



**ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE**

in the matter of a conduct hearing pursuant to the  
*Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act*, RSC, 1985, c R-10

Between:

**Designated Conduct Authority, "C" Division**

(Conduct Authority)

and

**Corporal Robert Beaulieu**  
Regimental Number 37690

(Subject Member)

---

**Conduct Board Decision**

Gina Lévesque, Conduct Board

March 26, 2025

---

Sabine Georges, Conduct Authority Representative

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CONDUCT PROCESS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>HOLDING A CONDUCT HEARING IN THE ABSENCE OF THE SUBJECT MEMBER .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>ALLEGATIONS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
SUBJECT MEMBER'S RESPONSE TO ALLEGATIONS .....	15
<b>EVIDENCE.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>FACTS ESTABLISHED BY THE CONDUCT BOARD.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>DECISION ON ALLEGATIONS.....</b>	<b>17</b>
ALLEGATION 1.....	18
<i>Particular 9 .....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Particular 10.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Particulars 10 to 22 .....</i>	<i>24</i>
ALLEGATION 2.....	27
<i>Expression Orale québécoise school .....</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Groupe Beaulieu Inc. ....</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Perturbés du CNR .....</i>	<i>33</i>
<b>CONDUCT MEASURES .....</b>	<b>34</b>
APPLICABLE LEGAL PRINCIPLES.....	35
CONDUCT AUTHORITY REPRESENTATIVE'S SUBMISSIONS.....	36
DECISION ON CONDUCT MEASURES .....	38
<i>Range of conduct measures.....</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Neutral factors.....</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Mitigating factors .....</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Aggravating factors.....</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Analysis.....</i>	<i>44</i>
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>46</b>

## SUMMARY

The *Notice of Conduct Hearing*, dated November 20, 2023, contains three allegations of contravention of the RCMP Code of Conduct: two allegations under section 8.1 and one allegation under section 7.1. One of the allegations of contravention of section 8.1 was withdrawn by the Conduct Authority before the hearing began.

The remaining two allegations concern the fact that Corporal Beaulieu allegedly provided inaccurate information during a security screening, contravening section 8.1 of the RCMP Code of Conduct (Allegation 1), and breached RCMP conflict of interest policies by holding employment or being involved with organizations without first obtaining authorization, contravening section 7.1 of the Code of Conduct (Allegation 2).

Corporal Beaulieu refused to participate in the conduct process, be it personally or through a representative. A conduct hearing was held in Corporal Beaulieu's absence.

As a result of this hearing, the Conduct Board has determined that Allegation 1 has not been established on a balance of probabilities. With regard to Allegation 2, the Conduct Board finds that the Conduct Authority has established that Corporal Beaulieu violated RCMP policies by engaging in activities related to the *Expression Orale Québécoise* school, without first obtaining authorization.

The following conduct measures were imposed: (a) an indefinite demotion from the rank of corporal to the rank of constable; and (b) an order that, within 60 days of service of the written decision, Corporal Beaulieu review the requirements of Chapter 17.1, "Conflict of Interest," of the *Administration Manual* and discuss them with his supervisor in order to establish that he has all the necessary authorizations relating to his outside activities.

## INTRODUCTION

[1] Corporal Robert Beaulieu is facing two allegations of contravening the RCMP Code of Conduct, namely an allegation of providing inaccurate information during a security screening contrary to section 8.1, and an allegation of discreditable conduct contrary to section 7.1.

## CONDUCT PROCESS

[2] On May 20, 2021, Corporal Beaulieu was summoned to an interview as part of a security clearance upgrade process (the security interview).

[3] On November 30, 2021, Inspector Marie-Ève Lavallée was notified that a memorandum from the Central Department Security Branch revealed potential contraventions of the Code of Conduct by Corporal Beaulieu. The memorandum (memo) states, among other things, that there are considerable discrepancies between the information Corporal Beaulieu entered in the *Pre-Interview Questionnaire* and the information he provided before and during the security interview. The memo also reveals that Corporal Beaulieu was involved in activities outside the RCMP for which he had not first obtained authorization.

[4] On January 18, 2022, Inspector Marie-Ève Lavallée ordered a conduct investigation under Part IV of the *Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act*, RSC, 1985, c R-10 [*RCMP Act*], with respect to four alleged contraventions of the Code of Conduct in connection with the information contained in the memo issued by the Central Department Security Branch.

[5] On February 5, 2022, Corporal Beaulieu sent an email to Inspector Marie-Ève Lavallée entitled [translation] “My defence against the 4 misconduct (conduct) charges (No file number)”.

[6] On September 20, 2022, Inspector Marie-Ève Lavallée received the conduct investigation report.

[7] On March 21, 2023, the Commanding Officer of “C” Division signed a *Notice to Designated Officer* requesting a conduct hearing in relation to five alleged contraventions of the RCMP Code of Conduct, namely, two alleged contraventions under section 8.1 (Allegations 1 and 5) and three alleged contraventions under section 7.1 (Allegations 2, 3 and 4).

[8] On April 18, 2023, I was appointed as the Conduct Board pursuant to subsection 43(1) of the *RCMP Act*.

[9] The *Notice of Conduct Hearing*, dated November 20, 2023, contains only three allegations, since Allegations 3 and 4, which concerned contraventions of section 7.1 of the Code of Conduct, were withdrawn by the Conduct Authority prior to the signing of said notice:

- (a) Allegation 1: Providing inaccurate information as part of a security clearance upgrade process contrary to section 8.1 of the Code of Conduct;
- (b) Allegation 2: Discreditable conduct contrary to section 7.1 of the Code of Conduct; and
- (c) Allegation 5: Providing inaccurate information during a conduct investigation contrary to section 8.1 of the Code of Conduct.

[10] On December 11, 2023, Corporal Beaulieu's supervisor attempted to hand-deliver him copies of the *Notice of Conduct Hearing* and the investigation report. Corporal Beaulieu refused to take possession of the documents.

[11] On December 13, 2023, the *Notice of Conduct Hearing* and the investigation report were sent by registered mail to Corporal Beaulieu's home address.

[12] On December 18, 2023, Corporal Beaulieu returned the envelope containing the *Notice of Conduct Hearing* to the detachment, unopened.

[13] On February 9, 2024, having received no response from the Subject Member pursuant to subsection 15(3) of the *Commissioner's Standing Orders (Conduct)*, SOR/2014-291 [*CSO (Conduct)*], I wrote to the National Police Federation to confirm the identity of the lawyer retained to represent Corporal Beaulieu in the conduct process.

[14] On February 16, 2024, the National Police Federation confirmed that it had been unable to obtain any instructions or request for assistance from Corporal Beaulieu.

[15] On March 4, 2024, I sent a letter to Corporal Beaulieu by registered mail, informing him that the conduct process was under way. The letter underlined how important it was for Corporal Beaulieu to participate in the conduct process, either personally or through a lawyer, since the

hearing could take place in his absence. The letter contained an invitation to a pre-hearing conference scheduled for April 9, 2024.

[16] On March 6, 2024, my letter was delivered by Canada Post to Corporal Beaulieu's home address.

[17] On March 7, 2024, Corporal Beaulieu returned the envelope containing my letter to me by registered mail, unopened.

[18] On March 19, 2024, in a last-ditch effort to reach Corporal Beaulieu for the pre-hearing conference, I asked the Conduct Authority Representative to contact the Division so that it could notify Corporal Beaulieu of the contents of my letter the next time he reported to his workplace in person in accordance with the directions of his suspension.

[19] On March 20, 2024, the Conduct Authority Representative confirmed that the request had been forwarded to the Conduct Authority. In addition, she informed me that Corporal Beaulieu had been on sick leave since January 9, 2024, but that RCMP Occupational Health Services had confirmed that this sick leave did not prevent Corporal Beaulieu from participating in the conduct process.

[20] On March 25, 2024, the Conduct Authority wrote to Corporal Beaulieu requesting his response to the allegations, as required by subsection 15(3) of the *CSO (Conduct)*, and informing him, among other things, of the date of the first pre-hearing conference. This letter was received by Corporal Beaulieu at his home address on March 27, 2024.

[21] Corporal Beaulieu did not attend the pre-hearing conference on April 9, 2024, be it personally or through a lawyer. At the pre-hearing conference, it was determined that Corporal Beaulieu's conduct hearing would be held by videoconference from August 19 to 23, 2024.

[22] On June 11, 2024, I wrote to Corporal Beaulieu again, notifying him of the date of his conduct hearing and inviting him to take part in the next pre-hearing conference scheduled for June 26, 2024.

[23] On June 13, 2024, Canada Post tried to deliver the letter to Corporal Beaulieu's home address, to no avail. Canada Post therefore left a delivery notice notifying Corporal Beaulieu that mail addressed to him was ready for pickup at the post office.

[24] On June 18, 2024, Canada Post sent a final notice to Corporal Beaulieu's home address, reminding him that mail addressed to him was ready for pickup at the post office.

[25] On June 19, 2024, I asked the Conduct Authority Representative to send me the time extensions granted with respect to Allegations 1, 2 and 5, because of concerns about these issues, raised following a closer review of the documentary evidence contained in the file.

[26] On June 20, 2024, the Conduct Authority Representative confirmed that the Director General of the Workplace Responsibility Branch had granted an extension of time for Allegations 1 and 2 on November 23, 2022. The deadline for convening the conduct hearing for these two allegations had been extended to March 30, 2023.

[27] On June 26, 2024, a second pre-hearing conference was held in Corporal Beaulieu's absence. During this meeting, the Conduct Authority Representative informed me that the Conduct Authority was requesting that Allegation 5 made under section 8.1 of the Code of Conduct be withdrawn as the conduct hearing was convened after the expiry of the time limit prescribed in subsection 41(2) of the *RCMP Act* and there had been no request for an extension of time for this allegation. The Conduct Board agreed to this request and withdrew Allegation 5.

