

2015

Annual Report

On the Use of
Electronic Surveillance

As Required Under Section 195
of the *Criminal Code* of Canada
Prepared by the
Ministry of the Attorney General of Ontario

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	SECTION 195 OF THE <i>CRIMINAL CODE</i>	2
III.	OVERVIEW TO PART VI OF THE <i>CRIMINAL CODE</i>	7
IV.	VIDEO-WARRANTS: SECTION 487.01 OF THE <i>CRIMINAL CODE</i>	11
V.	STATISTICS.....	12
VI.	ASSESSMENT OF THE UTILITY OF INTERCEPTING PRIVATE COMMUNICATIONS	22

I. Introduction

This report is prepared pursuant to the provisions of s. 195 of the *Criminal Code* of Canada (“*Code*”). The report sets out statistical data in respect of four forms of interception:

- i. interception pursuant to authorizations issued by a judge of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice pursuant to s. 186 of the *Code* for the interception of private communications;
- ii. interception pursuant to warrants issued by a judge of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice pursuant to s. 487.01(1) of the *Code*, authorizing peace officers to observe by means of a television camera or other similar electronic device any person engaged in activity in circumstances in which the person has a reasonable expectation of privacy;¹
- iii. interception pursuant to authorizations issued by a specially appointed judge of the Superior Court of Justice, upon application of a designated peace officer, pursuant to s. 188 of the *Code*, for the interception of private communications in urgent circumstances; and
- iv. interceptions made in exceptional circumstances without prior judicial authorization under s. 184.4 of the *Code*.

Consistent with the requirements of s. 195 of the *Code*, this report does not address the frequency of interceptions pursuant to ss. 184.1 (Interception to Prevent Bodily Harm) or 184.2 (Interception with Consent).

¹ By virtue of sections 487.01(5) and 195 of the *Criminal Code*, reporting requirements only relate to video-warrants that do not involve consenting parties.

II. Section 195 of the *Criminal Code*

Section 195 of the *Code*, as it read on December 31, 2014, is set out in full below.

Annual report

195. (1) The Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness shall, as soon as possible after the end of each year, prepare a report relating to

(a) authorizations for which that Minister and agents to be named in the report who were specially designated in writing by that Minister for the purposes of section 185 applied and to the interceptions made under those authorizations in the immediately preceding year;

(b) authorizations given under section 188 for which peace officers to be named in the report who were specially designated by that Minister for the purposes of that section applied and to the interceptions made under those authorizations in the immediately preceding year; and

(c) interceptions made under section 184.4 in the immediately preceding year if the interceptions relate to an offence for which proceedings may be commenced by the Attorney General of Canada.

Information respecting authorizations – section 185 and section 188

(2) The report shall, in relation to the authorizations and interceptions referred to in paragraphs (1)(a) and (b), set out

- (a) the number of applications made for authorizations;
 - (b) the number of applications made for renewal of authorizations;
 - (c) the number of applications referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b) that were granted, the number of those applications that were refused and the number of applications referred to in paragraph (a) that were granted subject to terms and conditions;
 - (d) the number of persons identified in an authorization against whom proceedings were commenced at the instance of the Attorney General of Canada in respect of
 - (i) an offence specified in the authorization,
 - (ii) an offence other than an offence specified in the authorization but in respect of which an authorization may be given, and
 - (iii) an offence in respect of which an authorization may not be given;
 - (e) the number of persons not identified in an authorization against whom proceedings were commenced at the instance of the Attorney General of Canada in respect of
 - (i) an offence specified in such an authorization,
 - (ii) an offence other than an offence specified in such an authorization but in respect of which an authorization may be given, and
 - (iii) an offence other than an offence specified in such an authorization and for which no such authorization may be given,
- and whose commission or alleged commission of the offence became known to a peace officer as a result of an interception of a private communication under an authorization;

(f) the average period for which authorizations were given and for which renewals thereof were granted;

(g) the number of authorizations that, by virtue of one or more renewals thereof, were valid for more than sixty days, for more than one hundred and twenty days, for more than one hundred and eighty days and for more than two hundred and forty days;

(h) the number of notifications given pursuant to section 196;

(i) the offences in respect of which authorizations were given, specifying the number of authorizations given in respect of each of those offences;

