

Decision Regarding Findings Report INV-24-29 Concerning the Conduct of Cornwall Police Service Board Member Amanda Brisson

Decision By:

Ryan Teschner, Inspector General of Policing

I. INTRODUCTION

[1] This decision concerns an allegation that Amanda Brisson, a member of the Cornwall Police Service Board (“CPSB”), committed misconduct by improperly disclosing confidential information. This allegation was investigated by an inspector with Ontario’s Inspectorate of Policing (“IoP”) who prepared a Findings Report,¹ which is attached to this Decision as Appendix A. Following a review of the Findings Report and for the reasons that follow, I conclude that Ms. Brisson has not committed misconduct in contravention of section 15(1) of the *Code of Conduct for Police Service Board Members Regulation*, O Reg 408/23 (“Code of Conduct”), enacted under the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019*, SO 2019, c 1, Sch 1 (the “Act”).

[2] At the conclusion of my Decision, I also identify a matter that, more broadly, police service boards in Ontario should consider in the context of their own governance responsibilities. This matter relates to a police service board’s duty to monitor the chief of police’s administration of the disciplinary system, and to ensure that an appropriate policy (or policies) is in place to provide appropriate visibility for the board and adequate governance direction to the chief.

II. BACKGROUND

[3] Ms. Brisson is the current chair of the CPSB. At the time of the complaint about her alleged disclosure of confidential information, she was Vice Chair.

[4] In May 2024, Ms. Brisson became aware that a civilian member of the Cornwall Police Service (“CPS”) had been charged with a criminal offence. Ms. Brisson did not know what she was required to do with this information as a board member. She later disclosed this information to another member of the CPSB.

¹ Section 123 of the Act requires an IoP inspector who completes an investigation of a complaint to report their findings to the Inspector General. This report is redacted to comply with the *Publication of Findings Reports and Directions under Sections 123 and 125 of the Act Regulation*, O Reg 317/24.

[5] This disclosure prompted the board member recipient of the information to ask a question at a closed meeting of the CPSB on June 6, 2024, about whether the CPS had a procedure for civilian members who were charged with a criminal offence. This question, and the discussion that followed, was of a general nature and did not contain personal identifiers or details of the alleged offence the specific civilian member was accused of.

[6] As a result of this discussion, the CPSB identified gaps in CPS procedures about civilian members charged with criminal offences.

III. ISSUES

[7] The sole issue is whether Ms. Brisson contravened the Code of Conduct by disclosing confidential information.

IV. ANALYSIS

[8] After a consideration of the facts and the applicable law, I find, on a balance of probabilities, that Ms. Brisson did not breach the Code of Conduct.

[9] Section 15(1) of the Code of Conduct prohibits police service board members from releasing information that they obtain in the course of their duties to the public except in specific, statutorily defined circumstances:

15. (1) A member of a police service board shall not disclose to the public information obtained or made available in the course of the member's duties except as authorized by the police service board or as required by law.

[10] On the record before me, there is simply no evidence that Ms. Brisson: (i) obtained the information at issue in her capacity as a board member, or (ii) disclosed information she obtained in her capacity as a board member to an unauthorized person or in an unauthorized manner.

a. The Board Member did not obtain the information in the course of her board member duties

[11] First, the Findings Report does not indicate that this information came to Ms. Brisson in connection with her duties as a board member, but, rather, in her personal capacity through a personal interaction where someone volunteered the information to Ms. Brisson. Therefore, the required nexus between the circumstances through which Ms. Brisson obtained the information and her board member role or duties does not exist. This conclusion is enough to dispose of this matter, as the threshold required in section 15(1) of the Code of Conduct is not met. However, I will consider the other elements of the section for completeness, and to the extent my analysis and conclusions will be informative to the Ontario police governance sector.

b. The Board Member did not disclose the information to an unauthorized person

[12] Second, Ms. Brisson disclosed information she had learned about a civilian member being subject to criminal charges to another board member. Section 15(1) of the Code of Conduct specifically states that board members are prohibited from disclosing confidential information “to the public.” A fellow member of the police service board on which a board member sits, or a member of the police service for that matter, are not “the public” for the purpose of this provision. Board members must have the ability to raise information to their colleague board members, or to the chief of police, without first having to weigh whether that information may be confidential. The confidentiality cloak that covers the police service board table is there to facilitate a full exchange of information that aids the board in discharging its governance responsibilities. An interpretation that would expand this confidentiality cloak such that it could exist as between board members would be antithetical to the CSPA and the Code of Conduct.