[28] At the same pre-hearing conference, the Conduct Authority Representative confirmed that Corporal Beaulieu sick leave had ended on May 4, 2024, and that Occupational Health Services had confirmed that he was still fit to participate in the conduct process.

[29] On June 28, 2024, Canada Post returned the envelope containing the letter dated June 11, 2024, which Corporal Beaulieu had failed to pick up at the post office.

[30] On July 2, 2024, I ordered the Conduct Authority Representative to send me, by August 7, 2024, a copy of the security documents completed by Corporal Beaulieu at the beginning of the process to upgrade his security clearance since I considered that I needed these documents to fulfill my role under subsection 45(1) of the *RCMP Act*.

[31] On July 5, 2024, in consideration of the anticipated delays in obtaining these documents, the conduct hearing was postponed to the week of October 7, 2024.

[32] On July 8, 2024, I sent Corporal Beaulieu the summaries of the pre-hearing conferences of April 9, 2024, and June 26, 2024. I also informed him that the next pre-hearing conference would be held on August 13, 2024, and that the conduct hearing would be held from October 7 to 11, 2024.

[33] On July 10, 2024, Canada Post delivered this letter to Corporal Beaulieu's home address.

[34] On July 15, 2024, Corporal Beaulieu returned the envelope containing my letter of July 8, 2024, to me by registered mail, unopened.

[35] On August 6, 2024, the Conduct Authority Representative informed me that Corporal Beaulieu was once again on sick leave, until September 1, 2024.

[36] On August 6, 2024, the Conduct Authority Representative forwarded me the security documents completed by Corporal Beaulieu at the start of the security clearance upgrade process.

[37] On August 7, 2024, I drafted a *Determination of Established Facts* based on the investigation report and supporting documents appended to that report.

[38] On August 13, 2024, the final pre-hearing conference was held. Corporal Beaulieu failed to appear.

[39] On October 7, 2024, the conduct hearing was held by videoconference without Corporal Beaulieu as he failed to appear at the hearing, be it personally or through a representative. As the Conduct Authority did not call any witnesses during the allegations phase, the Conduct Authority Representative presented her arguments immediately after the Conduct Board's opening remarks.

[40] On October 9, 2024, I delivered my oral decision on the allegations and concluded that Allegation 2 had been established on a balance of probabilities.

[41] On October 10, 2024, the conduct measures phase began with the submissions of the Conduct Authority Representative.



[42] On October 18, 2024, I delivered my oral decision on conduct measures and imposed a demotion for an indefinite period from the rank of corporal to the rank of constable in addition to ordering Corporal Beaulieu to review the requirements of the *Administration Manual*, Chapter 17.1, “Conflict of Interest,” and to discuss them with his supervisor in order to establish that he has all the necessary authorizations relating to his outside activities.

[43] This written decision expands on, clarifies and supplements the reasons given in the oral decisions delivered at the conduct hearing.

### **HOLDING A CONDUCT HEARING IN THE ABSENCE OF THE SUBJECT MEMBER**

[44] Subsection 45.1(8) of the *RCMP Act* and section 14 of the *CSO (Conduct)* allow a Conduct Board to hold a conduct hearing in the absence of the subject member where the Board is satisfied that the subject member has received reasonable notice of the date, time and place of the hearing and has failed to provide a reasonable cause for not attending the hearing.

[45] I note that Corporal Beaulieu has refused to take part in the conduct process and has done so from the very beginning. In fact, Corporal Beaulieu has made a considerable effort in this regard by systematically refusing any communication addressed to him in connection with the conduct process. Despite this, the *Notice of Conduct Hearing* is deemed to have been served on Corporal Beaulieu on December 20, 2023, pursuant to subsection 15(6) of the *Royal Canadian Mounted Police Regulations, 2014*, SOR/2014-281.

[46] For my part, I tried to contact Corporal Beaulieu three times by registered mail to invite him to take part in the process and to notify him of the dates of his conduct hearing, without success. Corporal Beaulieu redirected those items to me unopened or simply failed to pick up an envelope at the post office, and it was returned to me by Canada Post.

[47] The *Notice of Place, Date and Time of Conduct Hearing*, dated August 14, 2024, was hand-delivered to Corporal Beaulieu on September 11, 2024, as confirmed by Sergeant Eric Demers in a certificate of service. On September 16, 2024, Sergeant Demers received an envelope from

Corporal Beaulieu containing the documents he had hand-delivered to him on September 11, 2024.<sup>1</sup>

[48] I also note that Corporal Beaulieu's supervisor sent him a text message on the morning of October 7, 2024, reminding him that his conduct hearing would take place that same day on Zoom and providing him with the link to join this virtual meeting.<sup>2</sup>

[49] I am therefore satisfied that Corporal Beaulieu did receive reasonable notice of the date, time and place of the hearing, even though he decided to return the envelope containing this notice to Sergeant Demers a few days later. In fact, I note that several attempts were made to notify Corporal Beaulieu of the date, time and place of the hearing, but that he did not respond to these.

[50] On several occasions during the conduct process, I was notified by the Conduct Authority Representative that Corporal Beaulieu was on sick leave. However, the Conduct Authority Representative also confirmed to me that Occupational Health Services had determined that this situation did not prevent Corporal Beaulieu from participating in the conduct process. Moreover, at no time during the process did Corporal Beaulieu indicate to me that he could not take part in the hearing for medical reasons.

[51] Although he had been notified of the conduct hearing, Corporal Beaulieu failed to attend in person or through a representative and failed to provide reasonable cause for not attending. Accordingly, I decided to proceed with the conduct process pursuant to subsection 45.1(8) of the *RCMP Act* and section 14 of the *CSO (Conduct)*.

## ALLEGATIONS

[52] Corporal Beaulieu faces two allegations of contraventions of the Code of Conduct, as set out in the *Notice of Conduct Hearing* of November 20, 2023:

[Translation]

---

<sup>1</sup> Will-Say of Corporal Shawn Firlotte, dated October 8, 2024, recounting the attempts and efforts made by the Division to contact Corporal Beaulieu, at page 4.

<sup>2</sup> Will-Say of Corporal Shawn Firlotte, dated October 8, 2024, recounting the attempts and efforts made by the Division to contact Corporal Beaulieu, at page 6.

Facts relevant to all allegations

1. You have been a regular member of the RCMP since 1982, with over 40 years of service.
2. In 1993 you were promoted to corporal, and in October 2021 you were demoted to the rank of constable.
3. In March 2021, because of the closure of the Commercial Crime Section, you were transferred to “C” Division’s Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit (CFSEU).

**Allegation 1**

**Between March 30, 2021, and May 21, 2021, in an unknown city in the province of Quebec, Constable<sup>3</sup> Robert Beaulieu provided inaccurate information during a security screening of his person by the Central Department Security Section. It is therefore alleged that [Corporal] Robert Beaulieu contravened section 8.1 of the RCMP Code of Conduct.**

Particulars:

4. In November 2020, Acting Inspector Francis Martin (A/Insp. Martin) of the CFSEU requested that your security clearance be upgraded from “Secret” to “Top Secret.”
5. A/Insp. Martin met with you to express his concerns about you working from home while renting out rooms to several foreign students. He wanted to ensure that RCMP information and assets were well protected.
6. On March 31, 2021, you submitted the French version of Form 1020-1, which you had completed by answering the included questions in anticipation of the security/reliability interview.
7. Question 4 of this form, in the [translation] “Associations” section, reads as follows: [translation] “List all clubs, organizations, or associations that you belong to or have belonged to or that you have contributed financially to or otherwise supported”; you answered: “Les Pollués de Montréal Trudeau inc. [in block letters, the same line also has “Pierre PÉLOQUIN pierre.e.lachapelle@gm”) (sic)], the Parti Québécois and the Bloc Québécois.
8. The investigation revealed considerable discrepancies between the information provided in the pre-interview questionnaire and the information obtained before and during the security/reliability interview.

Compagnie Gestion Immobilière Attaché inc. (“GIA”)

9. You stated in the interview that the company’s hours of operation were based on employee availability and said that you had never indicated hours

---

<sup>3</sup> In October 2021, Corporal Beaulieu was demoted to the rank of constable for a period of 30 months. He was reinstated as a corporal in April 2024.

from Monday to Friday, when in fact the GIA website provided the following hours of operation on March 17, 2021:

Tuesday 9:00 AM—9 h

Wednesday 9:00 PM—9 h

Thursday 9:00 PM-9:00 PM

Friday 9:00 PM—9 h

Saturday By appointment

Sunday Closed

Monday By appointment

10. You were asked whether there were any sub-companies associated with GIA and you answered “no”, whereas an open source search revealed 64 companies under the GIA name. These 64 companies were not mentioned in the questionnaire or during the interview.

Expression Orale québécoise school

11. You failed to mention the Expression Orale québécoise school in the questionnaire.

12. The school’s website indicates that you have been operating the school since 2020, and the costs associated with teaching services.

13. At the security interview on May 20, 2021, you admitted to renting rooms to tenants with the option of learning French through the school.

Le Groupe Beaulieu Inc.

14. You failed to mention Le Groupe Beaulieu Inc. in the questionnaire.

15. On May 20, 2021, during your security interview, you were asked about your activities with Le Groupe Beaulieu Inc. You initially stated that you did not know this company and that you had never used it.

16. The open source search identified your Facebook profile as being associated with Le Groupe Beaulieu inc.

Les Pertubés (sic) du Canadian National Railways (CNR)

17. You failed to mention Les Pertubés (sic) du CNR in your questionnaire.

18. On May 20, 2021, during the security interview, you were asked about your activities in connection with Les Pertubés (sic) du CNR, and you indicated that this organization was active and that it was related to the noise caused by trains passing near your residence.

Email addresses not provided

19. In question 9 of the questionnaire, where you were asked to provide your email addresses, you provided only one email address: [email address redacted].