(j) a description of all classes of places specified in authorizations and the number of authorizations in which each of those classes of places was specified;

(k) a general description of the methods of interception involved in each interception under an authorization;

(l) the number of persons arrested whose identity became known to a peace officer as a result of an interception under an authorization;

(m) the number of criminal proceedings commenced at the instance of the Attorney General of Canada in which private communications obtained by interception under an authorization were adduced in evidence and the number of those proceedings that resulted in a conviction; and

(n) the number of criminal investigations in which information obtained as a result of the interception of a private communication under an authorization was used although the private communication was not adduced in evidence in criminal proceedings commenced at the instance of the Attorney General of Canada as a result of the investigations.

Information respecting interceptions — section 184.4

(2.1) The report shall, in relation to the interceptions referred to in paragraph (1)(c), set out

(a) the number of interceptions made;

(b) the number of parties to each intercepted private communication against whom proceedings were commenced in respect of the offence that the police officer sought to prevent in intercepting the private communication or in respect of any other offence that was detected as a result of the interception;

(c) the number of persons who were not parties to an intercepted private communication but whose commission or alleged commission of an offence became known to a police officer as a result of the interception of a private communication, and against whom proceedings were commenced in respect of the offence that the police officer sought to prevent in intercepting the private communication or in respect of any other offence that was detected as a result of the interception;

(d) the number of notifications given under section 196.1;

(e) the offences in respect of which interceptions were made and any other offences for which proceedings were commenced as a result of an interception, as well as the number of interceptions made with respect to each offence;

(f) a general description of the methods of interception used for each interception;

(g) the number of persons arrested whose identity became known to a police officer as a result of an interception;

(h) the number of criminal proceedings commenced in which private communications obtained by interception were adduced in evidence and the number of those proceedings that resulted in a conviction;

(i) the number of criminal investigations in which information obtained as a result of the interception of a private communication was used even though the private communication was not adduced in evidence in criminal proceedings commenced as a result of the investigations; and

(j) the duration of each interception and the aggregate duration of all the interceptions related to the investigation of the offence that the police officer sought to prevent in intercepting the private communication.

Other information

(3) The report shall, in addition to the information referred to in subsections (2) and (2.1), set out

(a) the number of prosecutions commenced against officers or servants of Her Majesty in right of Canada or members of the Canadian Forces for offences under section 184 or 193; and

(b) a general assessment of the importance of interception of private communications for the investigation, detection, prevention and prosecution of offences in Canada.

Report to be laid before Parliament

(4) The Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness shall cause a copy of each report prepared by him under subsection (1) to be laid before Parliament forthwith on completion thereof, or if Parliament is not then sitting, on any of the first fifteen days next thereafter that Parliament is sitting.

Report by Attorneys General

(5) The Attorney General of each province shall, as soon as possible after the end of each year, prepare and publish or otherwise make available to the public a report relating to

(a) authorizations for which the Attorney General and agents specially designated in writing by the Attorney General for the purposes of section 185 applied and to the interceptions made under those authorizations in the immediately preceding year;

(b) authorizations given under section 188 for which peace officers specially designated by the Attorney General for the purposes of that section applied and to the interceptions made under those authorizations in the immediately preceding year; and

(c) interceptions made under section 184.4 in the immediately preceding year, if the interceptions relate to an offence not referred to in paragraph (1)(c).

The report must set out, with any modifications that the circumstances require, the information described in subsections (2) to (3).

III. Overview to Part VI of the *Criminal Code*

Part VI of the *Criminal Code*, “Invasion of Privacy”, represents an almost entirely self-contained statutory scheme that governs the use of electronic surveillance in criminal matters. It sets out the means by which authorizations for electronic surveillance may be obtained and the circumstances in which this investigative technique may be used without resort to judicial authorization. Part VI also includes: a definitional section;² an offence provision related to interception;³ reference to procedural matters, such as the sealing of application materials;⁴ notice;⁵ and disclosure provisions.⁶

The term “private communication” is defined in s. 183 of the *Criminal Code* as follows:

"private communication" means any oral communication, or any telecommunication, that is made by an originator who is in Canada or is intended by the originator to be received by a person who is in Canada and that is made under circumstances in which it is reasonable for the originator to expect that it will not be intercepted by any person other than the person intended by the originator to receive it, and includes any radio-based telephone communication that is treated electronically or otherwise for the purpose of preventing intelligible reception by any person other than the person intended by the originator to receive it.

