

Dear Union of BC Municipalities,

The recent decision by the federal and provincial governments to offload the full cost of emergency dispatch services onto municipalities underscores the need for a *fundamental restructuring of law enforcement and emergency services*. I am writing to urge municipalities across British Columbia to take this opportunity to unite and **begin reforming policing in our province by creating locally controlled independent dispatch services**.

The province's sudden withdrawal of funding is not just a budgetary decision—it has placed South Island municipalities in a position where they are effectively being cornered into using and funding E-Comm 911. This move consolidates provincial control over emergency services while quietly eliminating financially viable alternatives for municipalities. If municipalities ever want fairness for their constituents, they must take action now to reform policing and emergency services in a way that keeps matters *as local and accountable as possible*.

Without immediate exploration of alternatives, municipalities risk being locked into a centralized dispatch model that limits their ability to self-govern and make community-driven decisions about emergency response. If municipalities do not act now to create new emergency dispatch services, they risk funding a future where emergency services are entirely dictated by provincial mandates, *stripping communities of any real decision-making power over public safety*.

These concerns are already being raised by municipal leaders. Colwood Mayor Doug Kobayashi stated that local leaders were “blindsided” by the financial burden. Similarly, Tobias, speaking to The Westshore, voiced “grave concerns over service quality and governance over the E-Comm 911 service” and went as far as to call its governance a “dumpster fire” for responsible oversight of new service members such as View Royal. These statements reinforce the growing alarm over how E-Comm operates and how municipalities are being backed into a system with high costs and questionable oversight.

The first step toward breaking free from this unfairly imposed system is establishing locally controlled, independent dispatch services. Creating municipal or regional dispatch centers will not only eliminate reliance on E-Comm's overpriced and opaque service but also lay the groundwork for fully independent municipal police forces. Without an independent dispatch system, policing reforms will remain constrained by centralized control, limiting municipalities' ability to create truly community-focused law enforcement.

Municipalities are now left with two costly options: fund an overpriced dispatch system or develop their own alternative—something that is financially difficult given the abrupt nature of these policy changes. However, by working together, municipalities can pool resources to establish a provincial network of locally controlled dispatch centers, providing better service, greater accountability, and a *clear pathway to policing reform*. Independent dispatch services pave the way for independent policing, ensuring public safety remains in the hands of those *closest to the communities they serve*.

One of the most compelling reasons for this shift is the urgent need to protect democratic oversight, particularly in the context of School Liaison Officer (SLO) programs. These programs, designed to support and safeguard children in educational settings, face significant challenges

under the RCMP's current structure. For example, as confirmed in the forwarded response from the Civilian Review and Complaints Commission (CRCC) regarding concerns about E-Comm and the RCMP's inability to properly address potential corruption complaints, "it is unreasonable to expect RCMP employees across the country to be familiar with *all initiatives* the RCMP has in place. The attention of most general duty (contract policing) RCMP officers is *focused on investigating common offences found within the Criminal Code and a variety of provincial and/or municipal laws.*" This incompatibility is particularly evident in the case of SLO programs, where the unique dynamics of schools and the subsequent needs of parents and students require a highly localized and collaborative approach to ensure fairness and transparency.

When school boards or other democratically elected bodies are forced to cede authority over these programs without just cause, the ability to ensure the safety and well-being of students is jeopardized. The BC Human Rights Commissioner and the BC Civil Liberties Association (BCCLA) have called for an end to SLO programs in 2022 until civilian-led alternatives could be investigated, in order to protect students and families in the province. Unfortunately, the province's Minister of Education and Child Care has now leveled threats to dissolve the democratically elected Greater Victoria School District 61 purely for adhering to these recommendations at a time when SLO programs were no longer even being funded by police. This threat comes despite the Minister having been *repeatedly requested to adequately fund schools*; the democratically appropriate mechanism for the provincial government to resolve such issues.

I implore municipalities to take action against these systemic power-grabs and to seek guidance from the BC Human Rights Commissioner and the BCCLA to ensure that any such reforms prioritize community rights and protections. By uniting with these institutions, municipalities can reclaim control over emergency services, ensuring a law enforcement model that is fair, cost-effective, and *truly accountable to the communities it serves*—rather than to provincial and federal bureaucracies.