[13] Far from being misconduct, it is commendable that Ms. Brisson took steps to determine how best to bring this matter forward, In fact, it is because Ms. Brisson brought this matter forward that there is now a proper procedure for the Chief of Police to make the CPSB aware of instances where civilian members of the CPS have been criminally charged. Ms. Brisson’s approach is very much in keeping with her duties as a board member.

[14] This complaint appears to be much ado about nothing. Discussions between fellow board members and the Chief of Police could, and should have resolved this matter without there ever being a need for a complaint to the IoP in the first place.

V. CONCLUSION

[15] Ms. Brisson did not breach the Code of Conduct.

[16] Before concluding, I would like to take this opportunity to strongly urge the CPSB to determine whether, as part of its own duty to monitor the Chief of Police's handling of discipline within the police service (as set out in section 37(1)(i) of the CSPA), it needs to create or revisit its own CPSB policy on this matter. The policy should: cover both uniform and civilian members who are the subject of discipline and potential discipline; identify what information the Chief should provide the CPSB on a regular basis concerning their handling of discipline; and, govern in what circumstances the Chief implements actions when there is a criminal charge laid against a member. Good governance of the CPS requires a comprehensive policy approach by the CPSB to this matter. I would also urge other police service boards in Ontario to take similar action if this gap exists within their respective governance frameworks.

Date: April 2, 2026

Original Signed By

Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing

FINDINGS REPORT

Cornwall Police Service Board Chair:
Amanda Brisson

**Section 106(1) Board Member
Conduct Investigation**
(INV-24-29)

Submitted to:
Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing of
Ontario

November 7, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABOUT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICING AND THE INSPECTORATE OF POLICING	3
INTRODUCTION	3
OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION	4
The Complaint	4
The Subject Police Service Board Member	4
Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions	5
SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED	5
Witness Interviews	5
Interview of Witness 1:	5
Interview of Witness 2:	7
Interview of Witness 3:	8
Interview of Witness 4:	8
Interview of Witness 5:	10
Subject Police Service Board Member Interview	11
INVESTIGATION FINDINGS	13

ABOUT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICING AND THE INSPECTORATE OF POLICING

The Inspector General of Policing drives improved performance and accountability in policing and police governance by overseeing the delivery of adequate and effective policing across Ontario. The Inspector General ensures compliance with the province's policing legislation and standards, and has the authority to issue progressive, risk-based and binding directions and measures to protect public safety. Ontario's Community Safety and Policing Act embeds protections to ensure the Inspector General's statutory duty is delivered independently from government.

The Inspector General of Policing leads the Inspectorate of Policing (IoP). The IoP provides operational support to inspect, investigate, monitor, and advise Ontario's police services, boards and special constable employers. By leveraging independent research and data intelligence, the IoP promotes leading practices and identifies areas for improvement, ensuring that high-quality policing and police governance is delivered to make everyone in Ontario safer.

In March 2023, Ryan Teschner was appointed as Ontario's first Inspector General of Policing with duties and authorities under the Community Safety and Policing Act. Mr. Teschner is a recognized expert in public administration, policing and police governance.

For more information about the Inspector General of Policing or the IoP, please visit www.ioontario.ca.

INTRODUCTION

This is a report to the Inspector General of Policing by an inspector appointed by the Inspector General, who has completed an investigation under Part VII of the [Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019](#) (CSPA).

OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION

The Complaint

[Redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] notified the Chair of the Cornwall Police Service Board (CPSB) of a possible breach of confidentiality with respect to CPSB member Amanda Brisson. The issue came to [redacted – s 1(1)2– O Reg 317/24]’s attention after another member of the CPSB was scheduled to participate in a “job shadow” assignment in a civilian unit of the CPS. A civilian member working within the unit at the time raised concerns about the CPSB member attending the unit while she was working due to an ongoing police related matter and that this information was shared by a CPSB member. [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

The Chair of the CSPB, after being notified by [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24], reported the matter to the Inspectorate of Policing (IoP).

A written complaint was received by the Inspector General of Policing in relation to the conduct of the (then) Vice-Chair of the Cornwall Police Service Board (CPSB), Ms. Brisson. It is alleged that Ms. Brisson disclosed confidential information from the closed portion of a CPSB meeting to a civilian member of the Cornwall Police Service (CPS), contravening the [Ontario Regulation 408/23: Code of Conduct for Police Service Board Members](#) (Code of Conduct).

The Subject Police Service Board Member

Name of Police Service Board: Cornwall Police Service Board

Subject Board Member: Amanda Brisson

Length of Service (Term): Appointed 2023 (3 years)

Specific Roles Held on Police Service Board: Board member, Vice-Chair, Acting Chair, Chair (elected January 2025)

Previous Substantiated Misconduct: None

Appointing Authority: Provincial Appointee

Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions

Section 35(6) of the CSPA provides that every member of a police service board shall comply with the prescribed code of conduct.

[Ontario Regulation 408/23: Code of Conduct for Police Service Board Members](#) was reviewed having regard to the allegations made in the complaint and the following sections were deemed to be relevant:

- a) Section 3(1) - A member of a police service board shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines or is likely to undermine the public's trust in the police service board or the police service maintained by the board; and
- b) Section 14 - A member of a police service board shall not access, collect, use, alter, retain, destroy or disclose to any person information that has been obtained by or made available to the member in the course of their duties if doing so would be contrary to law, and
- c) Section 21 - A member of a police service board shall not use their position as a police service board member to ... (b) benefit one or more persons with whom they have a personal relationship.

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED

As part of the investigation process, interviews were conducted with five witnesses, which included three members of the CPS and two members of the CPSB, as well as with the subject board member, Ms. Brisson. Additionally, information provided by the CPS, along with the CPSB meeting minutes and by-laws were reviewed.

Witness Interviews

Interview of Witness 1:

IoP investigators interviewed Witness 1. [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

Witness 1 disclosed that both she and [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] were criminally charged in relation to a [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] incident, and she believes that the charges against her were unfounded. As a result, she expressed a general distrust of the police service involved in the matter.

In relation to this board member conduct investigation, Witness 1 described this ordeal as “a game of telephone gone south”. Witness 1 indicated that she is unsure whether her personal situation was ever discussed at a CPSB meeting. However, she indicated that [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] knows Ms. Brisson [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]. Witness 1 indicated that she believes that [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] told Ms. Brisson about their [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] incident. She recalled on one occasion she walked in on a phone conversation between [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] and Ms. Brisson. As [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] was visibly upset, Witness 1 asked [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] who [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] was talking to. [Redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] replied that it was Ms. Brisson. Ms. Brisson told both over the phone “you guys have so much love and support, you guys got this”. Witness 1 indicated that [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] and Ms. Brisson were originally discussing [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] issues and that there was no discussion concerning the CPS or the CPSB.

Witness 1 does not know if her personal matters were discussed at a CPSB meeting, she does read the meeting minutes and noticed that there were new policies concerning civilian discipline.

On September 6, 2024, Witness 1 learned from her colleague, Witness 2, that CPSB member, Witness 4, would be coming into the office that day to “job shadow”. Knowing that Witness 4 is a former police officer, Witness 1 said that this news sent her anxiety “through the roof.” Witness 1 indicated that normally this type of information is sent through the supervisor; however, the supervisor was off sick that day.

Witness 1 stated that she had a breakdown in front of Witness 2 and made it known that she did not want to be present when Witness 4 was in the office.