The police must seek judicial authorization before intercepting private communications, except in specified cases of urgent circumstances (as governed by s. 184.4 of the *Code*) or safety concerns (as governed by s. 184.1 of the *Code*).

There are three types of applications contained in Part VI of the *Code* that may be brought for judicial authorization. They are sub-categorized below, and described along with interceptions made without application in urgent circumstances.

- **Interception in Exigent Circumstances**

In exceptional circumstances, police officers may need to intercept private communications prior to obtaining judicial authorization. Intercepts to prevent serious harm made without authorization are governed by s. 184.4 of the *Code*. Under s. 184.4, a police officer may intercept private communications without authorization if he or she

² Section 183 of the *Code*.

³ Sections 184 and 191 of the *Code*.

⁴ Section 187 of the *Code*.

⁵ Sections 189 and 196 of the *Code*.

⁶ Sections 193 and 193.1 of the *Code*.

has reasonable grounds to believe that the urgency of the situation is such that an authorization could not be obtained with reasonable diligence, the interception is immediately necessary to prevent serious harm, and either the originator or the recipient of the intercepted communications is the person who would commit the offence causing harm or the intended victim.

The Supreme Court of Canada considered the constitutionality of s. 184.4 in the case of *R. v. Tse* [2012] 1 S.C.R. 531. In response to the constitutional shortcomings identified by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Tse*, Parliament passed amendments to the *Criminal Code* requiring that persons intercepted under s. 184.4 be notified in accordance with s. 196.1, and that intercepts under s. 184.4 be included in the annual report of both the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness and the Attorneys General of the provinces.

- **Interception With the Consent of One of the Parties to the Communication**

The first type of application falls under s. 184.2 of the Code. It allows a peace officer to apply to a judge of either the provincial or superior court to authorize the interception of private communications where at least one of the people involved in the communication consents to its interception. An affidavit must be sworn in support of the application and a number of statutory criteria, as set out in s. 184.2, met. Section 195 does not require the Attorney General to report on these consent authorizations.

- **Applications to Specially Appointed Judges in Urgent Circumstances**

The second type of application falls under s. 188 of the Code. It is an application that is brought in urgent circumstances. This type of application to intercept private communications may only be made by a peace officer who is specially designated in writing, by name or otherwise, by the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness (in the case of offences that may be instituted by the Government of Canada) or the Attorney General of a province (in the case of offences that may be prosecuted by a provincial Attorney General, typically criminal offences). Moreover, the application must be made to a specially designated judge, appointed from time-to-time by the Chief Justice. In Ontario, the “Chief Justice” is defined under s. 188(4)(a) as the “Chief Justice of the Ontario Court”.

In order to obtain a s. 188 authorization, the urgency of the situation must be such that an authorization could not be obtained, with reasonable diligence, pursuant to s. 186 of the Code. Nonetheless, s. 188 contemplates that a s. 186 authorization “could” issue, but for the urgency of the situation. This type of authorization may only issue for a period up to thirty-six hours.

Pursuant to s. 195(1)(b), information about these authorizations must be contained in the annual report of the respective Attorneys General and Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness.

- **Applications for Third-Party Authorizations**

The final type of application under Part VI of the *Code* is governed by s. 185. Authorizations granted in response to these applications issue pursuant to s. 186 of the *Code*. Section 185 allows an application to be made, in the case of Ontario, to a judge of the Superior Court of Justice. The application may only be brought by the Attorney General of the province or the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness or an agent specially designated in accordance with s. 185(1)(a) or (b) of the *Code*. In Ontario, a number of Crown Counsel are designated in writing by the Attorney General or Deputy Attorney General to bring s. 185 wiretap applications.

Agents may bring an application for an authorization to intercept private communications where the offence under investigation is a s. 183 designated offence. The applicant is determined by who has prosecutorial authority over the s. 183 offence. In Ontario, the Attorney General has prosecutorial authority in relation to all criminal matters and, in the result, most s. 185 applications relating to criminal offences contained in s. 183, are the subject of provincial applications. The Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness (or an agent on the Minister's behalf) brings applications in respect of offences over which the Attorney General of Canada has prosecutorial authority. Sometimes applications for authorizations include offences that involve both federal and provincial matters and, thereby, engage the authority of both governments. In these situations, dual applications for a single authorization are brought by agents of both the federal and provincial governments.