This letter is being carbon copied to every municipality in the province to encourage collective action and dialogue on this critical issue.

I welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter further and collaborate on strategies for effective policing and emergency services reform.

Sincerely,

Philip Perras

From: Complaints-CRCC <complaints@crcc-ccetp.gc.ca>

Sent: June 12, 2024 2:06 PM

To: philip_perras@hotmail.com <philip_perras@hotmail.com>

Subject: Civilian Review and Complaints Commission R2024-003308 Philip Perras

Good afternoon, Philip Perras.

The Civilian Review and Complaints Commission for the RCMP (the Commission) acknowledges receipt of your e-mail dated June 7, 2024, in which you state that you wish to lodge a public complaint, apparently about the RCMP not providing you with an e-mail address (natdivanticorruptionpreventioin@rcmp-grc.gc.ca) when you wished to discuss potential corruption issues. You added that your complaint does not involve any specific members of the RCMP but does involve multiple detachments.

Please be advised that according to s. 45.53 (1) of the RCMP Act, "Any individual may make a complaint concerning the conduct, in the performance of any duty or function under this Act of the Witness Protection Program Act, of any person who, at the time that the conduct is alleged to have occurred, was a member or other person appointed or employed under Part I." In other words, the Commission cannot accept a complaint against a detachment in general but rather against individuals (and incidents) who (which) fall within the jurisdiction of the Commission. In order to determine if the incidents, and the individuals with whom you communicated, fall within the jurisdiction of the Commission we would require the dates or approximate dates (and times if available) that you communicated with those individuals, their names (if possible), the method of communication (in person, via telephone - if via telephone, the telephone number you called to speak to that individual) and the location of each interaction.

Keep in mind that public complaints must normally be lodged within one year of the alleged improper behaviour. In each instance were you attempting to report alleged corruption? If so, the Commission would require a brief synopsis about the alleged corruption you were attempting to report.

If your communication with an RCMP employee was only to determine if they knew of the existence of the e-mail address you provided, then it is unlikely the Commission would accept a complaint in those instances. Not being familiar with an internal RCMP e-mail address to report corruption does not necessarily amount to improper behaviour. It is unreasonable to expect RCMP employees across the country to be familiar with all initiatives the RCMP has in place. The attention of most general duty (contract policing) RCMP officers is focused on investigating common offences found within the Criminal Code and a variety of provincial and/or municipal laws. In the provinces of Ontario and Quebec where the RCMP does not perform contract policing, the focus is on the enforcement of federal statutes. The RCMP is responsible in part or in whole for enforcing numerous federal statutes but the Commission would not expect every RCMP member to be familiar with all of them. As noted within the e-mail address itself that you referenced, it originated out of the RCMP's National Division which is located in Ottawa and is focused on the enforcement of certain federal laws/statutes. As noted by the RCMP's web page, where you may have located

that e-mail address, the RCMP encourage the public to report corruption to that e-mail address under certain conditions:

Report it to the RCMP at natdivanticorruptionprevention@rcmp-grc.gc.ca if it involves:

- Canadian businesses offering bribes to foreign officials
- Canadian federal government employees or institutions
- businesses dealing with the federal government
- companies operating outside of Canada

In the cases where you made contact with the RCMP to report incidents of corruption and raised concerns about not being provided the e-mail address in question, did those incidents of corruption you were attempting to report fall within the parameters listed above?

Please respond to the following questions by June 26, 2024.

Respectfully,

Complaint Intake, Complaint Intake and Review Directorate

Civilian Review and Complaints Commission for the RCMP / Government of Canada

Bureau de réception des plaintes, Direction de la réception des plaintes et des examens

Commission civile d'examen et de traitement des plaintes relatives à la GRC / Gouvernement du Canada



Civilian Review and
Complaints Commission
for the RCMP

Commission civile d'examen
et de traitement des plaintes
relatives à la GRC

Canada