$100 bills and not \$20 bills. I mean, it's just a matter of moving that money around. If you've ever seen a million dollars in \$20 bills, it's quite voluminous.

Nominees, beneficial ownership, if you want to go to page 40, again, this is nominees is something that is, you know, almost universal to any sector. It's a very typical layering technique to separate the criminal offender and the source of funds from the laundered asset and it's basically putting the asset into someone else's name, having someone conduct transactions on your behalf. But it's very commonly used in the purchase of real estate, so putting -- if you purchase real estate over the process of time, putting that real estate or real property in the name of a nominee, often a family member or a But this is something that's very common friend. through all laundering operations. It was very predominant in the cases I looked at in my study, and it's certainly -- again, like I said, it's something that is common throughout different sectors as well.

And so this is -- and it's easy to do. It's relatively easy to put an asset in the name of your wife or your mother or brother-in-law. So it's an easy fairly relatively unsophisticated

 technique, but it works because, again, in a country like Canada where the onus or proof is on the Crown to prove that, you know, a particular asset is the proceeds of crime. If you have it in the name of your mother or father, it's often difficult to prove that the asset belonged to the criminal offender. So it's very common because it works. It works as far as layering is concerned and it's also fairly easy to use. It's a fairly simple process.

- Q Can I just interrupt to ask, when you talk about the onus of proof, does that contrast as one example with what we've referred to something called the unexplained wealth order in the UK and a few other jurisdictions, or making of use of it effectively reverses the burden of proof if they're suspicious of holdings or assets, that the person may be required to prove that they're not criminal in their origin?
- A Right. Yes, in certain countries they will have that in place through several procedures. But, again, in a criminal court where most of the proceeds of crime is forfeited, the criminal offender or their nominee does not have to prove necessarily the source of their funds is legitimate, you know. Regardless of the ways to get around -- the legal ways to get around and try to confiscate property from a nominee, it's a very common technique used and it's something that is, again, as I mentioned, very universal to a lot of different sectors.

I'll just touch on a couple more of these layering techniques. A loan-back is basically an effective technique where it uses a number -- a method that uses a number of techniques, as well. So loan-back is basically you provide the proceeds of crime to a nominee or to a shell company and then they repatriate the money back to you through a loan or basically a fake loan. So it can be, you know, providing the proceeds of crime to your brother-in-law who lends -- you know, who says he's lent you the money back, and you claim that as a loan, so you now have a legitimate source -- a seemingly legitimate source of revenue. You said to your brother-in-law, "I'll loan that to you."

It's also very typical amongst shell

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2728

29

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

companies, so you set up a labyrinth of shell companies, and all these shell companies loan money to one another, and that helps [indiscernible] the paper trail in terms of It also helps get money back layering. internationally. It helps transfer money internationally, so -- so let's say you set up a shell company in a tax haven country. You wire -- the proceeds of crime are somehow deposited in a bank account, and then that shell company lends money back to another shell company in Canada, which the criminal offender owns. And if it's a financial tax haven country, it's very difficult to find out the source of the funds. So, loanback is, again, another technique that can be used between individuals or between companies, but it's, again, a technique or a method that's used for both layering and also repatriating the proceeds of crime back, and also justification, because you can now claim it's a legitimate source that someone is lending money.

Again, offshore financial haven countries have always been an issue with respect to capital flight or money laundering, and they are still quite predominant in a lot of, you know, sophisticated international money laundering operations. Going through some of the more sophisticated stock market frauds and mass marketing frauds that FINTRAC has documented, they've looked at how financial haven countries are really abused, used and abused for money laundering. And, again, they're attractive, obviously, for their secrecy laws and confidentiality, but also because once you're able to start transferring money internationally, then that makes it even more difficult for law enforcement to follow that money, as well. mean, I just scratched the surface of, you know, financial havens.

That's good, this is very useful, so carry on.

A Okay. So down -- if you want to go down to page 43, this is "Justification,

Extraction/Repatriation." Again, the methods that I include in here tend to satisfy all three of these phases or functions, or -- or the two phases or functions. Extraction/repatriation is one phase.