An application for an authorization under s. 186 must be accompanied by an affidavit, sworn by a peace officer or public officer. It must depose to a number of factors set out in s. 185(1) (c-h). These factors include, but are not limited to, reference to the facts relied on to justify the belief that an authorization should be granted, the types of communications sought to be intercepted, the names, addresses and occupations of the people whose private communications there are reasonable grounds to believe may assist in the investigation of the offence, the period of time for which the authorization is requested, and whether "investigative necessity" has been met. In respect of this latter requirement, the affiant must depose to the following:

- s. 185(1)(h) - whether other investigative procedures have been tried and have failed or why it appears they are unlikely to succeed or that the urgency of the matter is such that it would be impractical to carry out the investigation of the offence using only other investigative procedures.

Note that pursuant to s. 185(1.1), the investigative necessity requirement need not be met in relation to criminal organization and terrorism offences.

Before granting the application, s. 186 requires that the judge be satisfied of the following:

186(1) An authorization under this section may be given if the judge to whom the application is made is satisfied

- (a) that it would be in the best interests of the administration of justice to do so; and
- (b) that other investigative procedures have been tried and have failed, other investigative procedures are unlikely to succeed or the urgency of the matter is such that it would be impractical to carry out the investigation of the offence using only other investigative procedures.

Like s. 185(1.1), by virtue of s. 186(1.1), investigations into criminal organizations and terrorism offences are exempt from the investigative necessity requirement built into s. 186(1)(b) of the *Code*.

Sections 186(2) and (3) refer to the special circumstances surrounding the interception of private communications that may be the subject of solicitor-client privilege. Section 186(4) sets out a number of statutory requirements as it relates to the contents of the authorization. Importantly, s. 186(4)(e) allows an authorization to be valid for a period up to, but not exceeding, 60 days. Section 186.1 exempts authorizations from the sixty-day rule where the subject of the investigation is a criminal organization or terrorism offence. In these circumstances, an authorization may continue for a period of up to one year in duration.

IV. Video-Warrants:

Section 487.01 of the *Criminal Code*

The jurisdiction for a video-warrant resides in Part XV of the *Criminal Code*. Section 487.01 provides for a “general warrant” to allow a peace officer to “use any device or investigative technique or procedure or do anything described in the warrant that would, if not authorized, constitute an unreasonable search or seizure in respect of a person or a person’s property ...”.⁷ Within the general warrant provision is embedded specific reference to the use of video. For ease of reference, the provision is set out in full below:

Section 487.01: Information for General Warrant

Video surveillance

(4) A warrant issued under subsection (1) that authorizes a peace officer to observe, by means of a television camera or other similar electronic device, any person who is engaged in activity in circumstances in which the person has a reasonable expectation of privacy shall contain such terms and conditions as the judge considers advisable to ensure that the privacy of the person or of any other person is respected as much as possible.

Other provisions to apply

(5) The definition "offence" in section 183 and sections 183.1, 184.2, 184.3 and 185 to 188.2, subsection 189(5), and sections 190, 193 and 194 to 196 apply, with such modifications as the circumstances require, to a warrant referred to in subsection (4) as though references in those provisions to interceptions of private communications were read as references to observations by peace officers by means of television cameras or similar electronic devices of activities in circumstances in which persons had reasonable expectations of privacy.

While the jurisdiction to grant a video-warrant is found in Part XV of the *Code*, by the adoption of significant aspects of Part VI of the *Code*, it operates, for all intents and purposes, as if it were located in Part VI. Significantly, among other provisions, s. 487.01(5) adopts ss. 184.2, 185, 186, 188 and 195. This means that all one-party consent (s. 184.2), third-party (ss. 185-186) and emergency (s. 188) applications for video-warrants are governed by the specific statutory criteria contained within the Part VI provisions. In the result, all video-warrants granted for electronic surveillance, where there is no consenting party, must be reported upon annually, subject to the criteria contained in s. 195 of the *Code*.

⁷ Section 487.01(1) of the *Code*.

