

July 27, 2026

Delivered by E-mail

The Right Honourable Mark Carney
Prime Minister of Canada

The Honourable Gary Anandasangaree
Minister of Public Safety

The Honourable Sean Fraser
Attorney General of Canada and Minister of Justice

The Honourable Ruby Sahota
Secretary of State Combating Crime

The Honourable Lena Metlege Diab
Minister of Immigration, Refugees & Citizenship

Ms. Joanne Blanchard
Chairperson, Parole Board of Canada

Mr. Kevin D'Souza
Regional Vice-Chairperson
Parole Board of Canada, Pacific Region

Dear Sirs/Madams:

Re: Offender: Junior Clinton Gayle
Offence: First-Degree Murder and Attempted Murder
Sentence: Life Imprisonment

We are counsel for the family of murdered Toronto Police Officer Todd Baylis, Toronto Police Officer Michael Leone, who, while seriously wounded, survived an attempted murder, and the Toronto Police Association (“TPA”).

On what effectively amounts to two weeks’ notice, we were recently informed that Mr. Gayle’s next parole hearing has been scheduled for this Thursday, July 30, 2026. This was done without any consultation with the victims, their counsel and interested parties. To the contrary, PBC had promised that it would give us “timely” notice which we relied upon to our prejudice. PBC chose to renege on that promise. We were misled. That is an act of bad faith. PBC refuses to adjourn the hearing to the latter part of August or early September as we have requested to accommodate the victims of this unspeakable, gut-wrenching tragedy.

Page 2
July 27, 2026

For the reasons discussed below, the conduct of PBC amounts to an egregious miscarriage of justice. There has been a complete denial of natural justice and due process. Further, it constitutes a violation of the letter and spirit of the *Canadian Victims Bill of Rights* (“CVBR”), which itself expressly recognizes the *Charter* rights of victims guaranteed by the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (“*Charter*”). All of these factors are intended to prevent PBC from engaging in its mechanical, overly technical unprincipled and heartless interpretation of the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* (“CCRA”) and its Regulations. The effect of the government’s extremely narrow and overly technical interpretation of the CCRA is an unforgivable insult to the victims, their families, and every police officer in the country, particularly Toronto Police Officers. Further, the government should keep its promises. As a result, under the leadership of TPA President Clayton Campbell and the TPA Board of Directors, every effort possible will be made to right this terrible wrong and demand appropriate legislative reform. We seek your urgent intervention to prevent this injustice and further re-victimization.

The findings of the trial judge, The Honourable Justice Watt (later appointed to the Ontario Court of Appeal) are of paramount importance. He found as a fact, that Mr. Gayle “**executed**” Police Constable Todd Baylis whose service revolver remained strapped in its holster.¹

Specifically, His Honour held:

By their verdict the jurors concluded, as do I, that it was Clinton Gayle who fired first. It was Clinton Gayle who began the battle. He fired, I am fully satisfied, two (2) shots before his handgun jammed. The first struck Constable Leone in the shoulder and back. A matter of millimetres separated Constable Leone from paralysis, if not death. The second shot struck and killed Constable Baylis. It was fired from a distance of not more than six (6) inches from his temple. **For all practical purposes, he was executed** (para. 9).

The entire series of events which culminated in the gun battle outside the south exit door of 710 Trethewey occurred in consequences of the accused’s unlawful assault of Constable Baylis at the south exit door. It was the accused who took and maintained the initiative throughout. It was the accused who began, then escalated the violence. It was the accused who introduced handguns to the altercation (para. 11).

The prior criminal convictions of Clinton Gayle, as well as his sworn testimony at trial, reveal him to be **a gun-toting crack dealer who displays a brazen contempt for the law and those who enforce it** (para. 18).

¹ 1996 CarswellOnt 3242, [1996] O.J. 3020.

Page 3
July 27, 2026

The attitude of Mr. Gayle, which plainly emerges from a review of his previously-recorded criminal convictions, **is replicated by the entire absence of remorse which he displays for having snuffed out the life of one police officer and nearly duplicated the feat in relation to another.** It is one thing to maintain one's innocence, consonant with testimony given at trial. It is another **to be so devoid of humanity as to be incapable of expressing remorse for the egregious results of one's conduct** (para. 19).