20. At the beginning of the interview, you provided another email address, namely [email address redacted].

21. Following the discovery of email addresses by TIOS [Tactical Internet Operational Support], you indicated that you also use [email address redacted] and [email address redacted].

Websites not provided

22. In the questionnaire, you failed to mention several websites belonging to you, such as:

- Gestion immobilière attachée (GIA) <http://www.gia.ca/>
- Website: Mécanique auto-mobile <http://www.gia.quebec/>
- Website (subdomain): les perturbés du CNR/ les perturbés du CNR (Canadian National Railway)
- <http://www.lesperturbesducnr.gia.quebec/>
- Website (subdomain): l'école Expression orale québécoise
- <http://expressionoralequebec.gia.quebec/>

Website: Entretien immobilier <http://entretienimmobilier.gia.quebec/>

**Allegation 2**

**Between an unknown date and May 20, 2021, at an unknown location in the province of Quebec, [Corporal] Robert Beaulieu contravened RCMP policies by holding jobs or entities, including the “Expression Orale Québécoise” school, without first obtaining authorization from the RCMP. It is therefore alleged that [Corporal] Robert Beaulieu contravened section 7.1 of the RCMP Code of Conduct.**

Particulars:

Expression Orale québécoise school

4. On October 6, 2020, it was announced on the GIA company website, that the website for the Expression Orale québécoise school was ready and up and running.

5. The website pages for the school include the following sections: “home”, “about us”, “classes”, “price list”, “registration”, “web extras” and “contact us”.

6. On May 20, 2021, during your security interview, you indicated that you were intending to open a language school after your service with the RCMP but not during it.

7. On November 8, 2021, you applied for authorization for secondary employment as a tutor. You later withdrew your application.

8. On February 5, 2022, you sent a letter to Sergeant Léo Albert (Sgt. Albert) in which you stated that you had never held, owned, operated or worked for the Expression Orale Québécoise school.

9. The school website indicates that you have been operating the school since 2020.

10. During the interview, you admitted to renting rooms to tenants with the option of learning French through the school.

11. You have not obtained your supervisor's approval for secondary employment in connection with the Expression Orale québécoise school.

Le Groupe Beaulieu Inc.

12. Using your street address, phone number and email address, an open source search identified your Facebook profile in connection with Groupe Beaulieu Inc.

13. In your security interview, you stated that you were not familiar with this name, before admitting that you were using it.

14. You did not submit a request for approval of secondary employment for your activities in connection with Le Groupe Beaulieu Inc.

Les Pertubés (sic) du CNR

15. During the interview, you were asked about your activities in connection with the organization Les Pertubés (sic) du CNR, and you indicated that this organization was active. You also mentioned that it was related to the noise caused by trains passing close to your home.

16. You did not submit a request for approval of secondary employment for your activities in connection with Les Pertubés (sic) du CNR.

**Allegation 3**

Withdrawn.

**Allegation 4**

Withdrawn.

**Allegation 5**

[Allegation 5 was withdrawn on June 26, 2024.]

[*French original quoted verbatim*]

### **Subject Member's response to allegations**

[53] Corporal Beaulieu failed to respond to the allegations in the *Notice of Conduct Hearing* pursuant to subsection 15(3) of the *CSO (Conduct)*. He therefore did not deny or admit the allegations, nor did he provide any written submissions.

[54] In addition, as Corporal Beaulieu failed to appear at the conduct hearing, the Conduct Board was unable to read the allegations to him, as required by subsection 20(1) of the *CSO (Conduct)*.

[55] Subsection 20(2) of the *CSO (Conduct)* provides that a member who does not admit or deny an allegation is deemed to have denied it.

[56] The file contains an email entitled [translation] "My defence against 4 charges of misconduct (Conduct) (no file number)" that Corporal Beaulieu sent to his supervisor on February 5, 2022, and in which he recounts the events leading up to the allegations and provides explanations. I note that this document was prepared less than 1 month after the conduct investigation was ordered, but some 21 months before the allegations were set out in the *Notice of Conduct Hearing* of November 20, 2023.

[57] Consequently, this document cannot be considered to be Corporal Beaulieu's response to the allegations in the *Notice of Conduct Hearing* in accordance with subsection 15(3) of the *CSO (Conduct)*.

### **EVIDENCE**

[58] The Conduct Authority did not call any witnesses at the hearing, relying solely on the documentary evidence in the record to establish the allegations.

[59] Subsection 23(1) of the *CSO (Conduct)* provides that if no testimony is heard at the hearing, the Conduct Board may render a decision with respect to the allegations based solely on the record. However, this evidence must be sufficient to prove the allegations.

[60] The documentary evidence in this case consists of the investigation report dated September 20, 2022, and its 50 appendices.

[61] The record also includes a request for an extension of the limitation period and the related decision, the security documents completed by Corporal Beaulieu at the beginning of the security clearance upgrade process, and the transcript of his security interview. These documents were obtained in response to orders for supplementary information which I issued on June 19, 2024, and on July 2, 2024.

[62] Lastly, in support of her pleadings, the Conduct Authority Representative submitted an affidavit from Sergeant Demers, dated September 16, 2024, and a Will-Say statement from Corporal Shawn Firlotte, dated October 8, 2024, in which they recount the attempts and efforts made by the Division to contact Corporal Beaulieu throughout the conduct process.

[63] I will therefore rely on this documentary evidence to render a decision in respect of the allegations.

#### **FACTS ESTABLISHED BY THE CONDUCT BOARD**

[64] On the basis of the evidence in the record, I issued a *Determination of Established Facts* on August 7, 2024.

[65] The facts relevant to all of the allegations contained in this *Determination of Established Facts* may be summarized as follows:

[Translation]

- (a) Corporal Robert Beaulieu has been a regular member of the RCMP since March 23, 1982.
- (b) From 2016 to March 2021, Corporal Beaulieu worked in “C” Division’s Commercial Crime Section.
- (c) On November 30, 2020, the head of the Commercial Crime Section submitted a request to “C” Division’s Personnel Security Unit to have Corporal Beaulieu’s security clearance upgraded from Secret to Top Secret.



- (d) On March 31, 2021, François Hébert, an investigator with the Central Department Security Section, requested an open source search regarding Corporal Beaulieu.
- (e) On March 31, 2021, Corporal Beaulieu completed the *Pre-Interview Questionnaire* form and sent it to Investigator Hébert.
- (f) On May 10, 2021, Investigator Hébert received the open source search report.
- (g) On May 20, 2021, Corporal Beaulieu's security interview was conducted by Investigator Hébert.
- (h) On December 2, 2021, Investigator Hébert drafted a continuation report in which he assessed the level of risk as medium and recommended that Corporal Beaulieu keep his Enhanced Reliability Status (ERS) at the secret level.

## DECISION ON ALLEGATIONS

[66] The burden is on the Conduct Authority to establish the allegations on a balance of probabilities.

[67] Under section 45 of the *RCMP Act*, the Conduct Board must decide whether the Conduct Authority has discharged its burden of proof. In other words, in this case, I must determine whether it is more likely than not that Corporal Beaulieu contravened sections 8.1 and 7.1 of the Code of Conduct. If I find that one or more of the allegations in the *Notice of Conduct Hearing* have been established, I must impose conduct measures that are proportionate to the nature and circumstances of the contravention of the Code of Conduct.<sup>4</sup>

[68] As held by the Supreme Court of Canada, the evidence must always be sufficiently clear, convincing and cogent to satisfy the balance of probabilities test.<sup>5</sup> Triers of fact must make their decisions on the basis of the totality of the evidence before them. The Supreme Court noted that there is no objective standard to measure whether the evidence is sufficiently clear, convincing and cogent.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> *RCMP Act*, at paragraph 36.2(e).

<sup>5</sup> *F.H. v McDougall*, 2008 SCC 53, at paragraph 46 [*McDougall*].

<sup>6</sup> *McDougall*, at paragraph 46.

[69] The particulars of each allegation are set out in the *Notice of Conduct Hearing*. The Conduct Authority is not required to establish every particular or every element of a particular, but only those that are essential to establish the allegations. Some particulars are provided simply to put the allegations into context.

### **Allegation 1**

[70] Section 8.1 of the Code of Conduct states that members must “provide complete, accurate and timely accounts pertaining to the carrying out of their responsibilities, the performance of their duties, the conduct of investigations, the actions of other employees and the operation and administration of the Force”.

[71] This section of the Code of Conduct covers a range of behaviours. The RCMP’s *Conduct Measures Guide*<sup>7</sup> (November 2014 version) specifically states that section 8.1 applies, among other things, in cases in which a member wilfully provides false or misleading information in the course of an internal investigation, such as a security investigation. This includes voluntarily withholding pertinent information.

[72] In this case, it is alleged that Corporal Beaulieu provided inaccurate information about his company, *Gestion immobilière attachée Inc.*, during the security interview and that he also withheld certain information from the *Pre-Interview Questionnaire*.

[73] To establish a contravention of section 8.1 of the Code of Conduct, the Conduct Authority must establish the following on a balance of probabilities:

- (a) the identity of the subject member;
- (b) the statement or information in question;
- (c) that the statement or information was inaccurate or incomplete; and
- (d) that the member
  - i. knew that the statements or information were inaccurate or incomplete; or
  - ii. was negligent with regard to the accuracy of the statements or information.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Conduct Measures Guide*, at page 74.

[74] Regarding the first element of the test for establishing a contravention of section 8.1 of the Code of Conduct, I am satisfied that the Conduct Authority has, on a balance of probabilities, established the identity of Corporal Beaulieu. The documents supporting this case include the *Pre-Interview Questionnaire*, duly completed and signed by Corporal Beaulieu on March 31, 2021.<sup>8</sup> Corporal Beaulieu emailed this form to Investigator Hébert on the same day.<sup>9</sup>

[75] The record further contains the recording and transcript of the security interview with Corporal Beaulieu, conducted by Investigator Hébert on May 20, 2021.<sup>10</sup> At the beginning of the security interview, Corporal Beaulieu identified himself with his date of birth and regimental number.<sup>11</sup>

[76] Regarding the other elements of the test, I will examine them in turn for each statement or piece of information referred to in Allegation 1, in order to determine whether the Conduct Authority has discharged its burden of proof.