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47

So, claiming the proceeds as legitimate revenue or a loan. I'll talk about legitimate revenue. Again, a very common money laundering method, and again, very common to set up a shell company, or a real company, one that's cashbased, and intermingle the proceeds of crime with the legitimate revenue and then basically deposit that in a bank account. And, again, you would like a company that produces cash in its normal line of business. In some cases, you know, the offenders will set up a shell company that does not business whatsoever, and the cash -- the proceeds of crime -- the cash-proceeds of crime will simply be deposited in a bank account under the quise of that shell company. And it's very common -- it's a very common method to use and it really is -- it can be both in the placement stage, if it's cash proceeds of crime, and it also satisfies the repatriation in that once you -- and justification, as well, because once you have deposited the cash proceeds of crime as a legitimate revenue, then you can now claim a legitimate source, and once the cash is in a bank account, then you have easy access to the cash. So, claiming the proceeds of crime as legitimate revenue is a fairly common technique, common method that satisfies a number of goals and objectives and the phases.

Under-invoicing, again, this is a method that can be used with informal value transfer systems, trade-based money laundering. It can be used with big ticket items, and basically the premises under-invoices, let's say you're going to buy a car, you've got \$100,000, you're going to buy a, you know, Lamborghini or Ferrari, but once you spend \$100,000, that is going to attract attention to the authorities because it shows you have a large amount of money. So, typically what you want to do is to be able to work with a conspiring seller, whether it's a car or a house, and have them agree to basically claiming the value of the property as much less than it really is. And so you pay let's say -- let's say a \$100,000 car, the car dealer sells it for \$50,000, so you've got the bill of sale is for \$50,000, that's recorded as \$50,000, so that underestimates the revenue or the amount of cash

or revenue that this individual has. 1 And at the 2 same time, you pay the other \$50,000 under the 3 table, so the seller basically receives all the 4 cash, the -- sorry -- the vendor receives all the 5 cash owing, while the person selling the car --6 or, sorry, buying the car -- sorry, getting away 7 here. In Nova Scotia, it's almost -- well, after 8 five o'clock. The person who sells the car or 9 the house now can claim that they only have 10 \$50,000 and not the \$100,000. 11

Q Mm-hmm.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

- Α And this can be used with cars, with property, and it's also used as far as what's called tradebased money laundering as well, an informal value transfer system, which we perhaps talk about when we come to that section, as well.
- Q Yeah, we can --
- But under-invoice under-invoicing is typically a method that is conducive to something as small as selling a car, buying a car to launder money, to something very sophisticated, which is international commercial trade-based money laundering.
- Q Right, and then that sort of example of underinvoicing, and maybe all of these cases, it's not that there's -- it's not describing a fictional In your example, there's a car that transaction. the person drove off at the end of the thing. But the sham part of it is the paperwork. paperwork records a much lower value, to then allow the person to engage in money laundering through that? There's other incidental benefits such as the taxation, other implications, I take it, that are maybe side benefits?
- I mean, the last -- if you're a drug Α Right. dealer, the last thing you want to be doing is -you know, the less money you spend, the less -suspicion is going to be voluminous. Suspicion is going to be [indiscernible] the less attraction you're going to have to yourself. at the same time, you can turn around and sell that property for its real value and then claim that as legitimate revenue. So it works on both So if you have a house, again, you -that's worth 2 million, you pay a million for it, you pay another million under the table, you turn around and sell it for 2 million on the

legitimate market, you now have \$2 million in legitimate revenue. So it works both to reduce the amount of money you're spending, but you don't draw attention to yourself at the same time. You're now able to generate a seemingly legitimate source of revenue by selling it for its real value.

- Mm-hmm. So I think that takes us up to the transition into talking about particular sectors of the economy that are used in money laundering.
- A Right. I think maybe this is something you want to leave for another day. This is really a pretty significant part of the report, and I have about 10 after 5:00, so 10 after 1:00, your time.
- Q Yes. But suffice to say, again, the argument is, is Α that it's the legitimate economic sectors, the legitimate commercial and financial sectors that are most attractive to money laundering as opposed to the informal underground economy. a number of reasons. Simply, you know, you want to legitimize your money, so you -- you know, that's the way to do that is through legitimate economy. The legitimate economy, as well, has a whole range of sectors and products and assets and transactions and professionals that can facilitate this. And so traditionally we think of money laundering as occurring through legitimate economy as opposed to the informal economy. And, again, we see movement, more and more use of informal economy to launder month, but you're never fully going to be able to move away from the legitimate economy to launder the money, simply because of just the sheer volume of opportunities you have for money laundering
- Q Mm-hmm.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 A This section, again, is focused by different economic sectors, from banks to casinos to I think real estate and -- so we can get into each sector in a little more detail subsequently.

within the commercial and financial sectors.