Clinton Gayle is a 27 year old recidivist. On June 16, 1994, whilst under a final order of deportation and bound by a prohibition against possession of firearms and ammunition, he had in his possession a fully-loaded nine (9) millimetre semi-automatic handgun, as well another full clip of ammunition. **He was an itinerant seller of crack cocaine, ready to deal if, as and when the opportunity arose.** He appears not to have the slightest inclination towards lawful employment. **He regards the laws of this country and those who enforce or administer them with unrelenting contempt** (para. 20).

The offence committed was one of egregious and gratuitous violence. It involved the use of a weapon, unlawfully possessed, the only real purpose of which is to wound, maim, disfigure, endanger life or kill. **It was directed at a police officer acting in the course of his duties. It represents a frontal attack upon the community at large and its values** (para. 28).

The offender who committed the offence is a recidivist. **He is a person who has displayed an unwavering disregard, if not contempt, for our laws.** He traffics in drugs. He carries and uses loaded handguns. **He is incapable of remorse. The likelihood of recidivism, in my respectful view, approaches virtual certainty.** He requires to be incarcerated to ensure the protection of society, in particular those sworn to uphold laws ... (para. 29).

Justice Watt is not just any judge. He is one of Canada's most respected and distinguished jurists and is widely recognized as one of the country's foremost authorities on criminal law, with an extraordinary career as a prosecutor and a trial and appellate judge.

Justice Nordheimer also reached the same conclusion as Justice Watt on Mr. Gayle's 745 *Criminal Code* hearing.² Justice Nordheimer is currently a member of the Ontario Court of Appeal. A very distinguished three-judge panel of the Ontario Court of Appeal (Osborne A.C.J.O., Doherty, J.A. and Sharpe J.A.) also reached the same conclusions as Justice Watt,³ yet Mr. Gayle has denied the aforesaid findings and taken radically different and contradictory positions before

² [2013] O.J. No. 4124.

³ [2001] O.J. No. 1559.

Page 4
July 27, 2026

different panels of the PBC. To date, neither Mr. Gayle's Case Management Team nor the PBC have held Mr. Gayle accountable for his shifting positions. This is dangerous. Public safety is at risk.

The only constant at Mr. Gayle's parole and ETA hearings are the victims, members of the Toronto Police Association, representatives of the Chief of Police for the Toronto Police Service, support people for the victims and myself. It is therefore up to the victims, through the reading of their carefully prepared Victim Impact Statements at Mr. Gayle's hearings to properly and fully educate the various panels of the Board of what took place at previous hearings and expose how manipulative Mr. Gayle is through changing his evidence in material respects and/or shifting his position, seemingly assuming they will go unnoticed. This is why the TPA has been demanding legislative reform that would allow victims and members of the public to order transcripts of parole hearings, just as they may in all judicial and *quasi*-judicial proceedings in Canada.

It is trite to say that the first step toward rehabilitation and attempting to manage the risk to public safety against dangerous offenders like Clinton Gayle is taking responsibility and ownership of one's actions, thereby demonstrating insight into one's crimes and demonstrating genuine, sincere and honest remorse. The fact that Mr. Gayle continues to repudiate the findings of the trial judge and jury, upheld by the Ontario Court of Appeal, without being challenged by the PBC panel is deeply concerning. Therefore, if there is ever a case for a public in-person Parole Board hearing with well informed thoughtful Victim Impact Statements, it is this case. Yet, on January 19, 2026, PBC advised that Mr. Gayle applied for day parole and his review would be conducted by way of a file review – that is, a review behind closed doors without the victims, interested parties and the public being in attendance, effectively rendering it a secret hearing for an offender convicted of the first-degree murder of one police officer and attempted murder of another.

This news came as quite a shock, particularly, since we had already experienced a similar occurrence with the PBC – Pacific Region in regard to Craig Munro who murdered Toronto Police Officer Michael Sweet. After receiving strong objections, PBC reversed itself and held an in-person hearing in British Columbia for Mr. Munro which we all attended. PBC was therefore fully aware of our position, yet, once again, was attempting to proceed with a behind-closed-doors-file review for another offender who murdered a Toronto Police Officer. This is unacceptable. The law must be changed. It must be mandatory that all parole hearings for offenders convicted of first-degree murder – offenders who pose the greatest threat to public safety, be held in public.

Apart from telephone communications, by correspondence dated February 18, 2026, we again confirmed our objection to secret parole hearings and why, demanding a public in-person hearing as in the past. This was of vital importance in a justice system that demands transparency and accountability. Let's be clear – section 5 of the *CVBR* confirms that the criminal justice system consists, *inter alia*, of "the corrections process and the conditional release process in Canada". Therefore, the principles informing the *Access to Information Act* must apply to parole hearings for offenders convicted of first-degree murder and sentenced to life in prison, namely, "... to

Page 5
July 27, 2026

enhance accountability and transparency of federal institutions in order to promote an open and democratic society and to enable public debate on the conduct of those institutions”.