#### *Particular 9*

[77] It has been established that Corporal Beaulieu has a family-owned residential property management company known as *Gestion Immobilière Attaché Inc. (GIA)*.<sup>12</sup>

[78] It has further been established that GIA has a website at <http://www.gia.ca>.<sup>13</sup>

[79] Particular 9 concerns information Corporal Beaulieu provided in the security interview regarding GIA's hours of operation. This particular reads as follows:

[Translation]

9. You stated in the interview that the company's hours of operation were based on employee availability and said that you had never indicated hours

---

<sup>8</sup> *Evidence Binder*, prepared by the Conduct Authority Representative (*Evidence Binder*), at page 71.

<sup>9</sup> *Evidence Binder*, at page 160.

<sup>10</sup> Investigation Report under Part IV of the *RCMP Act*, Schedule 6, and additional information obtained on August 7, 2024, pursuant to the order of July 2, 2024, to that effect.

<sup>11</sup> Transcript of security interview of May 20, 2021, at page 1, lines 18 and 19.

<sup>12</sup> *Evidence Binder*, at pages 127 to 132.

<sup>13</sup> *Evidence Binder*, at pages 135 to 138.

from Monday to Friday, when in fact the GIA website provided the following hours of operation on March 17, 2021:

Tuesday 9:00 AM—9 h

Wednesday 9:00 PM—9 h

Thursday 9:00 PM-9:00 PM

Friday 9:00 PM—9 h

Saturday By appointment

Sunday Closed

Monday By appointment

[80] It has been established that Corporal Beaulieu told Investigator Hébert during the security interview that his company's services were [translation] "provided based on employee availability. Normally on weekends".<sup>14</sup>

[81] When Investigator Hébert asked him, [translation] "You never indicated any hours from Monday to Friday?", Corporal Beaulieu first replied [translation] "No", and when the investigator repeated the question and asked him what the hours in question were, Corporal Beaulieu replied, [translation] "Maybe. Maybe. I don't know. I don't remember. . . . Anyway, no services are provided during the day."<sup>15</sup>

[82] The Conduct Authority contends that this information is inaccurate, as the GIA website on March 17, 2021, showed hours of operation for Monday to Friday.

[83] I carefully reviewed all of the evidence before me in order to locate the screenshot of the GIA website of March 17, 2021, showing these hours of operation, but was unsuccessful in doing so.

[84] When questioned about the absence of this information from the record during the conduct hearing, the Conduct Authority Representative was unable to provide the screenshot in question.

---

<sup>14</sup> Transcript of security interview of May 20, 2021, at page 22, lines 1236 and 1237

<sup>15</sup> Transcript of security interview of May 20, 2021, at page 22, lines 1241 to 1246.

Instead, she referred to Investigator Hébert's continuation report to prove the opening hours mentioned in Particular 9.<sup>16</sup>

[85] Unfortunately, the information contained in Investigator Hébert's continuation report does not constitute sufficiently clear, convincing and cogent evidence of the hours of operation displayed on GIA's website on March 17, 2021, as alleged in Particular 9.

[86] As a result, I find that the Conduct Authority has not established Particular 9 as it has not provided any evidence demonstrating that the information provided by Corporal Beaulieu during the security interview was false, misleading, inaccurate or incomplete.

#### *Particular 10*

[87] Particular 10 also concerns information Corporal Beaulieu provided during the security interview regarding GIA, namely that there were no sub-companies associated with GIA.

[88] The Conduct Authority alleges in Particular 10 that this information is inaccurate given that the open source search report identified 64 companies under the GIA name.

[89] It has been established that, according to the information available in the *Registre des entreprises du Québec* [Quebec Enterprise Register] for GIA (Quebec business number 1165763674), 64 company names are listed under the heading "*Autres noms utilisés au Québec* [other names used in Quebec]".

[90] It is further established that when Investigator Hébert asked him, [translation] "Are there any sub-companies in your company?", Corporal Beaulieu replied [translation] "No".<sup>17</sup>

[91] In order to establish that this statement was false or inaccurate, the Conduct Authority had to prove that the 64 company names identified in the open source search report were in fact sub-companies associated with GIA.

---

<sup>16</sup> *Evidence Binder*, at page 103.

<sup>17</sup> Transcript of security interview of May 20, 2021, at page 22, lines 1249 to 1251.

[92] In her submissions, the Conduct Authority Representative indicated that it was possible that GIA was a parent company with several divisions based on a fairly elaborate and well-structured business model and structure. However, the Conduct Authority Representative did not provide any evidence of the existence of such a corporate structure.

[93] The Conduct Authority Representative further alleged that the information available in the Quebec Enterprise Register shows that the [translation] “articles of incorporation of the sub-companies are in effect” and that the 64 company names are therefore active companies. Again, I note that these companies’ articles of incorporation are not part of the evidence on the record and that the open source search report makes no mention of these companies existing as separate entities. The report identifies only five companies in the Quebec Enterprise Register under Robert Beaulieu’s name.<sup>18</sup>

[94] I further note that the 64 company names revealed by the open source search report are listed in the Quebec Enterprise Register under the heading “*Autres noms utilisés au Québec*” and not as “sub-companies.” In addition, the words “*en vigueur* [in force]” also appear under the heading “*Autres noms utilisés au Québec*”.<sup>19</sup>

[95] During the security interview, Corporal Beaulieu clearly explained to Investigator Hébert that these names were not separate companies or sub-companies of GIA, but rather reserved names. He explained that he had reserved these corporate names with the Quebec government should he ever want to expand GIA’s operations in the future. He explained, however, that these plans had not yet come to fruition.<sup>20</sup>

[96] I note that this explanation is consistent with the information provided to the investigator tasked with conducting the conduct investigation by a representative of Services Québec when questioned about the Quebec Enterprise Register heading “*Autres noms utilisés au Québec*”. Indeed, Corporal Manon Villemaire’s continuation report, dated July 21, 2022, contains the following summary of a telephone conversation she had with this Services Québec representative:

---

<sup>18</sup> *Evidence Binder*, at page 127.

<sup>19</sup> *Evidence Binder*, at pages 129 to 132.

<sup>20</sup> Transcript of security interview of May 20, 202, at page 31, lines 1808 to 1854.

[Translation]

...

With regard to the [Quebec Enterprise Register entry] for GESTION IMMOBILIÈRE GIA INC. and all the company names identified in the section entitled “*AUTRES NOMS UTILISÉS AU QUÉBEC*”, Ms. CARIGNAN explained the following:

The person has to complete an annual update statement and submit an application when they want to reserve a company name. The information is entered in the system directly by the person. There is no limit on the number of company names that can be declared. Requested names may be refused if they are already in use or if they are in English.

When a person completes their application, the company name will be reserved for them for only 90 days. There is a \$25 fee for each application.

In the case of GIA INC. and all the names appearing in the “*AUTRES NOMS UTILISÉS AU QUÉBEC*” section and whose status is indicated as being “*en vigueur* [in force]”, she does not understand this. She confirmed that of these names only one has been deleted.

She found it strange that all the other company names said “*en vigueur*”. She could not explain it. In response to Cpl. VILLEMAIRE’s question as to whether the system was up to date, she said hesitantly that it should be.<sup>21</sup>

...

[*French original quoted verbatim.*]

[97] As a result, I am not satisfied that the information in the Quebec Enterprise Register establishes that the 64 company names under the heading “*Autres noms utilisés au Québec*” are in fact sub-companies of GIA, as alleged by Investigator Hébert in the security interview and by the Conduct Authority Representative in her submissions.

[98] As a result, I find that the Conduct Authority has not established Particular 10 on a balance of probabilities since it failed to establish that the information provided by Corporal Beaulieu in the security interview regarding the existence of GIA sub-companies was false, misleading, inaccurate or incomplete.

---

<sup>21</sup> *Evidence Binder*, at pages 178 and 179.

*Particulars 10 to 22*

[99] It is alleged that Corporal Beaulieu contravened section 8.1 of the Code of Conduct by withholding from the *Pre-Interview Questionnaire* the 64 company names (Particular 10), the *Expression Orale québécoise* school (Particular 11), *Groupe Beaulieu Inc.* (Particular 14), the *Perturbés du CNR* (Particular 17), 2 email addresses (Particular 21) and 7 websites (Particular 22).

[100] It has been established that Corporal Beaulieu did not report this information on the *Pre-Interview Questionnaire*.

[101] The particulars of Allegation 1 do not specifically say in which part of the *Pre-Interview Questionnaire* Corporal Beaulieu should have reported the 64 company names, the *Expression Orale québécoise* school, *Groupe Beaulieu Inc.* and the *Perturbés du CNR*.

[102] When questioned about this point at the hearing, the Conduct Authority Representative stated that these entities should have been reported as organizations in question 4 of the questionnaire, that question being entitled [translation] “*Associations*” and reading as follows: [translation] “List all clubs, organizations, or associations that you belong to or have belonged to or that you have contributed financially to or otherwise supported”.

[103] In response to this question, Corporal Beaulieu wrote by hand, [translation] “Les Pollués de Montréal Trudeau inc. the Parti Québécois and the Bloc Québécois”. At the beginning of the security interview, Corporal Beaulieu told Investigator Hébert that he wished to add the name and contact information of the president of “Les Pollués de Montréal Trudeau inc.” under question 4 of the *Pre-Interview Questionnaire*. Investigator Hébert added this information in block letters under question 4 of his copy of the questionnaire.