Q So maybe just to give us the overview about what that section does look like, and I'm just going to do that by actually going back to your table of contents. So under the economic sectors, you talk about -- under separate headings effectively. I'll just run through these fairly

78
Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the Commission

quickly. Deposit institutions, real estate, casinos, motor vehicles, money service businesses, securities, capital markets, criminally influenced companies, previous metals and gems, the internet, other virtual medias and cryptocurrencies. And then not following directly under the sectors discussion, you have the topic headers of professionals and occupations used for ML, and then the separate section of "Criminal Methods and Techniques". Yeah, so what I tried to include there are the

sectors that appear to be the most vulnerable to money laundering and the most frequently used. Whether it's based on just studied I've done or other studies or reports by law enforcement or government. I've also tried to, this section, cater it to B.C. as well. Typically, I -- you know, casinos in Canada have never been, far as my research is concerned and these cases are concerned, a predominant way to launder money. Quite frankly, because you're limited in how you can launder through casinos, and it's a relatively easy thing to do is to stop money laundering in casinos, if you're really focused on that. But obviously, for B.C. -- obviously, for British Columbia, according to literature, casinos are a major laundering vehicle.

Motor vehicles, as well. Peter German talks about that a lot. But motor vehicles have always been a destination for proceeds of crime. Securities market, as well. Criminally-influenced companies where bad guys incorporate or take over a company. Precious metals and gems are very much a very popular destination of proceeds of crime. And that includes the internet and other virtual media, cryptocurrency. It's not so much that they're that predominant now, but certainly they represent sort of an emerging threat for money laundering.

Q And so just to at least -- as we sort of look over and look ahead to the discussion that we'll follow in getting into the specifics of these sectors, but maybe I can just orient this by going to page 44. As you introduce the new section of the report you write:

Money laundering objectives and phases are

You go on to give two reasons for that.

more likely achieved when the legitimate economy is used (compared to the underground economy).

Do you

Α

want to comment a little bit about why the objectives of money laundering are more likely to be successful or achieved if the method is one engaging in using the legitimate economy? Well, I guess in a nutshell, just back to what I said before, and that's, you know, one of your most crucial goals in money laundering is to create the guise of legitimacy, and so what better way to do that than to the legitimate economy. If you are transferring funds through [indiscernible] or an informal value transfer system, you know right away that's going to raise red flags because although those are very -- you know, a lot of people use those legitimately, and they are underground. And so, again, it's really all about, you know, two predominant reasons why the legitimate economy used, is (a) because it contributes to the crucial money laundering

array of industries, assets, services, transactions professionals, you know, that are conducive to facilitate money laundering and satisfy [indiscernible].

legitimacy. And the second is simply the vast

objective of justification or creating a guise of

Q And before getting into the specifics of these sectors, you have some discussion, 44 and on to 45, in particular, the 2015 Finance Canada report that made an effort to identify and rank commercial and financial sectors exposed to both money laundering and terrorist financing, giving an assessment of 27 economic sectors and financial products in Canada. And then I see at the bottom of page 44, you list off the different criteria that were -- that the experts were asked to look at and inherent characteristics, the nature of the products and services, the nature of the business relationship, the geographic reach, and then the nature of the delivery

channels?

A Right, and that was -- what Finance Canada produced there was quite interesting as far as the very high vulnerability rating. Obviously,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39 40

41

42 43

44

45

46

47

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

domestic banks are in there.

- MR. MARTLAND: I wonder, again, because I think it's a useful way for us all to track along, I might ask Madam Registrar if we could please have, from Exhibit 6, the Literature Review, page 45, in the middle of the page, displayed. That might be quite useful for us all to have that table in front of us.
- Q Just as you answer this question, so if you can just --
- A So that would be page 45.
- Q 45 of your literature review, yeah, there it is.
- So what's interesting here, again, I said domestic banks, there's not a lot of dispute over that. Express trusts are, you know, trusts that the fact that they had such a very high vulnerability rating is interesting, as well, and then exposes -- and this is borne out by the research I've done as well is that, you know, these trusts that are set up, you know, are very vulnerable; again, especially if they're set up through the legal process, having a lawyer set up a legal trust account.

