

CAMPAIGN DOCUMENT / PUBLIC-INTEREST OP-ED

Economic Sabotage or Institutional Failure? Canada Needs an Inquiry Into the Fentanyl Narrative

If official drug and border narratives helped create economic harm, the answer is evidence - not slogans.

Prepared for Great Scott for Mayor of Vancouver | DrainTheSwamp.ca | June 2026

Suggested website placement: Research and Documents; EconomicSabotage.ca; media package.

The responsible version of the allegation

The words “economic sabotage” are politically explosive. Used carelessly, they sound like a conclusion before the evidence. Used carefully, they name a question that Canada cannot afford to ignore: did official or tolerated public-safety narratives about fentanyl, precursor chemicals, enforcement success, and the northern border contribute to policy decisions that harmed Canadian workers, businesses, and national credibility?

The responsible position is not to declare guilt. It is to demand an independent review. Canadians should know whether federal drug-enforcement communications were accurate, whether decision-makers were warned about misleading impressions, whether corrections were delayed or refused, and whether economic damage followed.

The appropriate ask is an independent review, not a public declaration of guilt.

Why the issue matters

The RCMP and related federal public-safety agencies are not ordinary communicators. Their statements shape news coverage, Parliament, budgets, diplomatic assumptions, border policy, organized-crime strategy, and public confidence. When they speak about fentanyl, GHB/GBL, precursor chemicals, border integrity, and enforcement success, Canadians reasonably treat those statements as authoritative.

That is why the test must be measurable. A major seizure photo is not the same thing as safer streets. A press conference is not proof of market disruption. A budget increase is not proof of effectiveness. If enforcement is working, the public should see evidence in availability, price, potency, deaths, emergency calls, cross-border flow, and prosecution outcomes.

The economic-harm theory

The strongest public-interest question is this: if Canadian public-safety narratives materially contributed to U.S. tariff action or other economic pressure despite Canadian data suggesting northern-border fentanyl volumes were negligible relative to total U.S. fentanyl seizures, then the economic consequences may be national in scale and warrant independent inquiry.

A damages figure such as \$200 billion should be treated as a hypothesis requiring economist review, not as a proven amount. To make that theory credible, analysts would need to separate direct tariff effects, retaliatory effects, supply-chain effects, lost investment, regional sector impacts, broader U.S. trade strategy, and the portion, if any, attributable to Canadian public-safety communications.

What an inquiry should test

- Did public drug-enforcement communications accurately distinguish between fentanyl, GHB, GBL, 1,4-butanediol, and other precursor risks?
- Did enforcement activity measurably reduce fentanyl availability, street price, potency, deaths, poisonings, or border flow?
- Did Canadian agencies internally recognize that northern-border fentanyl flow was negligible while public narratives suggested a larger threat?
- Did U.S. decision-makers rely on Canadian public-safety narratives, omissions, or failures to correct?
- Were Parliament, media, and the public given outcome metrics or merely seizure narratives?
- Did senior leadership preserve institutional budget and authority while failing to deliver measurable protection?

Why this is pro-accountability and pro-police

The public should not conflate institutional leadership with every individual officer. Many rank-and-file members did not design national communications strategy, border narratives, or tariff diplomacy. If misleading narratives were created or tolerated at senior levels, ordinary members should not have to carry the reputational cost alone.

An inquiry would protect the public, protect honest officers, and protect Canada from policy built on defective premises. If the allegations are wrong, a serious review can say so. If they are partly right, Canadians need correction before the next economic or public-safety failure.

Source and verification note

Based on the existing preliminary RCMP accountability briefing, which frames the matter as allegations requiring independent review, not a finding of fact; it highlights date-rape-drug/GHB/GBL communications, fentanyl enforcement effectiveness, border narratives, tariff risk, and the need to treat large damages estimates as hypotheses requiring expert review.

Authorized by Scott Gilbert, Financial Agent for Scott Gilbert. Contact: scottgilbertvan@gmail.com. Campaign contributions and expenses will be reported as required under B.C. local election campaign financing law.