[104] To establish the third element of the test for a contravention of section 8.1, the Conduct Authority must establish that Corporal Beaulieu provided incomplete information by withholding the information contained in Particulars 10, 11, 14, and 17 from question 4 of the *Pre-Interview Questionnaire*.



[105] Upon reading the wording of this question, I am not persuaded that a reasonable person in the same circumstances would necessarily have understood that each of the entities referred to in Particulars 10, 11, 14, and 17 had to be reported in that part of the questionnaire.

[106] As mentioned above, Corporal Beaulieu explained during the security interview that he had reserved the 64 company names with the Quebec government should he ever want to expand GIA's activities in the future. This explanation was corroborated by a Services Québec representative in a telephone conversation with the investigator tasked with the conduct investigation. Given that the reserved names did not constitute separate organizations, I am not satisfied that Corporal Beaulieu was required to declare this information in question 4 of the *Pre-Interview Questionnaire* as organizations with which he was involved in any way.

[107] The same reasoning applies to *Groupe Beaulieu Inc.* This name is one of 64 company names listed in the Quebec Enterprise Register under the heading "*Autres noms utilisés au Québec*". The only evidence in the record relating to Corporal Beaulieu's activities in connection with *Groupe Beaulieu Inc.* is a reference to a Facebook profile containing a limited number of photographs and posts, the last of which dates back to December 29, 2015, and refers to the GIA website under the "Contact info" heading.<sup>22</sup> As a result, I am not satisfied that *Groupe Beaulieu Inc.* was an organization within the meaning of question 4 of the *Pre-Interview Questionnaire*.

[108] However, I will not dwell further on the issue of whether the Conduct Authority was able to establish that Corporal Beaulieu provided incomplete information in response to question 4 of the *Pre-Interview Questionnaire*, given that I am also not satisfied that the Conduct Authority established the last element of the test for section 8.1 of the Code of Conduct with respect to Particulars 10, 11, 14, 17, 21 and 22.

[109] The Conduct Authority Representative stated that it is inconceivable that Corporal Beaulieu was unaware of the organizations identified in Particulars 10, 11, 14 and 17, and of the email addresses and websites identified in Particulars 21 and 22. She argued that Corporal Beaulieu withheld this information deliberately and that he was dishonest in that regard. She admitted that it is difficult to prove intent but contended that in an administrative process such as

---

<sup>22</sup> *Evidence Binder*, at page 154.

this one, it is sufficient to establish that it is more likely than not that Corporal Beaulieu was aware of this information.

[110] The Conduct Authority Representative noted that [translation] “the mental element is present until proven otherwise, because . . . [Corporal] Beaulieu provided no evidence that could diminish the degree of blameworthiness or reduce his level of knowledge regarding the organizations or entities that were not mentioned, or the emails and websites that were not mentioned”.<sup>23</sup>

[111] I do not agree. Notwithstanding the fact that Corporal Beaulieu provided some explanations during the security interview, I note that the onus is on the Conduct Authority to establish all the elements of an alleged contravention of the Code of Conduct on a balance of probabilities, and not on the subject member to refute the allegations or establish that they did not intend to mislead.

[112] To satisfy the last element of the test for section 8.1 of the Code of Conduct, it is essential that the Conduct Authority establish on a balance of probabilities not only that the Subject Member knew that the provided information was incomplete, but also that he intended to mislead by voluntarily withholding that information or that he was reckless or negligent with respect to that information. The *Conduct Measures Guide* explains this point as follows:

One must not overlook the important nuance between a **false** report, which is intentionally written to mislead or pervert the course of justice, and an **inaccurate** report, where a member includes information that later proves to be untrue, either because the report was based on third party information, the officer’s perceptions, or simply a fault in memory, recollection, understanding, or perception. Again, adverting to Ceyssens:

There are three possible outcomes in case where a statement is false, misleading or inaccurate; it may be the product of actual intention to deceive, falsify or mislead (in which it would constitute misconduct), the product of recklessness or negligence (which may constitute [neglect of duty]) or the product of an honest mistake (which would not constitute misconduct).

---

<sup>23</sup> Transcript of the Conduct Hearing of October 7, 2024, at page 57, lines 9 to 15.

...<sup>24</sup>

[113] The Conduct Authority Representative alleged in her submissions that this was not a case of negligence or error, but rather a deliberate act, as Corporal Beaulieu's behaviour since the beginning of the conduct process demonstrates that he knows exactly what he is doing and that his actions are calculated. However, I note that she failed to provide any evidence establishing that Corporal Beaulieu voluntarily withheld the information mentioned in Particulars 10, 11, 14, 17, 21 and 22 from the *Pre-Interview Questionnaire* and that, in doing so, he intended to mislead.

[114] I therefore find that the documentary evidence does not allow me to conclude on a balance of probabilities that Corporal Beaulieu voluntarily withheld from the *Pre-Interview Questionnaire* the information mentioned in Particulars 10, 11, 14, 17, 21 and 22 of the *Notice of Conduct Hearing*. Consequently, the Conduct Authority has failed to establish that Corporal Beaulieu contravened section 8.1 of the Code of Conduct with respect to this information.

[115] In summary, since the Conduct Authority was unable to establish on a balance of probabilities that the information mentioned in Particulars 9 and 10 was inaccurate and that Corporal Beaulieu intended to mislead by withholding from the *Pre-Interview Questionnaire* the information described in Particulars 10, 11, 14, 17, 21 and 22, Allegation 1 has not been established.

## **Allegation 2**

[116] Section 7.1 of the Code of Conduct requires that "[m]embers behave in a manner that is not likely to discredit the Force".

[117] To establish discreditable conduct under section 7.1 of the Code of Conduct, the Conduct Authority must prove the following elements on a balance of probabilities:

- (a) the identity of the subject member; and
- (b) the particulars of the allegations that constitute the alleged conduct.

---

<sup>24</sup> *Conduct Measures Guide*, at page 72.

[118] If the Conduct Authority is able to establish these elements, the Conduct Board must determine:

- (c) whether the conduct of the subject member is likely to discredit the RCMP, that is, to determine whether a reasonable person in society, with knowledge of all relevant circumstances, including the realities of policing in general and the RCMP in particular, would view the behaviour of the subject member as likely to bring discredit to the RCMP, taking into account the reasonable expectations of the community (i.e., the reasonable person) regarding police conduct; and
- (d) whether the conduct of the subject member is sufficiently related to their duties and functions as to provide the RCMP with a legitimate interest in disciplining the member.

[119] The wording of Allegation 2 does not identify which RCMP policy Corporal Beaulieu allegedly violated by failing to obtain prior authorization for his outside activities. However, the investigation file contains a copy of the *Administration Manual*, Chapter 17.1, “Conflict of Interest” (July 5, 2021, version).<sup>25</sup>

[120] On October 4, 2024, in preparation for the conduct hearing, I brought to the attention of the Conduct Authority Representative the fact that the version of the policy included in the record was not the version in effect during the period covered by Allegation 2, namely between an unknown date and May 20, 2021. On October 6, 2024, the Conduct Authority Representative forwarded me a copy of the *Administration Manual*, Chapter XVII.1, “Conflict of Interest” (version dated November 28, 2014), which was in effect during the period covered by the allegation. I will therefore refer to this version of the policy in my analysis.

[121] Section 12.1.4 of the policy prohibits RCMP employees from participating in outside activities without attaining prior authorization. Authorization must be attained before the employee commences these activities.

[122] The policy also provides in section 12.2.3.2 that prior authorization is required for any activity, including a voluntary activity, if a conflict of interest exists or could exist.

---

<sup>25</sup> *Evidence Binder*, at page 180.

[123] Allegation 2 concerns three organizations for which Corporal Beaulieu allegedly did not first attain authorization, namely the *Expression Orale québécoise* school, *Groupe Beaulieu Inc.* and the *Perturbés du CNR*.

[124] I will consider each of these organizations in turn.

*Expression Orale québécoise* school

[125] The facts relevant to the *Expression Orale québécoise* school in the *Determination of Established Facts* can be summarized as follows:

[Translation]

...

- a. On October 6, 2020, a message on the GIA blog announced that the *Expression Orale québécoise* school's website was ready and that the school was providing oral and written French courses.
- b. The open source search report reveals the existence of a subdomain associated with [www.gia.ca](http://www.gia.ca) for the *Expression Orale québécoise* school ([www.expressionoralequebecoise.gia.quebec](http://www.expressionoralequebecoise.gia.quebec)).
- c. According to the *Expression Orale québécoise* school's webpage on March 17, 2021, the school was founded in 2020.
- d. On March 17, 2021, the *Expression Orale Québécoise* school's webpage indicated that [translation] "Mr. Beaulieu is a Quebecer with extensive experience teaching French to new immigrants".
- e. On March 17, 2021, the *Expression Orale québécoise* school's webpage contained a course and accommodation price list.
- f. During the security interview, [Corporal] Beaulieu indicated that he was intending to open a language school after his service with the RCMP.
- g. During the security interview, [Corporal] Beaulieu admitted that he had rented rooms in his residence to persons of foreign descent and given them French lessons.<sup>26</sup>

...

[126] I note that during the security interview, Corporal Beaulieu stated that he was intending to open a language school after he retires from the RCMP. When Investigator Hébert told him that the

---

<sup>26</sup> *Determination of Established Facts* dated August 7, 2024.

*Expression Orale québécoise* school's website was visible online and said that the school was founded in 2020, Corporal Beaulieu replied that it should not be online because it was a prototype and one of his employees, responsible for managing his websites, must have made a mistake.

[127] The Conduct Authority Representative argued that, considering the amount of information it contained, it was unlikely that the website in question had been published online by mistake. On this point, I note that the screenshots of the *Expression Orale québécoise* school website in the open source search report appear to show that the site had not been fully developed since the content in some languages was not the same and the price list did not appear in the French and Chinese versions of the site.<sup>27</sup>

[128] Corporal Beaulieu could not be questioned about this given that he failed to appear at the hearing. However, whether or not the *Expression Orale québécoise* school's webpage was published online by mistake does not change the fact that this information was available when the open source search was performed.