Witness 1 had previously discussed her personal [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] situation with Witness 3 [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]. On the date of the scheduled job shadow, Witness 3 was on duty. Witness 1 indicated that she overheard Witness 2 talking to Witness 3 about Witness 1 being uncomfortable with being in the same room as Witness 4 for the job shadow. During this exchange the fact that Witness 1 had a personal connection to Ms. Brisson was also mentioned.

Witness 1 emphasized that her concerns were not related to Ms. Brisson. During her break, she texted Witness 3, questioning why Ms. Brisson was brought into this and asked that her name not be included moving forward.

Witness 1 stated that no one from the CPS or CPSB has ever approached her to advise that any of her personal matters were discussed at a CPSB meeting. Witness 1 feels that the matter was blown out of proportion and that this incident has brought back the initial anxiety she experienced when she was arrested.

Interview of Witness 2:

IoP investigators interviewed Witness 2. Witness 2 stated that in early September 2024, she received a call from a CPS inspector advising that CPSB member, Witness 4, would be visiting the unit that day to “job shadow”. The call was directed to her because the unit supervisor was away.

Witness 2 explained that she and Witness 1 are close friends and that Witness 1 had previously confided in her regarding her personal [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] incident. Witness 2 started her shift before Witness 1 and received the inspector’s call before Witness 1 arrived. Witness 2 waited until Witness 1 had settled in before informing her about Witness 4’s upcoming visit. Upon hearing the news, Witness 1 became visibly upset and began to cry.

Witness 2 stated that Witness 1 did not want Witness 4 in the room and that Witness 1 also felt embarrassed about the matter. Witness 2 asked Witness 1 if she would like her to speak with Witness 3. While still tethered to the radio, Witness 2 spoke with Witness 3 at the door. Witness 2 relayed to Witness 3 that Witness 1 did not want to be in the office with Witness 4 and that both Witness 4 and Ms. Brisson know about Witness 1’s personal [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] situation. Witness 2 also stated that Witness 1 believed that Witness 4 knew about her personal matters as he is a former police officer with the police service that laid the criminal charges. Witness 2 asked Witness 3 to change Witness 4’s job shadowing to a different shift.

Later that morning, Witness 2 received either a phone call or email from Human Resources advising that Witness 4 would no longer be “job shadowing” that day. Witness 2 informed Witness 1 and no further discussion took place between them on the matter. Witness 2 stated that she was never informed of any breach of information being discussed at a CPSB meeting. She also noted that, throughout the year, Ms. Brisson was the only board member who would regularly greet civilian staff in the office. Witness 2 suggested that the situation may have stemmed from a misunderstanding related to her earlier conversation with Witness 3 and believes it could have been resolved if someone from management had simply come down to clarify what had been said.

Interview of Witness 3:

IoP investigators interviewed Witness 3. Witness 3 stated that approximately 8 months ago, Witness 2 approached him [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]. Witness 2 shared their concerns that Witness 1's personal matters had somehow been discussed at a CPSB meeting and that board members were aware of the criminal charges. Witness 2 also informed him that Witness 4 was scheduled to "job shadow" that day, which made Witness 1 uncomfortable.

Witness 3 stated that no notes of the conversation with Witness 2 were taken [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

After this conversation, Witness 3 stated that he spoke with Witness 1, who requested that Ms. Brisson's name be left out of this situation. Witness 3 indicated that there was some connection between Witness 1 and Ms. Brisson and that he believed that they were friends.

Witness 3 indicated that he does not attend CPSB meetings, nor does he know if any conversations concerning Witness 1's personal matters had taken place at the board level.

Witness 3 indicated that he notified a CPS inspector of the situation as they were aware of Witness 1's personal circumstances and would be able to deal with the "job shadowing" issue as Witness 3 did not have the authority to do so.

[Redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] Witness 3 also advised that the notified inspector was the only person that he reported the matter to.

[Redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] Witness 3 also indicated that he feels terrible that Witness 1 has been caught up in all of this.