V. Statistics

1. Overview

a) Total Authorizations

From January 1 to December 31, 2015, 34 authorizations and/or video-warrants were issued from the Ontario Superior Court of Justice pursuant to ss. 186, 188, and/or 487.01 of the *Code*.⁸ The following table places these 34 authorizations/warrants in the context of previous years:

Year	Number of Authorizations Issued
2000	69
2001	58
2002	60
2003	57
2004	64
2005	43
2006	38
2007	43
2008	48
2009	37
2010	28
2011	43
2012	57
2013	54
2014	40
2015	34

b) Video Authorizations

From January 1 to December 31, 2015, there were 0 independent video-warrants. There were 8 video-warrants included with an authorization pursuant to s. 186 of the *Code*.

c) Emergency Interception – 184.4

From January 1 to December 31, 2015, there were 3 interceptions conducted pursuant to s. 184.4 (exceptional circumstances).

⁸ Note that video-warrants are most frequently sought in conjunction with an authorization under s. 186 of the *Code*. Where this occurs, depending on jurisdictional practice, an omnibus order is granted. In this report, where a video-warrant is included as part of an omnibus order that grants an authorization under s. 186 of the *Code*, it is counted as a single authorization for purposes of the total number of authorizations for the year.

d) Investigations

The 34 authorizations/warrants granted in 2015 relate to 20 separate police investigations. Of those 20 police investigations, 25 involved more than one authorization/warrant, as set out in the table below:

Number of Authorizations/Warrants obtained <i>per</i> investigation	Number of Investigations	Actual Number of Authorizations/Warrants
1	9	9
2	8	16
3	3	9
Total	20	34

e) Renewals and Expansions

Often, successive authorizations in respect of the same general matter under investigation are granted on different terms than the original authorization. Such subsequent authorizations typically vary from previous ones as to the named people, the places of interception, the manner in which interceptions are permitted to occur, and/or the enumerated offences. These changes correspond to the progress of the investigation as new information comes to light and as the focus of the inquiry expands or is narrowed. Where the police seek a subsequent authorization that reflects the changes in the investigation, incorporating, among other things, new parties, locations, terms and conditions, they require a new application under s. 185 and new authorization under s. 186. While s. 186(6)-(7) allows for an application to renew an authorization in the same form, these applications are rarely made, as the required parameters of an authorization will almost inevitably evolve over time.

For the purposes of this annual report, where multiple authorizations/warrants have been granted in respect of the same investigation, (even where they are not “renewals” under s. 186(6)-(7)) the relevant statistical data relating to the following areas identified in s. 195(2) has not been “double counted”:

- s. 195(2)(d): the number of persons identified in an authorization against whom proceedings were commenced
- s. 195(2)(e): the number of persons not identified in an authorization against whom proceedings were commenced

- s. 195(2)(l): the number of persons arrested whose identity became known to a peace officer as a result of an interception under an authorization.

f) Limitations to Annual Statistics

Given the length of time it takes to commence proceedings and bring them to conclusion, the full results of wiretap investigations will rarely be understood within a single calendar year. For instance, pursuant to s. 195(2)(m) of the *Code*, there is a need to report upon the number of criminal proceedings commenced at the instance of the Attorney General of Ontario in which private communications obtained by interception under an authorization were adduced in evidence and the number of convictions that resulted from such proceedings. It is exceptionally rare that these facts would crystallize in a single year.

Where a wiretap project involves more than one authorization and the authorizations bridge two consecutive years, it may be that the existence of an authorization will be reported upon in the year it issues, but other statistics related to that authorization will be reported upon in previous or subsequent annual reports.

Where a delay of notification order is in place, the existence of an authorization is reported upon for the year it was issued but the aggregate number of notifications may include no notifications in respect of the authorization for that year because of delay orders in place.