[129] On the basis of the facts established in this matter, I am satisfied on a balance of probabilities that Corporal Beaulieu has been engaged in activities related to the *Expression Orale québécoise* school since at least October 6, 2020. In addition, on the basis of the evidence in the record, I am satisfied that Corporal Beaulieu did not submit a request for prior authorization for activities related to the *Expression Orale québécoise* school.

[130] I therefore find that the Conduct Authority has, on a balance of probabilities, established the first two elements of the test for discreditable conduct.

[131] I will therefore consider the third and fourth elements of the test for establishing discreditable conduct, namely whether Corporal Beaulieu's behaviour was likely to bring discredit to the RCMP and whether it was sufficiently related to his duties and functions as to provide the RCMP with a legitimate interest in disciplining him.

[132] I find that a reasonable person in society, with knowledge of all relevant circumstances, including the realities of policing in general and the RCMP in particular, would view Corporal

---

<sup>27</sup> *Evidence Binder*, at pages 139 to 143.

Beaulieu's behaviour as likely to bring discredit to the Force. All RCMP employees must comply with existing policies, particularly those relating to conflicts of interest. In the case of Corporal Beaulieu, the evidence shows that he has more than 40 years of service with the RCMP and was aware of his duties under the conflict of interest policy. RCMP employees must uphold the highest ethical standards to maintain public confidence in the objectivity of the RCMP by avoiding actual, apparent or potential conflicts of interest. In addition, it is well established that RCMP members must comply with the Code of Conduct while on duty and after working hours.

[133] I find that the public would be concerned to learn that a police officer was providing accommodation and French lessons in his home to persons of foreign descent without first obtaining authorization from his employer to confirm that this activity did not conflict with his responsibilities as a police officer. The public would rightly question the risks that such a situation could pose to the organization and Corporal Beaulieu's ability to perform his duties as a police officer effectively.

[134] By engaging in activities outside the RCMP in connection with the *Expression Orale québécoise* school without prior authorization, Corporal Beaulieu was clearly contravening the RCMP's policy on conflicts of interest. The policy is clear: employees must obtain authorization before commencing activities outside their duties as police officers. As such, I find that Constable Beaulieu's actions were sufficiently related to his duties and functions as a police officer as to provide the Force with a legitimate reason for imposing conduct measures on him.

[135] As a result, I find that Allegation 2 has been established with respect to the *Expression Orale québécoise* school.

*Groupe Beaulieu Inc.*

[136] With respect to *Le Groupe Beaulieu Inc.*, the relevant facts in the *Determination of Established Facts* may be summarized as follows:

[Translation]

...

- a. The open source search report revealed the existence of a Facebook page for *Le Groupe Beaulieu Inc.*

- b. The postal and internet addresses provided on this Facebook page correspond to those of [Corporal] Beaulieu.
- c. The Facebook page also refers to the GIA website.
- d. During the security interview, [Corporal] Beaulieu initially stated that he did not know the name *Le Groupe Beaulieu Inc.* and that he did not use it.<sup>28</sup>

...

[137] On the basis of the evidence in the record, I am satisfied that Corporal Beaulieu did not submit an application for prior authorization for *Groupe Beaulieu Inc.*

[138] In order to demonstrate that Corporal Beaulieu contravened the conflict of interest policy, the Conduct Authority had to establish that Corporal Beaulieu had commenced activities related to the *Groupe Beaulieu Inc.* requiring the attainment of prior authorization.

[139] I note first that the only evidence in the record relating to Corporal Beaulieu's activities in connection with *Groupe Beaulieu Inc.* is a reference to a Facebook profile containing a limited number of photographs and posts, the last of which dates back to December 29, 2015, and refers to the GIA website under the "Contact info" heading.<sup>29</sup>

[140] I am not satisfied that the existence of a Facebook profile constitutes sufficiently clear, convincing and cogent evidence that Corporal Beaulieu was engaged in activities related to *Groupe Beaulieu Inc.* that required prior authorization under the RCMP's conflict of interest policy.

[141] The Conduct Authority Representative claimed that *Groupe Beaulieu Inc.* was a separate organization from GIA, which is operated by Corporal Beaulieu. However, I note that *Groupe Beaulieu Inc.* is one of 64 company names listed under "*Autres noms utilisés au Québec*" for GIA. In addition, it has been established on the basis of the evidence in the record that Corporal Beaulieu has prior authorization from his employer for his activities in connection with GIA.<sup>30</sup>

[142] I therefore find that although the Conduct Authority has proven the first two elements required to establish discreditable conduct, I find that it has been unable to establish an essential

---

<sup>28</sup> *Determination of Established Facts* dated August 7, 2024.

<sup>29</sup> *Evidence Binder*, at page 154.

<sup>30</sup> *Evidence Binder*, at pages 213 to 217.



element of Allegation 2, namely that authorization was required in the circumstances. Indeed, the evidence in the record does not allow me to conclude, on a balance of probabilities, that Corporal Beaulieu had commenced activities related to *Groupe Beaulieu Inc.* that required prior authorization from his employer.

[143] Therefore, I find that Allegation 2 has not been established with respect to *Groupe Beaulieu Inc.*

*Perturbés du CNR*

[144] The *Perturbés du CNR* is a non-profit enterprise registered with the Quebec Enterprise Register since December 20, 2018. Its activities are aimed at raising community awareness about noise and vibrations caused by passing trains.<sup>31</sup>

[145] I note that the record contains an *Application for Secondary Employment/Outside Activity* for the *Perturbés du C.N.R. inc.*, which Corporal Beaulieu submitted to his officer-in-charge on November 22, 2018, when this organization was created.<sup>32</sup> That application was approved by the delegated manager for human resources on November 27, 2018.<sup>33</sup>

[146] The Conduct Authority Representative argued that this approval expired on November 27, 2019, given that, in her view, section 3.7 of the *Administration Manual*, Chapter XVII.1, “Conflict of Interest,” requires that authorizations for outside employment and activities be renewed every year.

[147] With respect, I cannot agree with that interpretation of the policy. Section 3.7 of the *Administration Manual*, Chapter XVII.1, stipulates as follows:

Employees and their supervisors will review annually the requirements outlined in this Directive, or when the employee’s duties, position, or personal circumstances change.

---

<sup>31</sup> *Evidence Binder*, at pages 263 and 264.

<sup>32</sup> *Evidence Binder*, at pages 238 to 247.

<sup>33</sup> *Evidence Binder*, at pages 234 to 236.

[148] Employees and their supervisors are therefore required to review the requirements of the policy annually.

[149] Pursuant to sections 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 12.2.5, 12.7.5 and 12.7.5.1 of the *Administration Manual*, Chapter XVII.1, regarding the renewal of authorizations for outside activities, this must be done when circumstances have changed or where a conflict of interest has arisen. The policy requires employees to evaluate their outside activities annually or when they change positions or duties, or when their personal situation changes, to ensure that they are not in a conflict of interest and, where necessary, to discuss this with their supervisor and re-submit an application for approval if there has been a change.

[150] The Conduct Authority did not provide any evidence that changes that would have required Corporal Beaulieu to obtain new approval had occurred since November 27, 2018. The Conduct Authority was therefore unable to establish an essential element of Allegation 2, namely that Corporal Beaulieu contravened RCMP policies by not having authorization for his outside activities related to the *Perturbés du CNR*.

[151] As a result, I find that Allegation 2 has not been established on a balance of probabilities with respect to the *Perturbés du CNR*.

[152] In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, Allegation 2 has been established on a balance of probabilities with respect to the *Expression Orale québécoise* school, namely that between an unknown date and May 20, 2021, at an unknown location in the province of Quebec, Corporal Beaulieu contravened RCMP policies by engaging in activities related to that organization without first obtaining authorization from his employer, thereby contravening section 7.1 of the Code of Conduct.

## **CONDUCT MEASURES**

[153] As the Conduct Authority has discharged its burden of proof with respect to one of the allegations contained in the *Notice of Conduct Hearing*, I am required to impose a fair and just measure that will be commensurate to the gravity of the contravention, the degree of blameworthiness of the Subject Member, and the presence or absence of mitigating or aggravating

factors.<sup>34</sup> In accordance with subsection 24(2) of the *CSO (Conduct)*, I “must impose conduct measures that are proportionate to the nature and circumstances of the contravention of the Code of Conduct”.

### **Applicable legal principles**

[154] In her submissions, the Conduct Authority Representative referred to the *Phase I Report*,<sup>35</sup> in which the authors set out five principles that serve as the foundation for the process of crafting a fit conduct measure. These principles have since been adopted by RCMP conduct boards.

[155] The first principle established in this report provides that “[a] conduct measure must fully accord with the purposes of the police complaint and discipline process”.<sup>36</sup>

[156] These objectives are “the public interest”, the RCMP’s interests “in its ‘dual capacity’ as an employer . . . and as [a public body]”, “the interests of [the subject member] in being treated fairly”, and, finally, the interests of the individuals affected by the misconduct in question.<sup>37</sup>

[157] The second foundational principle contained in the *Phase I Report*, namely that corrective and remedial dispositions should prevail, where appropriate, is also expressed in paragraph 36.2(e) of the *RCMP Act*.<sup>38</sup>

[158] The third principle is the presumption of the least onerous disposition. However, this presumption will be displaced in cases where the public interest or other specified considerations should prevail.<sup>39</sup>

[159] The fourth foundational principle, which has been confirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada and several courts of appeal, provides that a higher standard applies to the conduct of

---

<sup>34</sup> *Conduct Measures Guide*, at page 3.

<sup>35</sup> Paul Ceysens and W. Scott Childs, “Phase I” *Final Report Concerning Conduct Measures, and the Application of Conduct Measures to Sex-Related Misconduct under Part IV of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act*, Report to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (February 24, 2022) (*Phase I Report*).