Having received no response, on March 9, 2026, we requested an answer to our February 18, 2026 correspondence. That same day, the PBC advised that our request would be shared with the Board and that “if” the Board deemed an in-person hearing necessary **“notification will be provided at the earliest opportunity”** (emphasis added). We relied on this express representation and undertaking in good faith. This said, there should be no “if” when dealing with offenders convicted of first-degree murder – offenders who represent the greatest threat to public safety.

Having not heard anything further, on April 16, 2026, we again wrote to the PBC impressing upon the Board the vital importance of a public, in-person hearing as in the past, and the need to be notified **“well in advance”**. The offences occurred in Toronto. The victims reside in Toronto, the Police Service and Association involved are in Toronto. The victims, their families, and the representatives have professional and personal commitments. They cannot reasonably be expected to simply drop everything and board a plane to British Columbia on short notice.

The federal government is free to transfer Mr. Gayle from Ontario where the crime occurred, to British Columbia. The *quid pro quo* is that reasonable and sensible accommodations must be made in serious cases such as first-degree murder to coordinate a hearing date and allow for sufficient time for the victims and their representatives to make travel arrangements.

On April 21, 2026, PBC advised our request was finally shared with the Board and “... should the Board determine a hearing is required, **timely** notification will be provided to you, as a victim representative” (emphasis added). We interpreted this to mean, among other things, that PBC accepted our request to be notified **“well in advance”**. Again, we relied in good faith on this further representation, promise and undertaking by government officials.

Our clients proceeded on the basis that the Government of Canada and PBC in particular, would act in good faith. It cannot be overstated that we accepted the PBC’s repeated promise, undertaking and representation that we would be notified at the **“earliest opportunity”** and in a **“timely”** manner and **“well in advance”**.

To our shock, on Friday afternoon, July 10, 2026, PBC advised that Mr. Gayle’s in-person parole hearing would be held in British Columbia on July 30, 2026, and that Victim Impact Statements were to be filed in three days (July 16, 2026). Apart from the PBC’s breach of its promise of **“timely”** notice of whether an in-person hearing would be held so that victims and their representatives could proceed accordingly, and apart from a clear breach of the letter and spirit of the *CVBR* and the victims’ *Charter* rights as confirmed in the *CVBR* itself, this constituted a serious insult to the victims and every police officer in Canada, particularly Toronto Police Officers. This re-victimization cannot be permitted.

Page 6
July 27, 2026

It is hard to accept that this was coincidental. It is clear that there is a direct link between PBC's decision to (i) conduct this hearing by a file review, behind closed doors, in secret; (ii) its decision to delay for months any decision on our request/demand for a public in-person hearing; and (iii) then blindsiding us with only a short notice, in the summertime, when most Canadians are on summer vacation – all to the exclusive benefit of the offender who “executed” Police Constable Todd Baylis. This is what results in public cynicism and disrespect for the administration of justice. Canadians know, intuitively, that this is wrong and completely unnecessary.

In the face of this injustice, PBC excused its broken promise and bad faith by asserting that its hands were tied, claiming that it must hold Mr. Gayle's parole hearing within six months of receiving his application for parole in January 2026. Ignoring the *CVBR* and the *Charter*, PBC maintains it has no discretion to extend that six-month period, irrespective of the unfairness and injustice. This position is untenable. In fact, the Supreme Court of Canada, appellate and trial courts across the country, have struck down legislation as unconstitutional by reason of the injustice caused, resulting from the absence of judicial or *quasi*-judicial discretion.

This said, by correspondence dated July 10, 2026, received by courier on July 13, 2026, PBC confirmed that the Board had recently reviewed Mr. Gayle's file, as it had always intended to do (by file review, not in-person review), thereby commencing the parole hearing. Section 122 (3) of the *CCRA* states that with respect to a review under this section that the Board may adjourn the review for a reason authorized by the Regulations for a reasonable period not exceeding the maximum period prescribed by the Regulations, which pursuant to section 157 (4) of the Regulation is two months. Therefore, the Board has the statutory authority to adjourn the review for up to an additional two months, from approximately July 10, 2026.