Interview of Witness 4:

IoP investigators interviewed Witness 4. Witness 4 stated that he and Ms. Brisson attended a Police Service Board (PSB) conference in Collingwood in early June 2024. During their travel to the conference, they became aware that a civilian member of the CPS had been charged criminally. Witness 4 could not recall how they came to know this information, or the identity of the individual involved.

He explained that this led to a general discussion in which he questioned whether CPS had a policy addressing situations where civilian members are charged under the Criminal Code. According to Witness 4, Ms. Brisson stated she was not aware of such a policy. Witness 4 indicated that he planned to raise the issue at the next CPSB meeting. However, he also suggested that the board should allow the Chief to bring the matter forward first, noting that the Chief had a responsibility to inform the board of such issues involving CPS personnel.

On June 6, 2024, during a CPSB closed meeting, Witness 4 indicated that the Chief did not bring up the issue. Near the end of the meeting, Witness 4 raised his hand and asked for a point of order. Witness 4 indicated that the board was aware that a civilian member had been charged and that the board wanted to know if there is a policy concerning civilian members that have been charged criminally. Witness 4 stated that he did not provide any specific information such as the member's name, gender or position of employment of the person charged.

Witness 4 stated that the Chief was a "little defensive", spoke with the Deputy Chief, and stated that there was in fact a gap in the policy. Witness 4 indicated that he directed the Chief to have a policy in place by September. Witness 4 stated that his concern was that the CPS civilian member had access to sensitive information such as CPIC and RMS and would be capable of searching information on [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]. Witness 4 stated that sometime during the summer of 2024, during a personal outing in the city, the Chief asked to speak with him. Witness 4 advised the Chief that he did not want to get the civilian member in trouble; he just wanted to ensure that there was a policy in place to deal with the issue.

Witness 4 reported that he knew which police service laid the criminal charges; however, he did not receive any further information, nor did he seek any information from that Service. Witness 4 believes that Ms. Brisson initially told him about the matter. Witness 4 explained the CPSB process in relation to adding items on the agenda. Witness 4 stated that he did not follow the process as he was waiting to see if the Chief would address the issue first. Witness 4 was of the belief that when a sworn member is charged, the Chief would notify the board during the closed portion of the CPSB meeting.

Witness 4 stated that on October 3, 2024, the Chief had advised that a policy was in place and the gaps were closed.

Witness 4 stated that Ms. Brisson did not identify the member; rather, she said that it was a civilian member of the CPS. Witness 4 indicated that Ms. Brisson did not tell him as to how she found out about this information.

Witness 4 stated that his purpose for bringing up the issue was not to get the civilian member in trouble, rather it was to protect the victim. Witness 4 also stated that it was not personal at all as he did not know the civilian member or [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24].

Witness 4 stated that the policy concerning charged CPS civilian members is not retroactive. Witness 4 re-iterated that he did not discuss any personal details with anyone other than CPSB members about this issue.

Interview of Witness 5:

IoP investigators interviewed Witness 5. Witness 5 stated that at the June 6, 2024 closed portion of the CPSB meeting, Witness 4 called a point of order as to whether there was a policy in place to deal with civilian members who committed a criminal offence. Chief Spowart replied that there was.

Witness 5 also indicated that Witness 4 did not follow the CPSB protocol, in that he should have noted the question in the agenda, which is prepared one week in advance. Witness 5 advised that Witness 4 is a new board member, having joined the CPSB in February 2024.

Witness 5 stated that she was not aware of any CPS member being charged with a criminal offence, however the board members do receive updates about those issues. In her role, Witness 5 advised that she is not privy to that information and would not be able to speak on behalf of other members. Witness 5 indicated that there is a daily “police blotter” on Facebook which is available to the public, however, she does not subscribe to those updates.

Witness 5 indicated that Witness 4’s question was generic, and that he did not provide any personal identifiers or narrative to any criminal charges.