<sup>36</sup> *Phase I Report*, at page 17, paragraph 4.1.

<sup>37</sup> *Phase I Report*, at pages 18 to 19, paragraphs 4.5 to 4.12.

<sup>38</sup> *Phase I Report*, at pages 19 to 21, paragraphs 5.1–5.5.

<sup>39</sup> *Phase I Report*, page 21, at paragraphs 6.1 and 6.2.

police officers,<sup>40</sup> compared to employees generally, principally because police hold a position of trust.<sup>41</sup>

[160] Lastly, according to the *Phase I Report*, the fifth foundational principle relates to proportionality.<sup>42</sup> According to this principle, the conduct board must identify the relevant proportionality considerations in the circumstances, assess each consideration and determine whether it is mitigating, aggravating or neutral, depending on the context, and lastly, appropriately balance or weigh those various considerations, on the basis of the factual context of the matter.

[161] The RCMP's *Conduct Measures Guide*, while not prescriptive, is intended to promote parity of sanctions; however, it is a "guide" that must be read in the context of evolving societal standards, as established by jurisprudence or applicable policies and legislation.

[162] Furthermore, while I am not bound by past decisions rendered by RCMP conduct boards, they can provide some guidance with respect to the appropriate range of sanctions for a particular category of misconduct.

### **Conduct Authority Representative's submissions**

[163] In support of her submissions, the Conduct Authority's Representative submitted three decision reports concerning allegations of contraventions of the Code of Conduct previously established against Corporal Beaulieu, together with the documents in his employee record, namely his performance reviews for 1982 to 2022 and numerous letters of recommendation addressed to him over the years.

[164] The Conduct Authority Representative reiterated in her submissions that the Conduct Authority was seeking the immediate dismissal of Corporal Beaulieu under paragraph 45(4)(a) of the *RCMP Act*. The Conduct Authority Representative alleged that significant factors that go

---

<sup>40</sup> *Montréal (City) v Quebec (Commission des droits de la personne et des droits de la jeunesse)*, 2008 SCC 48 at paragraphs 33 and 86.

<sup>41</sup> *Phase I Report*, at page 22, paragraph 8.1.

<sup>42</sup> *Phase I Report*, at page 21, paragraph 7.1.

beyond the nature of the behaviour have been established in this case and make immediate dismissal the only possible conduct measure.

[165] She explained that the Conduct Authority was not asking the Board to order Corporal Beaulieu to resign within 14 days pursuant to paragraph 45(4)(b) of the *RCMP Act*, given that, in her view, Corporal Beaulieu would be unlikely to comply with such an order, considering his disregard for the orders issued to him to date in this conduct process.

[166] The Conduct Authority Representative stated that although the conduct process is aimed at correcting behaviour so that members can be rehabilitated, dismissal is used in the most serious and egregious cases, which are beyond rehabilitation. In the case of Corporal Beaulieu, the Conduct Authority considers that there is no prospect of rehabilitation given the nature of the allegation and his disciplinary record.

[167] The Conduct Authority Representative submitted that Corporal Beaulieu's attitude and behaviour throughout the conduct process showed that he had repudiated his employment contract, making him unfit to continue working for the RCMP. She pointed out, among other things, that he had displayed arrogance and contempt towards the RCMP and the conduct process. The Conduct Authority Representative pointed out that Corporal Beaulieu's lack of cooperation was an administrative burden for the organization, given the considerable resources that had to be deployed throughout the process in the attempts to contact him. She argued that the RCMP had an obligation to act in these circumstances by taking the necessary measures. She argued that Corporal Beaulieu's behaviour had to be considered in assessing the appropriate conduct measures in this case.

[168] The Conduct Authority Representative stated that the situation was serious because continuing to employ Corporal Beaulieu undermined public confidence. She questioned how the RCMP could justify continuing to employ a member who acted in this manner and who had a history of disciplinary issues. She described the relationship between the RCMP and Corporal Beaulieu as dysfunctional and untenable. She stated that the Conduct Authority was seeking Corporal Beaulieu's dismissal because it no longer had confidence in his ability to continue working for the RCMP.

[169] After setting out the five foundational principles identified in the *Phase I Report*, the Conduct Authority Representative considered the mitigating and aggravating factors applicable in this case. She pointed out that since the *Conduct Measures Guide* does not provide a range of measures for violating the conflict of interest policy, the analysis of aggravating and mitigating factors would make it possible to determine the appropriate conduct measures in this matter.

[170] The Conduct Authority Representative referred to *Trumbley and Fleming*<sup>43</sup> to assert that the fundamental purpose of dismissal is not to punish the employee, but rather to rid the employer of the burden of an employee who has shown that they are not fit to remain an employee. She contended that Corporal Beaulieu had clearly demonstrated that he was not fit to remain an employee of the RCMP.

[171] The Conduct Authority Representative submitted that the Conduct Authority had done everything it could to reason with Corporal Beaulieu and obtain his cooperation. The Conduct Authority's level of trust in Corporal Beaulieu was at an all-time low and she did not believe that Corporal Beaulieu would end up complying with the applicable directions.

[172] The Conduct Authority Representative is therefore asking me to take a strong stand and to order the immediate dismissal of Corporal Beaulieu.

### **Decision on conduct measures**

[173] I begin my analysis by setting out the range of conduct measures available. I will then apply the five foundational principles identified in the *Phase I Report* to the circumstances of this case, by first considering the proportionality factors.

#### *Range of conduct measures*

[174] I find that the range of conduct measures applicable to the allegation established in this matter, namely, the failure to comply with the conflict of interest policy, includes a financial

---

<sup>43</sup> *Re Trumbley et al. and Fleming et al.*, 1986 CanLII 146 (ON CA) [*Trumbley and Fleming*].

penalty of 10 days' pay or more and other conduct measures, including demotion, an order to resign, and dismissal.

*Neutral factors*

[175] The Conduct Authority Representative notes that Corporal Beaulieu's performance reviews are generally positive, except in recent years, where his performance has been somewhat mixed. She therefore finds that I should not give these performance reviews too much weight. I agree with the Conduct Authority Representative on this point and consider Corporal Beaulieu's performance reviews to be a neutral proportionality factor. Although Corporal Beaulieu's work record was generally above average early in his career, it has deteriorated over the last 15 years. I note that Corporal Beaulieu's dissatisfaction with how various grievances and complaints filed against the organization were handled and a certain deterioration in his health appear to have contributed to these changes in his performance.

*Mitigating factors*

[176] Mitigating factors do not constitute a justification or an excuse for misconduct, but in fairness to the subject member, they may be taken into consideration to reduce the severity of the sanction imposed in order to appropriately deal with the misconduct.

[177] The Conduct Authority Representative argues that it is normally up to the subject member to submit mitigating factors to the Board. In this case, having failed to respond to the allegations and to appear at the hearing, Corporal Beaulieu did not provide any evidence aimed at reducing the severity of the penalty to be imposed on him in this case.

[178] For my part, I consider the seriousness of the misconduct to be a mitigating factor in this matter. Indeed, the fact of violating the conflict of interest policy by failing to attain authorization before engaging in an outside activity is, while reprehensible, still at the lower end of reprehensible behaviour.

[179] After a careful review of the record, I was unable to identify any other mitigating factors in this matter.

*Aggravating factors*

[180] Aggravating factors are factors related to the commission of the misconduct that increase its guilt or enormity or add to its injurious consequences.

[181] I have identified several aggravating factors in this matter.

[182] The Conduct Authority Representative argued that the fact that Corporal Beaulieu has more than 40 years of service with the RCMP should be considered a mitigating factor. I do not agree.

[183] I do not believe that Corporal Beaulieu's many years of service with the RCMP should be considered a mitigating factor. On the contrary, with experience comes an increased responsibility to lead by example and to comply with applicable directions. It is reasonable to expect that a member with as many years of experience as Corporal Beaulieu would have a good knowledge of the organization and its internal processes and would understand the importance of complying with applicable policies. In fact, the evidence reveals that Corporal Beaulieu was well aware of his obligations under the conflict of interest policy, having previously requested authorization for other outside activities. Although RCMP members are expected to be familiar with internal policies, in this matter, I consider Corporal Beaulieu's seniority and his specific knowledge of the policy at issue in the allegation to be aggravating factors.

[184] The Conduct Authority Representative points out that the fact that Corporal Beaulieu was aware of the conflict of interest policy shows that his behaviour was deliberate. She alleges that this increases his degree of blameworthiness and should be considered an aggravating factor. As mentioned above, I have accepted the fact that Corporal Beaulieu was aware of his obligations under the conflict of interest policy as an aggravating circumstance. However, the evidence in the record does not enable me to find that Corporal Beaulieu acted intentionally or deliberately. I therefore cannot accept the deliberate nature of the behaviour to be an aggravating circumstance.

[185] The Conduct Authority Representative argued that there is no possibility of rehabilitation for Corporal Beaulieu because of the nature of the allegation, his disciplinary record and his behaviour during the conduct process, which demonstrated complete disregard for his employer and the conduct process. She found that this increased the enormity of the behaviour. To establish



this total lack of respect for the RCMP and its representatives, the Conduct Authority Representative referred to information contained in the Will-Say statement of Corporal Firlotte, Corporal Beaulieu's supervisor, where he mentioned, for example, that Corporal Beaulieu had failed to comply with the conditions of his suspension and had taken annual leave without authorization during his suspension.

[186] I recognize that the potential for rehabilitation is an important consideration in weighing appropriate conduct measures. The fact that Corporal Beaulieu chose not to participate in the conduct process makes my assessment of his potential for rehabilitation difficult. However, the Conduct Authority is asking me to consider evidence that was not established at the hearing in order to find that Corporal Beaulieu repudiated his employment contract and to justify his dismissal. Indeed, I note that while the document signed by Corporal Firlotte refers to certain unacceptable behaviours, it is not evidence of its contents since it is not a sworn statement and Corporal Firlotte did not testify at the hearing. If the Conduct Authority believes that Corporal Beaulieu engaged in reprehensible behaviour during the conduct process, the RCMP has several tools at its disposal to address this situation.