Further, Regulation 157 was plainly drafted for offenders serving fixed sentences, not life sentences. It states that where an offender applies for day parole pursuant to ss. 122 (1) or (2) of the *Act*, the application shall be submitted to the Board not later than six months before the expiration of **two thirds** of the term of imprisonment to which the offender has been sentenced.

Mr. Gayle was sentenced to life in prison. He had been denied parole twice, on June 27, 2019 and, October 29, 2024. **There is no “two-thirds” of a life sentence.** As discussed below, the political compromise reached in 1976 (July 14, 1976 to be precise), was that in exchange for abolishing the death penalty, offenders convicted of first-degree murder would be sentenced to **mandatory life imprisonment** with no eligibility for parole for 25 years. The compromise confirmed that **life imprisonment meant life imprisonment**. As the Supreme Court of Canada held in *R. v. Bissonnette* “**Parole is a statutory privilege and not a right**” (emphasis added).⁴

Accordingly, the six-month rule contemplated by Regulation 157 has no application to offenders serving life sentences. Even under PBC's mechanical, extremely technical interpretation of the *CCRA*, it has the authority to extend Mr. Gayle's parole hearing by two months.

⁴ *R. v. Bissonnette*, 2022 SCC 23, at para. 41.

Page 7
July 27, 2026

Alternatively, when interpreted through the lens of the *CVBR* and the *Charter*, the *CCRA* must be interpreted in a manner that allows for reasonable and measured extensions.

Shortly after receiving the voicemail message from the PBC on July 10, 2026 advising of the July 30, 2026 hearing, I called the PBC, but got a voicemail. Leaving a strong voicemail, followed by an e-mail that same day, I advised, *inter alia*, that the hearing had to be re-scheduled for the latter part of August or early September – a very modest adjournment.

We did take some solace in the fact that the written (as distinct from the verbal) communication described the July 30, 2026 hearing as being “tentatively scheduled”. We therefore assumed that the PBC would honour its promise and undertaking and agree to a modest adjournment of Mr. Gayle’s parole hearing. This was confirmed in our correspondence dated Monday, July 13, 2026.

The next day, July 14, 2026, the PBC advised that Mr. Gayle’s July 30, 2026 hearing would not be rescheduled. The Board’s reference to this being a “tentative” date was solely and exclusively for the benefit of Mr. Gayle. At his sole discretion he and he alone could request an adjournment, waive the hearing, or withdraw his application. The victims, by contrast, had no corresponding right to seek an adjournment regardless of the merits of such a request. The victims had no rights in this important respect. The PBC’s rigid position effectively renders the *CVBR* and the *Charter* irrelevant.

Without reference to any provision of the *CCRA* or its Regulations, PBC simply stated that legislative timelines that apply in this case require the Board to proceed with the hearing as scheduled and that there are no legislative provisions that would allow the hearing to be re-scheduled. For the reasons stated above, this is an untenable position and wrong in law. If otherwise the law must be changed immediately.

Not only does this render the promises made by PBC, that were relied upon by our clients and us in good faith, meaningless, it also means that the PBC can mislead victims into a false sense of security by delaying its decision for almost half a year (as it did), and then claim that because of the legislation, it cannot keep its promise of “timely” notice. Apart from being wrong in law for the aforesaid reasons, with all due respect, this is a shameful way to treat victims at their most vulnerable. As stated above, this is precisely the kind of conduct that fosters public cynicism toward the administration of justice and erodes respect for the rule of law.

We have reminded PBC of the supremacy of the *Charter* and the *CVBR*, and in particular the preamble of the *CVBR* and ss. 20, 21 and 22 thereof, but to no avail. The preamble to the *CVBR*, a federal statute passed by the Parliament of Canada, includes the following principles: “crime has a harmful impact on victims and on society; victims of crime and their families deserve to be treated with courtesy, compassion and respect, including respect for their dignity; victims of crime have rights that are guaranteed by the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*; [meaningful] consideration of the rights of victims of crime is in the interest of the proper administration of

Page 8
July 27, 2026

justice”. These words are not mere poetry or political symbolism. They are statutory principles enacted by Parliament that reflect Canadian values and are intended to guide the conduct of every participant in the criminal justice system. They demand more than lip service.

Section 20 of the *CVBR* requires the *Act* to be construed and applied in a manner that is reasonable in the circumstances and in a manner that is not likely to interfere with the proper administration of justice. Section 21 requires that every *Act* of Parliament such as the *CCRA* and its Regulations to be construed and applied in a manner that is compatible with the rights guaranteed under the *CVBR*. Section 22 states that if there is any inconsistency between the *CVBR* and any other *Act* such as the *CCRA* and its Regulations, the *CVBR* prevails. Again, these are not symbolic or aspirational provisions. They are strong statutory statements of principle and law by the Parliament of Canada that reflects important Canadian values, not to be ignored when inconvenient.