Witness 5 further indicated that at the September 12, 2024 board meeting, then Chair Maurice Dupelle, brought up the fact that Witness 4 was supposed to job shadow in a civilian CPS unit, however, the civilian member was uncomfortable, as “something” may have been discussed at a board meeting.

[Redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] Witness 5 stated that the issue came to light on September 6, when Chief Spowart called Mr. Dupelle and said that a civilian member was uncomfortable with Witness 4 “job shadowing”. The following Monday, Chief Spowart sent a written correspondence that Ms. Brisson may have said something that she should not have at a board meeting. Witness 5 advised that Mr. Dupelle directed her to send the information to Graham Wight, Police Service Advisor.

Witness 5 stated that at the October 3, 2024, public board meeting, the Chief gave an update in relation to the policy for civilians charged with criminal offences. The Chief replied that the policy was reviewed, and gaps were identified, resulting in changes to the reporting and discipline processes. Witness 5 also indicated that no personal details or identifiers were mentioned.

Witness 5 stated that no personal names or details were ever discussed, other than in the paperwork that was sent from the Chief to the Chair.

Subject Police Service Board Member Interview

IoP investigators conducted an interview with Ms. Brisson. Ms. Brisson has been a member of the CPSB for two years. Ms. Brisson held the position of Acting Chair through the latter part of 2024 and was elected Chair in January 2025.

Ms. Brisson stated that she is a very active board member and has attended all available PSB training opportunities. Ms. Brisson also indicated that she has not been the subject of any investigation prior to this incident.

[Redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] Ms. Brisson stated that she ran into [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] one day. [Redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] told her that [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] had called the police, resulting in both [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] and Witness 1 being charged criminally. Ms. Brisson indicated that [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] was worried that Witness 1 would be fired. Ms. Brisson replied that the board does not deal with operational issues. After this encounter, Ms. Brisson stated that she kept her distance from [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] .

Ms. Brisson stated that she did not feel comfortable about the information because she did not know if she had to do something as a board member, as there were possible liability issues with having a charged civilian member on the service. Ms. Brisson indicated that she sat on the information for a couple of weeks. Ms. Brisson also indicated that she assumed that Chief Spowart was already aware of the situation.

Ms. Brisson indicated that in June 2024, while attending a PSB conference with Witness 4, she asked him what would happen in his former service if a similar situation occurred. Witness 4 told her that the civilian would be sent home, and that an investigation would take place. Ms. Brisson stated that Witness 4 asked what was going on, to which she replied that she was struggling with this information and did not know what to do. At the conference, Witness 4 told her that he would bring up the question at the next meeting as to whether there was a policy in place for civilian members that were charged criminally.

Ms. Brisson did not have any conversations with anyone on the CPS about this issue, nor did she have any conversation with the civilian member that was charged.

Ms. Brisson stated that at the end of the June 2024 closed portion of the CPSB meeting, Witness 4 brought up a question as to whether the CPS had a policy in place regarding civilian members that have been charged with a criminal offence, to which the Chief replied that there were in fact gaps in the policy. Ms. Brisson advised that no personal identifiers were given by Witness 4, who in turn gave direction to the Chief for the gaps to be rectified.

Ms. Brisson stated that she is aware that board members were job shadowing in various CPS units, as she started this initiative with Chief Spowart.

Ms. Brisson stated that she has never divulged confidential closed meeting discussions in relation to this issue or any other confidential issues with anyone in the CPS. Ms. Brisson stated that the only communication she had with Witness 1 was when she was having a telephone conversation with [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24].

Ms. Brisson stated that she goes into the CPS station at least once a month to thank all the members that are on duty. Ms. Brisson indicated that certain areas of the CPS building are restricted, and board members do not have access to enter on their own.

Ms. Brisson stated that after the June closed portion of the CPSB meeting, she did not have any discussions with any CPS or CPSB member about the issue. Ms. Brisson indicated that Chief Spowart brought up the fact that a protocol was put in place in relation to civilians charged with a criminal offence during the September or October 2024 meeting.