[187] I further note that Corporal Beaulieu repeatedly explained to his supervisor that he did not want to read the documentation relating to the conduct process because it would be detrimental to his health.<sup>44</sup>

[188] I am not satisfied that the fact that a member refuses to engage in a conduct process shows, in and of itself, that there is no potential for rehabilitation.

[189] The Conduct Authority Representative also brought to my attention the fact that Corporal Beaulieu has three previous disciplinary incidents on his record. She further maintains that the cumulative effect of this misconduct requires me to find that dismissal is the only possible conduct measure in this matter.

[190] I recognize that a member's disciplinary record can have a cumulative effect and justify a much more severe conduct measure than would normally be imposed if the misconduct were

---

<sup>44</sup> Will-Say of Corporal Shawn Firlotte, dated October 8, 2024, recounting the attempts and efforts made by the Division to contact Corporal Beaulieu, at page 2 (December 11, 2023) and at page 4 (April 17, 2024).

considered in isolation, especially when the previous misconduct is recent and involves similar behaviour. However, in order to be considered an aggravating factor, a decision on established allegations would have to have been rendered and conduct measures been imposed when the member committed the acts at issue in the *Notice of Conduct Hearing*. The Conduct Authority Representative acknowledged this principle in her submissions when referring to *Greene*.<sup>45</sup>

[191] During the period covered by the allegation established in this case, that is, between an unknown date and May 20, 2021, only two past conduct incidents met these conditions, namely:

- The decision report of September 13, 2018, which imposed a written reprimand and a financial penalty of three days on Corporal Beaulieu for failing to comply with an order to attend a medical appointment; and
- The decision report of March 18, 2021, which imposed a written reprimand and a financial penalty of seven days on Corporal Beaulieu for failing to comply with a direction not to share a decision report concerning a harassment complaint.

[192] I find that this disciplinary record casts doubt on Corporal Beaulieu's potential for rehabilitation, since it involves behaviour similar to that established here, namely failure to obey with lawful orders or directions. This is therefore an aggravating factor.

[193] The third conduct matter was still under way during the period covered by the allegation established in this case, and no conduct measures had yet been imposed. For this reason, the measures imposed on Corporal Beaulieu on October 12, 2021, in relation to two allegations of contravening his supervisor's directions cannot be considered aggravating factors here.

[194] In light of Corporal Beaulieu's disciplinary record for similar conduct, I find that specific deterrence is also an important aggravating factor in this case, in order to ensure that this inappropriate and unacceptable behaviour does not happen again in the future.

[195] The Conduct Authority Representative also points out that the implications of *McNeil* are a further aggravating factor. I agree. However, *McNeil* only compels the disclosure of relevant information. I find it hard to imagine a criminal proceeding in which failure to obtain prior

---

<sup>45</sup> *Commanding Officer, "H" Division and Greene*, 2017 RCAD 5 [*Greene*], at paragraph 144.

authorization to participate in an outside activity would be considered relevant. However, I recognize that Corporal Beaulieu now has four conduct files that will have to be disclosed in accordance with *McNeil*, which will impose an administrative burden on the RCMP in terms of staffing.

[196] The Conduct Authority Representative also stated that the fact that Corporal Beaulieu's misconduct continued over a prolonged period, from October 2020 to May 2021, is also an aggravating factor. I do not agree. I find that the allegation arises from a single situation and cannot be considered an aggravating factor.

[197] The Conduct Authority Representative referred to Corporal Beaulieu's comments in his performance reviews regarding his numerous grievances and complaints against the RCMP. She asserted that these comments demonstrate that Corporal Beaulieu puts his personal interests ahead of those of the RCMP. In her view, this is an aggravating factor.

[198] I note, indeed, that Corporal Beaulieu made comments in some performance reviews indicating that he was preoccupied with the management of several disputes related to his employment with the RCMP. I also note that his superiors have expressed concerns about the time Corporal Beaulieu spent on these disputes. However, I do not see how this could be considered an aggravating factor in this case. As the Conduct Authority Representative did not provide me with any explanation in this regard, I will not accept this as a proportionality factor in this matter.

[199] Lastly, the Conduct Authority Representative alleged that an absence of remorse is a very significant aggravating factor in this matter. She pointed out that, instead of acknowledging his wrongs and taking responsibility, Corporal Beaulieu displayed contempt for the RCMP and the conduct process by choosing not to respond to the allegations or participate in the process. I cannot accept this as an aggravating factor. A subject member is free to choose not to respond to the allegations against them. The *RCMP Act* provides that the subject member is then deemed to have denied the allegations. On this point, I share the opinion expressed in *Greene*, in which the Conduct Board noted that an absence of remorse cannot be accepted as an aggravating factor.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> *Greene*, at paragraph 143.

*Analysis*

[200] I will now briefly explain how I weighed the proportionality factors identified in this matter to arrive at the conduct measures I see fit, while taking into account the interests of the public, the RCMP and the Subject Member.

[201] In doing so, I recognize that a higher standard applies to the conduct of police officers compared to employees generally.

[202] I further recognize the presumption that the least onerous conduct measure should be imposed. However, this presumption must be displaced if it is essential to the public interest.

[203] The public quite rightly expects RCMP members to uphold the highest ethical and professional standards, and the RCMP to act on misconduct by its members by taking appropriate action. Public confidence in the administration of discipline within the RCMP is undermined when a member fails to comply with orders or directions and is repeatedly sanctioned for that behaviour.

[204] On this point, the Conduct Authority Representative submitted that the cumulative effect of Corporal Beaulieu's disciplinary record warrants his dismissal, given the final admonishment issued to him in the October 12, 2021, decision report. As noted above, I cannot consider the admonishment in that decision report here. For an employer to be able to issue a final admonishment, that admonishment must necessarily have preceded the latest misconduct. But that is not the case here. I note, however, that the decision reports of September 13, 2018, and March 18, 2021, contain a warning that any future contravention of the Code of Conduct could result in the imposition of more serious conduct measures, up to and including dismissal.

[205] The Conduct Authority Representative argued that there is no precedent within the RCMP for a situation similar to that of Corporal Beaulieu and that, as a result, the Board can consider what happens in other workplaces. In this regard, she referred me to a decision of the Public Service Labour Relations Board in *Way*<sup>47</sup> and the decision in the matter of the *University of*

---

<sup>47</sup> *Way v Canada Revenue Agency*, 2008 PSLRB 39 [*Way*].

*Alberta*,<sup>48</sup> where employees were dismissed for contravening their respective employers' conflict of interest policies. She concluded that, because police officers are held to a higher standard of conduct than employees generally, Corporal Beaulieu should be dismissed for violating the RCMP's conflict of interest policies.

[206] I note that the facts of those two cases differ significantly from those before me, given that the employees in question held two jobs at the same time without authorization from their respective employers. In addition, the decisions to dismiss those employees were based on evidence that has not been made here, such as a lack of honesty and loyalty and the fact that the employees had acted deliberately. I therefore gave very little weight to these precedents.

[207] When weighing the mitigating and aggravating factors, and in particular when considering the enormity of the behaviour, Corporal Beaulieu's seniority, his knowledge of the applicable policies, his disciplinary record, and the need for deterrence in this matter, in light of the need to maintain public confidence, I find that the presumption of the least onerous disposition must be displaced.

[208] After careful consideration of the appropriate conduct measures and a painstaking assessment of all the circumstances of this case, I find that the conduct measure sought by the Conduct Authority, namely the immediate dismissal of Corporal Beaulieu, is nevertheless not commensurate to the gravity of his misconduct.

[209] However, given that Corporal Beaulieu's recent disciplinary record involved similar behaviour, I find that there is no reason to adopt a corrective conduct approach.

[210] Corporal Beaulieu holds the rank of corporal and has more than 40 years of service. A senior non-commissioned officer has to set an example and obey the orders and directions given to him. This includes obeying policies. Corporal Beaulieu's behaviour is incompatible with these responsibilities, and serious conduct measures are required in this case to maintain public confidence in the RCMP and its ability to manage its employees and fulfill its mandate.

---

<sup>48</sup> *University of Alberta and Academic Staff Association of the University of Alberta*, 2018 CanLII 5414 (AB GAA) [*University of Alberta*].

## CONCLUSION

[211] Accordingly, pursuant to paragraph 45(4)(c) of the *RCMP Act*, I am imposing the following conduct measures:

- (a) A demotion for an indefinite period from the rank of corporal to the rank of constable (at the highest pay increment for that rank);
- (b) In addition, I order that, within 60 days of the service of my written decision, Constable Beaulieu review the requirements of Chapter 17.1 of the *Administration Manual* with respect to conflicts of interest and discuss them with his supervisor to establish that he has all the required authorizations for his outside activities. Failure by Constable Beaulieu to comply with this order will constitute a contravention of a lawful order.

[212] I am giving Constable Beaulieu an opportunity to continue his career with the RCMP. However, this decision is a final admonishment and any future contravention of the Code of Conduct will most certainly result in his dismissal.

[213] Any interim administrative measures in place should be resolved as soon as possible in accordance with paragraph 23(1)(b) of the *Royal Canadian Mounted Police Regulations, 2014*, SOR/2014-281.

[214] Subsection 25(3) of the *CSO (Conduct)* provides that the Conduct Board must cause the decision to be served on the parties. The parties may appeal that decision under section 45.11 of the *RCMP Act* and section 22 of the *Commissioner's Standing Orders (Grievance and Appeals)*, SOR/2014-289, by submitting a statement of appeal to the Commissioner within 14 days after the decision is served.

---

Gina Lévesque  
Conduct Board

---

March 26, 2025  
Date