Money service businesses, both national and smaller ones, obviously they're in the business of taking cash. Whether you're a currency exchange company, whether you're a transfer, you know, an international funds transfer system, they're less regulated than banks. They offer -they provide -- they give you a cashier cheque. They're easier to corrupt. Certainly there's --I've come across a number of cases where bad guys have incorporated their own money service businesses and operated them legitimately while laundering money. And corporations, the reason that Finance Canada lists corporations is the beneficial ownership, and that corporations in Canada do not have to reveal beneficial owners. And so this is what -- it gets back to before when I talked about the importance of nominees and beneficial ownership. So they rank corporations, regardless of what kind of business they're in, as a high threat because of the beneficial ownership capacity of the corporation. Sorry. I think what they're alluding to here is when offenders actually set up their own corporations or companies and use that to hide

ownership, as well, hide criminal ownership. But if you look at the footnote, basically their underlying rationale for including this generic entity of corporations is that the vulnerability of corporations relate to the ability of these entities to use the concealed beneficial ownership, therefore facilitating the described conversion of illicit proceeds.

And then the others are, again, lower threats. You know, they're still high. You know, brick and mortar casinos, credit unions, caisses populaires, precious metals and stones. But certainly those ones that are considered the highest or the most vulnerable -- I mean, again, domestic banks are not a surprise, or express trusts. Certainly money services have always been very vulnerable. And, again, you know, corporations, especially if the corporate laws are used and abused, you know, by the bad guys to launder money specifically.

Q Good, okay.

- And the point you made before about there's a section in my literature review on criminally influenced companies, as well, which is a very common laundering method to expropriate a company or found a company and then use that to launder money.
- MR. MARTLAND: Okay. I don't think, Madam Registrar, we need to display the document more. Thank you.
- Q Professor Schneider, it's -- our hearings are set to go until 1:30, so another eight or nine minutes, if you are content for me to keep my foot on the gas for that last little bit of time, I wouldn't mind covering a few further things before we break for the day.
- A Sure. I can't guarantee I'll actually be articulating any better, but we'll try.
- Q Well, don't worry about that. So I'd like to start with page 47, and under the heading of "Deposit Institutions" you write there deposit institutions defined here to include banks, credit unions, caisses populaires are the most --sorry -- are used more often to launder the proceeds of crime than any other single sector of the economy, and you go on to talk about why deposit institutions are conducive to satisfying the aims of the money laundering process. Do you

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

want to give us that in a nutshell? Certainly. Well, again, as I mentioned before, Α the chartered banks, the big six, big five, big six charter banks in particular, are -- attract money launderers, just like they attract, you know, legitimate users. They dominate the financial service sector. They dominate the deposit institution sector. So the big banks in particular, in Canada, within the context of Canada, that's one of the first points you need to make. But obviously deposit institutions provide a vast array of financial services that are highly conducive to money laundering. They offer numerous products, numerous services, both domestic and international. I mean, really banks and deposit institutions are one-stop shopping for money laundering. You can -- you can launder your money exclusively through banks without ever to use any other sector.

That said, banks are also critical because they are kind of a centrifuge for numerous other laundering vehicles, as well. So they're used not only for the placement phase, they're used for layering, integration, justification, repatriation. So they're used for all those phases. They can satisfy -- you know, they provide services that can satisfy any number of those phases. They service, you know, a central core of a vast money laundering operation that always uses different sectors, techniques in different sectors. Banks are obviously valued because the ability to use electronic fund transfers, which are a very popular way to launder money, and also to receive proceeds of crime from, say, fraud victims. You know, and again, the electronic fund transfers can be sent internationally, and so that is always very attractive.

So, you know, deposit institutions are, you know, predominant in Canadian money laundering because they're predominant in banking in general, because they allow for the bad guys to convert the cash proceeds of the crime into an alternative aspect. They are really the central conduit through which cash is placed in the legitimate economy. There are numerous product service transactions you can use. Canadian banks

43

44

45

46 47 popular.

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

have correspondence banks and correspondence branches -- correspondence banks and branches 2 3 throughout the world. And, again, they form the 4 core of a very -- a multi-sectoral approach to 5 money laundering, as well, so --6 And so you -- go ahead. 7 Α No, I was just going to say --8 Yeah. 9 Α -- when you look at the study I did in 2004, the 10 deposit institutions were represented in close to 11 77 percent of all the cases. 12 Q Mm-hmm, yeah. 13 Α You know, so it speaks to, again, their 14 popularity as a laundering vehicle. 15 0 And in your literature review, you summarize and 16 describe a number of the deposit institution 17 services and products, so in italics about page 18 49 and on, we see the "Savings/Chequing 19 Accounts, " not surprisingly. Monetary 20 instruments, electronic fund transfers, which you 21 were just speaking about, and on to page 51, 22 "Account Transfers," "Safety Deposit Boxes." 23 Page 52, on to the "Use of Multiple Banking 24 Services and Transactions," the sum or even a 25 Go ahead. culmination. 26 Α Well, I was just going to say, people can see that by graphing, but just the whole list of 27 28 services and products you listed --29 30 Α -- is an indication of why banks and deposit 31 institutions are so popular, because they offer 32 so many different services that are so conducive 33 to money laundering. 34 Q Yes. Even something like mortgages, which you wouldn't 35 36 think would be, you know, that conducive, is 37 something that is quite prevalent with respect to 38 even through real estate. So really it's that, 39 you know, that sheer diversity of service with 40 the products that you can obtain through a bank 41 or deposit institution that makes them so