Further, notwithstanding that it is deeply offensive to the victims and the TPA and no doubt millions of Canadians that Mr. Gayle can exclusively control the process by consenting or not consenting to the requested brief adjournment, upon learning that neither PBC nor CSC had made such a request, we impressed upon them to do so. In the context of the *CVBR*, which as just stated guarantees that “victims of crime and their families deserve to be treated with courtesy, compassion and respect, including respect for their dignity”, it was profoundly humiliating, insulting and degrading for Mr. Gayle’s victims to be placed in the position of asking the offender for a favour, namely, his consent to a brief adjournment. This request was itself an affront to their dignity.

Let me explain this a different way. Clinton Gayle placed his illegally possessed firearm mere inches from the side of the head of a defenceless police officer (Todd Baylis) whose firearm was securely strapped in his holster and pulled the trigger blowing a hole in his head tearing apart his brain. But for his gun jamming, the same fate awaited Police Constable Leone. To force Clinton Gayle’s victims to ask him for a favour, is not just humiliating, degrading, insulting and an affront to their dignity – it’s cruel and PBC says this cruelty is authorized by the *CCRA* and not prevented by the *CVBR*. This is antithetical to Canadian values and Canadians’ sense of decency.

It is disturbing how insensitive and tone-deaf institutions and decision makers can be to the profound and enduring impact violent crimes have on victims. At least Parliament recognized this reality when it enacted the *CVBR*. Where gaps, inconsistencies or lacuna exist, the *CVBR* rectifies it. This legislation forces governments and government agencies to see what is transpiring through the eyes of the victim.

In this case, as just stated, but deserving emphasis, according to PBC and the government, the victims of Clinton Gayle, in a very vulnerable state, are forced, out of desperation, to ask him for a favour – the man who placed his illegally possessed firearm approximately 3” from the side of Todd Baylis’s head and pulled the trigger execution style and attempted to do the same to a second police officer whose life was spared only because Gayle’s gun jammed. This is an

Page 9
July 27, 2026

egregious and unforgivably shameless violation of the victims' rights protected by the *CVBR* and the *Charter*.

One would think that if Mr. Gayle had any insight into his crimes and was genuinely remorseful – two fundamental pre-requisites for any possible consideration for parole – he would gladly do so. In this sense, our request for an adjournment was a gift to Mr. Gayle to give him the opportunity to show insight, ownership, responsibility and remorse. It was an easy opportunity for Mr. Gayle to do the right thing even if insincere. But he just could not do that. He could not say “yes”. It is not in his nature. It is not who he is. His refusal speaks volumes. By refusing, Mr. Gayle confirmed exactly what Justice Watt said when he sentenced Mr. Gayle that he “**is incapable of remorse**”. Thirty-two years after the fact – thirty-two years to reflect on his actions, Mr. Gayle is the same person. After thirty-two years, Mr. Gayle has no insight into his offence. He still takes no ownership for what he did. He is incapable of remorse. After thirty-two years, he continues to display a brazen contempt for the law and those who enforce it. As Justice Watt found, Mr. Gayle continues to have an “unremitting contempt” for the laws of this country and the police officers who are duty bound to administer these laws.

Mr. Gayle had a choice – to say “yes” to his victims’ modest request or say “no”. He said “no”. He could have said my heart goes out to my victims – what I did was wrong and unforgiveable and if they want a brief adjournment then that is the very least I can do – so absolutely I say “yes” to their request. But he didn’t – he said “no”. It says it all – after 32 years of reflection.

Mr. Gayle, who is serving a life sentence for executing a Toronto Police Officer and attempting to do the same to another officer, has all the time in the world – he is serving a life sentence. A short adjournment for an offender who has been in prison for the past 32 years as part of his life sentence is of no consequence to him, yet according to CSC/PBC only he can decide whether a short adjournment is possible irrespective of any other consideration or the immeasurable hardship caused to his victims. This is not what Parliament intended, nor is it what justice demands.