Ms. Brisson stated that in relation to section 3 of the Code of Conduct for PSB members, she did not contravene this section. Ms. Brisson stated that in relation to section 14 of the Code of Conduct for PSB members, she did not contravene this section either. Ms. Brisson further indicated that she never disclosed confidential information whatsoever. Ms. Brisson also stated that this issue brought out the fact that there was not a proper CPS policy in place to deal with civilians charged with a criminal offence. Ms. Brisson indicated that since the CSPA came out, the CPSB is asking more questions to the Chief in relation to CPS policies.

Ms. Brisson stated that in relation to section 21(b) of the Code of Conduct for PSB members, Ms. Brisson stated that she did not contravene this section, nor did anyone else benefit from her actions.

Ms. Brisson stated that she did not hear anything about this investigation until Witness 4 told her that she was being investigated. Ms. Brisson advised that once she learned of the investigation, she spoke with the Police Service Advisor for guidance. [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]. Ms. Brisson mentioned that these investigations do bring out the areas that need improvement. Ms. Brisson also stated that she was not worried about being investigated.

Ms. Brisson stated that she has developed several new board policies. [Redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] Ms. Brisson stated that looking back, she would have done the same thing over, apart from maybe contacting a Police Service Advisor when she first learned of Witness 1's charges.

INVESTIGATION FINDINGS

I make the following findings, relying on the information collected during the investigation and summarized in part above:

- 1. Sometime during the month of May 2024, a member of the public advised Ms. Brisson that a civilian CPS member had been charged criminally.**
 - a. The Subject was advised [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] that both [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] and Witness 1 were charged criminally.

2. Ms. Brisson disclosed her knowledge of a civilian member of the CPS member being charged criminally to Witness 4.

- a. Ms. Brisson stated that she did not advise anyone of the information for a couple of weeks due to the fact that she did not know what her obligations were.
- b. Ms. Brisson and Witness 4 both confirmed that while attending a PSB conference, they had a conversation in relation to the fact that a civilian CPS member had been charged criminally.
- c. Ms. Brisson advised that she told Witness 4 about the issue, as Witness 4 would be able to provide guidance due to his previous employment as a police officer.
- d. Witness 4 advised Ms. Brisson that he would bring the matter up at the next CPSB meeting, which was to take place on June 6, 2024.

3. On June 6, 2024, during the closed session of the CPSB meeting, Witness 4 raised a point of order to the Chief of CPS and posed a question as to whether there was a CPS policy in relation to civilian members of the CPS that are charged with a criminal offence.

- a. Witness 5 indicated that Witness 4's question was actually a point of clarification rather than a point of order.
- b. Witness 4 acknowledged that he did not follow the CPSB protocol in relation to adding a question to the agenda, as he was waiting to receive an update from the Chief. Ms. Brisson, Witness 4 and Witness 5 agree that notifications to the board by the Chief have been done in the past when a sworn member of the CPS has been charged with a criminal offence.
- c. The Chief responded by stating that she would look into the matter. Witness 4 directed the Chief to report back to the board by September 2024.
- d. The Chief, Witness 4, Witness 5 and Ms. Brisson indicated that the question was generic in nature and that no personal identifiers or details of the charges were discussed.

- e. The CPS Chief reported in the October 2024 CPSB meeting that all gaps were identified and that there is now an updated CPS policy addressing the issue of civilian members facing criminal charges.

4. There is no information that Ms. Brisson disclosed confidential information to a civilian member of the CPS.

- a. After completing interviews with Ms. Brisson and all other witnesses, no information was provided that would suggest that any confidential information from the closed police service board meeting was disclosed.
- b. Witness 1 and Witness 2 believed that Witness 4 knew of the allegations simply due to the fact that he was a former police officer. Witness 4 stated that he was not privy to any details of Witness 1's charges and did not seek or receive information from anyone from his former police service.

777 Bay Street, 7th Floor
Toronto, ON M5G 2C8
Tel: +1-416-873-5930 or 1-888-333-5078
www.iopontario.ca

Improving policing performance to make
everyone in Ontario safer.

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français