2. Information Respecting Authorizations

s. 195(2)	The number of applications made for authorizations.	34
(a)	The number of applications made for renewal of authorizations.	0
(b)	(i) The number of applications referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b), above, that were granted.	34
(c)	(ii) The number of applications referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b), above, that were refused. ⁹	1
	(iii) The number of applications referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b), above, that were granted subject to terms and conditions.	34
s. 195(2)(d)	The number of persons identified in an authorization against whom proceedings were commenced at the instance of the Attorney General of Ontario in respect of:	
(i)	An offence specified in the authorization;	92
(ii)	An offence other than an offence specified in the authorization but in respect of which an authorization may be given; and	50
(iii)	An offence in respect of which an authorization may not be given.	19

⁹ It should be noted that, for purposes of the annual report, a refusal is considered to occur where an application for an authorization is made to a judge, is refused, and is never granted. This is to be distinguished from a situation where an application is made to a judge, refused on the basis that the judge may not be satisfied in relation to an identified matter(s) and it is later remedied, at which point the application is granted.

s. 195(2)(e)	The number of persons not identified in an authorization but whose commission or alleged commission of an offence became known to the police as a result of an interception of private communication under an authorization, and against whom proceedings were commenced at the instance of the Attorney General of Ontario in respect of:	
(i)	An offence specified in such an authorization;	51
(ii)	An offence other than an offence specified in such an authorization but in respect of which an authorization may be given; and	39
(iii)	An offence other than an offence specified in such an authorization and for which no authorization may be given, and whose commission or alleged commission of the offence became known to a peace officer as a result of an interception of a private communication under an authorization.	15
s. 195(2)(f)	The average period of days for which authorizations were given.	54
s. 195(2)(g)	The number of authorizations that by virtue of one or more renewals or expansions thereof were valid ¹⁰	
	For more than 60 days;	7
	For more than 120 days;	2
	For more than 180 days;	0
	For more than 240 days.	0
s. 195(2)(h)	The number of persons given notifications pursuant to s.196. ¹¹	268

¹⁰ These statistics are counted by adding the total number of days wiretap authorization(s) were valid in relation to a single investigation. It includes renewals and subsequent orders made on the same project.

¹¹ Often, people named in an authorization cannot be located or evade service. Because some people cannot be served, there may be a difference between the total number of people named in an authorization and the total number of people who receive notice. Another factor that may contribute to this disparity is that notification may be delayed by a judge for up to three years. This annual report does not track notifications on authorizations granted in prior years.

s. 195(2)(i)	The offences in respect of which authorizations were granted:	Total #
	s. 83.18 Participating in activity of terrorist group	2
	s. 83.2 Commission of offence for terrorist group	2
	s. 83.231 Hoax – terrorist activity	1
	s. 99 Weapons trafficking	1
	s. 103 Importing or exporting knowing it is unauthorized	1
	s. 139 Obstructing justice	3
	s. 235 Murder	27
	s. 239 Attempt to commit murder	4
	s. 240 Accessory after fact to murder	3
	s. 267(b) Assault causing bodily harm	1
	s. 267(c) Assault with a weapon	1
	s. 279(1) Kidnapping	1
	s. 279(2) Forcible confinement	1
	s. 333.1 Motor vehicle theft	1
	s. 344 Robbery	2
	s. 346 Extortion	1
	s. 354 Possession of property obtained by crime	2
	s. 355.2 Trafficking in property obtained by crime	1
	s. 434 Arson	2
	s. 464 Counselling to commit murder	1
	s. 465(1) Conspiracy/Attempt/Accessory...	1
	s. 467.11 Participation in criminal organization	3
	s. 467.12 Commission of offence for criminal organization	3
	s. 467.13 Instructing commission of offence for criminal organization	3

s. 195(2)(j)	<p>A description of all classes of places and devices specified in the authorization and the number of authorizations in which each such class of place was specified:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Residences 55 Vehicles 43 Hotels 0 Commercial Establishments 3 Correctional Institutions 7 Other 5</p>	
s. 195(2)(k)	<p>A general description of the methods of interception involved in each interception under an authorization:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Telephone 55 Mobile phone 336 Telecommunications 38 Room Probes 77 Body packs 11 Other 0</p>	
s. 195(2)(l)	<p>The number of persons arrested whose identity became known to a peace officer as a result of an interception under an authorization.</p>	58
s. 195(2)(m)	<p>The number of criminal proceedings¹² commenced at the instance of the Attorney General of Ontario in which private communications obtained by interception under an authorization were adduced in evidence.</p> <p>The number of such proceedings that resulted in a conviction.¹³</p>	10 0
s. 195(2)(n)	<p>The number of criminal investigations in which information obtained as a result of the interception of a private communication under an authorization was used although the private communication was not adduced in evidence in criminal proceedings commenced by the Attorney General of Ontario as a result of the investigation.</p>	4

¹² To be clear for purposes of this report, a “proceeding” is defined as a trial and/or a preliminary inquiry. Any given proceeding may include more than one accused.