This leads us to another important point and why this letter is also addressed to Ms. Diab. Prior to the execution of Police Constable Baylis and the attempted execution of Police Constable Leone, Mr. Gayle had been subject to a longstanding deportation order which, through breathtaking negligence and incompetence, the government failed to enforce. The government’s failure ultimately gave rise to a negligence action brought by the families which settled shortly before trial. Had the government properly enforced the deportation order, Mr. Gayle would have been deported back to Jamaica over 32 years ago and Todd Baylis would be alive today and Mike Leone would not have suffered the devastating injuries he did.

At the last parole hearing the panel informed us that they had been advised by Immigration Canada that if Mr. Gayle was granted parole, the Government of Canada would deport Mr. Gayle within 48 hours, the ultimate gift to Mr. Gayle. The prospect that PBC and the Canadian

Page 10
July 27, 2026

Government would effectively reward Mr. Gayle for his murderous acts by deporting him over 33 years after the fact, rather than 33 years earlier, is deeply disturbing. As matters stand, courtesy of PBC and the Government of Canada, within 48 hours of granting Mr. Gayle parole, Mr. Gayle will be on a beach in Jamaica, free to return to his drug trafficking activities, an outcome that would constitute the ultimate insult to the victims, every police officer in the country and Canadians' sense of justice and decency. For Mr. Gayle the government makes an exception – a life sentence is no longer a life sentence. Life imprisonment becomes little more than a pathway to eventual deportation. This makes a mockery of the correctional/parole and criminal justice system. We therefore need to know if this remains the current position of the Government of Canada.

As just stated, Parliament abolished the death sentence in 1976 as part of a political compromise. In exchange for eliminating the death sentence, offenders convicted of first-degree murder would be sentenced to life in prison without eligibility for parole for 25 years. The commitment/compromise was that life means life. When the PBC grants parole to a murderer serving a life sentence, the offender remains within its jurisdiction and subject to conditions imposed and enforced within Canada's correctional and parole system for life. If those conditions are breached, parole may be suspended or revoked and the offender returned to prison. Yet we are told that Mr. Gayle will be deported within 48 hours of being granted parole, with the result that PBC loses all jurisdiction over Mr. Gayle. In practical terms, life would no longer mean life for a person who executed a police officer. If parole is granted, the Government of Canada proposes to send this murderer to Jamaica, beyond the reach of the Canada parole system. That is fundamentally inconsistent with the legislative bargain Parliament struck in 1976. Nor can the PBC knowingly surrender the very jurisdiction Parliament entrusted to it over offenders serving life sentences. Let's be clear – context matters. But for the political compromise in 1976, Mr. Gayle would likely have been executed, and we would not be here today arguing over a short adjournment requested by the very victims of his heinous crimes. There must be some common sense and an air of reality.

To be clear, under no circumstances should Mr. Gayle be granted parole for the reasons stated herein. That decision, however, rests with the PBC panel presiding over Mr. Gayle's hearing. Should the Board take a different view, regrettable as that would be, the issue of the outstanding deportation order must be addressed.

At some point, the Government of Canada needs to give serious consideration to the comprehensive legislative reform package developed by the Toronto Police Association. There must be two substantive structural legislative changes to the *CCRA*, with one set of rules applying to the overwhelming majority of federal offenders serving fixed sentences and another governing, fortunately, a small minority of Canada's most dangerous offenders convicted of murder and serving life sentences. At least Regulation 157 (4) acknowledges this for the purposes of the six-month rule. It is not an answer that the PBC is too busy or understaffed when it comes to Canada's most dangerous offenders and public safety and the rights of victims. Canada's most dangerous offenders must be treated differently, with different priorities. That includes public in-person hearings with meaningful input from victims and reasonable accommodation that allows them to

Page 11
July 27, 2026

participate in the process. An offender who violently and deliberately takes the life of another – the most serious crime known to our laws, cannot be treated in the same manner as a person who is serving a fixed sentence for break and enter, theft or fraud. The legitimacy of our justice system is often measured by how it responds to the most serious of crimes – the crimes that represent the most serious threat to public safety. For more than three decades, the Baylis and Leone families have honoured every obligation the justice system has asked of them. They have attended hearings, relived unimaginable trauma, and continued to place their faith in the rule of law. The victims have kept their promises. It is now time for the Government of Canada to do the same – to honour its promise that victims matter, that life means life, and that justice remains worthy of the confidence of the Canadian people.

We ask that the immediate issues at hand be addressed meaningfully.

Thank you.

Yours very truly,

DANSON DELAVAR LLP

Per:

Timothy Danson

TSBD/hl

Timothy S. B. Danson

cc: Benjamin Roebuck
Federal Ombudsperson for Victims of Crime