> Yeah, and then when you get into your discussion, page 52, of "ML Methods and Techniques that are Specific to Deposit Institutions," not that they're restricted to deposit institutions, but they certainly seem to recur in this -- in

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 Stephen Schneider (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the
Commission

relation to deposit institutions. You talk about the use of nominees. On page 53, "Establishing Commercial Accounts and Depositing Illicit Funds in the Name of Companies". Do you want to tell us a little bit about that last item I mentioned? Establishing commercial accounts and depositing illicit funds in the name of companies is a particular method or technique in relation to deposit institutions.

- Α Again, there are obviously techniques or money laundering methods that are universal that are equally applicable to banks. So, you know, nominees setting up accounts in the name of nominees, account transfers, you know, electronic fund transfers. But definitely a method that's commonly used, again, is to be able to establish a commercial bank account and then deposit the proceeds of crime into that account. And, again, that satisfies, you know, two of the most crucial functions of money laundering. You're placing the cash into the legitimate system, and once it's in the system, you can -- you know, you have just a whole range of techniques and transactions to launder money. And also, when doing it as revenue from a commercial business, you're also able to satisfy the justification function, which is basically claiming the proceeds of crime as legitimate revenue. And once it's a legitimate revenue, then obviously it's -- you've been able to justify it and able to repatriate or maybe just withdraw the cash and use it, so -- so very -- you know, through my research and other reports and studies I've read, definitely a very common approach to money laundering is to set up a company, buy into a company, either a legitimate or shell company, and to truly maximize the benefit of creating a criminally influenced company is setting up that commercial bank account, and then using that bank account to place the proceeds of cash [indiscernible] to be able to justify it, to legitimize it, and then get the money back into your hands so it can actually be used.
- Q Good, and then just to round out the discussion under this heading, you've got the last item there of "Avoiding Contact with Bank Personnel."
 So, for example, using an ATM or going -- doing a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

232425

26 27

28 29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

Stephen Schneider (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. Martland, Counsel for the Commission

- night deposit at a bank of cash as opposed to the sort of face to face interaction with a clerk or teller.
- Right, right. This came out in the study I did, Α and in a lot of the cases they -- and this tended to be individuals probably less sophisticated, maybe street level drug traffickers, but not exclusively. But certainly by avoiding contact with tellers, for example, you know, you're able to avoid raising suspicion, especially if you're the nervous type, especially if you feel that, you know, your appearance or demeanour may attract suspicion. Using ATMS is -- it's common -- a common structuring technique, and when you use the ATMs, you're using not just multiple AMS from the same bank, you're using ATMs from different banks. That way you can structure. I'll say ATMs a fairly common way to get the cash proceeds of crime into a bank, using structuring, avoiding any, you know, unnecessary suspicion that may be cast upon you as you're entering and talking to a teller. So that was a fairly common method that was used in the research I conducted.

(WITNESS STOOD DOWN)

MR. MARTLAND: Good, I think that's a useful place for us to break for the day. And for the benefit of, I hope, maybe for the relief -- or to the relief of participants, I will be speeding up as I work my way through questions about particular sectors. We have the benefit of your report and I expect we'll be able to have that put on the website as an exhibit, too, for people who want the higher level of detail. We have a number of participants who have questions, as well, and that will begin tomorrow, but I guess midday or so, with participants asking their questions. we're very grateful for everyone's help today, and Professor Schneider, thank you. I know it's much later there than here, and we're grateful for you putting in all of this. We'll be And in fact, I'm advised reconvening tomorrow. that the report is already up on the website, the literature review. We'll be reconvening, Mr. Commissioner, subject to anything else, at 9:30 tomorrow.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Martland. 9:30, tomorrow morning, we will resume, literally and figuratively.

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