¹³ As noted above, this number only includes convictions entered in the same year as the authorization was issued, which is an extremely rare occurrence. Further, where charges result in a guilty plea before a trial or preliminary hearing, the conviction will not be included in this total. The *Criminal Code* requires reporting only of convictions resulting from proceedings in which the intercept evidence was adduced.

s. 195(2.1)(f)	A general description of the methods of interception used for each interception.	
	Telephone	0
	Mobile phone	8
	Telecommunications	3
	Room Probes	0
	Body packs	0
	Other	0
s. 195(2.1)(g)	The number of persons arrested whose identity became known to a police officer as a result of an interception.	3
s. 195(2.1)(h)	The number of criminal proceedings commenced in which private communications obtained by interception were adduced in evidence; and, the number of those proceedings that resulted in a conviction.	2 0
s. 195(2.1)(i)	The number of criminal investigations in which information obtained as a result of the interception of a private communication was used even though the private communication was not adduced in evidence in criminal proceedings commenced as a result of the investigations; and	1
s. 195(2.1)(j)	The duration of each interception and the aggregate duration of all the interceptions related to the investigation of the offence that the police officer sought to prevent in intercepting the private communication. ¹⁶	
Investigation#1	1 04:51:00	Aggregate Duration: 14:49:00
	2 04:51:00	
	3 04:51:00	
	4 00:47:00	
	5 00:45:00	
	6 00:04:00	
Investigation#2	1 00:07:31	Aggregate Duration: 00:07:44
	2 00:00:13	
Investigation#3	0 00:00:00	Aggregate Duration: 00:00:00

¹⁶ Duration cannot be reported for text-based interceptions. Even for audio communications, duration of interceptions is very difficult to interpret outside of the individual case context. For example, a call on a phone may be recorded as lasting 45 seconds but, without additional information, it is not apparent whether that 45 seconds includes an actual private communication (and therefore an interception) as opposed to an unanswered call. Further, when two intercepted lines contact each other, it may appear as two intercepts when in fact there is a single communication. The individualized intercept durations are therefore inexact and not reflective of the number or duration of private communications intercepted.

Offences against s. 184 or s. 193 by Officers or Agents of the Crown and Canadian Forces Members

s. 195(3)(a)	The number of prosecutions commenced against officers or servants of Her Majesty in right of Canada or members of the Canadian Forces for offences under section 184 or 193	0
--------------	---	----------

VI. Assessment of the Utility of Intercepting Private Communications

Pursuant to s. 195(3)(b) of the *Criminal Code*, the annual report must provide a “general assessment of the importance of the interception of private communications for the investigation, detection, prevention and prosecution of offences in Canada”. The interception of private communications is, undoubtedly, one of the most valuable investigative tools available to law enforcement agencies. This investigative technique is available in only the most serious investigations where detailed statutory criteria have been met.

Where the statutory criteria are met, the interception of private communications can lead to the identification of extremely dangerous people, prevent harm, and provide evidence that would not otherwise be available. This is especially true in the case of criminal and terrorist organizations, which are rarely susceptible to penetration by undercover operatives or state agents.

Not only can authorizations to intercept private communications lead to the identification of those who present serious safety risks to the public, but they can also produce invaluable evidence used to prosecute those individuals. In addition, they provide significant information that can be used to further an investigation, even if that information is not of any evidentiary value. Interceptions of private communications assist in preventing crime and saving lives.

The interception of private communications continued to provide valuable assistance to law enforcement in the year 2015. Intercepts provided key evidence for the investigation and prosecution of firearms trafficking, murder, national security and public threat, and violent offences. Police were able to identify members of criminal organizations and gain important intelligence and evidence on the structure and organization of such groups. Wiretap evidence has played a key role in criminal prosecutions. Evidence from intercepts was also important in eliminating suspects and preventing criminal offences, those these results are of course impossible to quantify. Electronic surveillance remains critically important to the public interest and the administration of justice in the Province of Ontario.

Ministry of the Attorney General
Crown Law Office – Criminal
Toronto, Ontario
