



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 088**

**PUBLIC PART ONLY - PARTIE PUBLIQUE SEULEMENT**

Monday, October 30, 2023

---

Chair: Mr. John Brassard





## Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics

Monday, October 30, 2023

• (1530)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC)):** I'm going to call the meeting to order.

Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to meeting number 88 of the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to the Standing Orders. Members are attending in person in the room and remotely using the Zoom application.

The clerk and I will maintain a consolidated speaking list of those wishing to speak.

Before we start the discussion of committee business, I would like to remind all members that our next meeting is on Wednesday, November 1. It's an informal meeting with a parliamentary delegation from the European Parliament, as agreed to earlier this fall. More details will be sent to you.

I'm going to start our committee business today. One of the challenges.... When we passed the original motion for the accounting report on the SDTC and the green sustainable technology fund, we didn't put a date to it. The clerk and I have been attempting to get this report in front of the committee. What I'm going to ask the committee to do is put a timeline on when this report should be presented to the committee. I'm going to ask for consideration of that today.

I did receive a copy of the report. It was sent to me by email—not by anybody official. I've seen it. It's redacted significantly. I think that, for the benefit of the committee, we need to see that report before we proceed, based on the motion. I think there's enough information in that report so that it would not just pique the interest of the committee, but also be significant to that study.

I need a timeline, a date for that from the committee. We didn't do that. It was a mistake that we made in the original motion, so we need to do that today.

That being said, this is why I called committee business today.

• (1535)

[Translation]

Mr. Villemure.

**Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

On a point of order.

I'd like to table a motion, which replaces the motion from last week. Consequently, I'd like us not to consider the motion on the RCMP that was tabled last week. I'm going to read the motion that I'm moving today, which I will send to the committee in both official languages.

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(h), the committee undertake a study of the RCMP's decision not to pursue a criminal investigation into Prime Minister Justin Trudeau following the reprimand issued by the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner regarding his involvement in the SNC-Lavalin affair; that the committee devote three meetings to this study; that the committee request to appear, for one hour per witness:

- (a) the former Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner, Mr. Mario Dion;
- (b) the acting Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner, Mr. Konrad Winrich von Finckenstein;
- (c) the RCMP Commissioner, Mr. Michael Duheme;
- (d) Mr. Frédéric Pincince, Sensitive and International and Investigations, Federal Policing, Ontario Division;
- (e) representatives of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in 2019; and
- (f) the former advisor to the Prime Minister, Mr. Gerald Butts;

that this study commence after the end of the current study of use of social media platforms for data harvesting and unethical or illicit sharing of personal information with foreign entities;

that the committee report to the House;

and that, pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee request a comprehensive response from the government.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Villemure.

Did you send the clerk the motion in both official languages?

**Mr. René Villemure:** We'll send it.

**The Chair:** Okay, thank you.

[English]

The motion is in order, and it's based on the notice of motion that you put forward.

[Translation]

Do you wish to add something?

**Mr. René Villemure:** Yes, Mr. Chair.

The motion states that I'd like the study to commence after the end of the current study on TikTok. So, I'm not asking to postpone the TikTok study.

However, I'm asking for this new study to have priority, because it's a very important matter. The media have reported on it extensively and the public is asking questions. My goal is to start this study quickly without torpedoing the TikTok study.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Thank you, Mr. Villemure.

[*English*]

Ms. Khalid, go ahead on the motion, please.

**Ms. Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.):** Thank you very much, Chair.

I absolutely appreciate Monsieur Villemure's commitment that this potential study start after our TikTok study. I know how important it is to me. It's been three years since we've been able to get a study going. So far we've only had maybe an hour and a half on this study. I am quite adamant that we move forward with our TikTok, social media and privacy study before we go into any other business.

I do have a couple of amendments to propose to Mr. Villemure's motion.

Chair, I'm wondering if you want to canvass the room to see if anybody else wants to speak before I propose those amendments to the main motion.

**The Chair:** Is there any other discussion on Monsieur Villemure's motion?

Go ahead, Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.):** Thanks, Chair.

I want to bring in my former hat, not only as parliamentary secretary at public safety but also as someone who was on the public safety committee for eight years.

We need to bear in mind the role of the RCMP as being independent with their investigations and not blend a whole bunch of other things into what we want to have here.

I fully support the RCMP coming and discussing what they're doing and why and everything else, but I think that, as we're looking at this motion, we should bear in mind that the RCMP is independent. We need to hear from them, but let's not blur what we're talking about with this motion and include people who probably don't have any bearing on what the RCMP has decided.

That's just a general comment, Chair.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Damoff.

Is there any other discussion on Mr. Villemure's motion?

I'm going to go back to Ms. Khalid.

Go ahead.

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Thank you, Chair.

I just wanted to confirm that the text we received as a notice of motion is the same as what is being talked about today.

**The Chair:** It is not. Mr. Villemure added to his notice of motion. We're working on sending that out to members of the committee right now.

Iqra, I know you still have the floor, but I think René might have something to add.

[*Translation*]

Go ahead, Mr. Villemure.

**Mr. René Villemure:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

There are two changes.

The first is that we're withdrawing "representatives of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in 2019;". Second, we have added that the study will commence after the end of the TikTok study.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Thank you.

[*English*]

Does that clarify things for you, Ms. Khalid?

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Yes, thank you very much, Chair.

I'm wondering if perhaps we can suspend while that language is being distributed.

**The Chair:** Yes. The clerk should have that out in one minute, so we'll take five.

We'll be back here just before 3:50.

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Thanks, Chair.

**The Chair:** We're going to suspend for a bit.

• (1535) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1545)

**The Chair:** We're going to resume the meeting.

The email has been sent in both official languages. There are two changes, as Mr. Villemure has indicated. One is eliminating "2019", and the other one is about the end of the TikTok study.

Go ahead, Ms. Khalid. Do you have an amendment?

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Chair, first and foremost, I just want to reiterate that we have never opposed the committee's will to have the RCMP come to this committee to testify on this or to speak to us about this.

I think it is very important to note that the last meeting we had on this was really about the process as to how this was done. That's a very important point for us to note because I think our committee is really all about openness and transparency. The more we can do that, the better it is, not just for us as a committee but also as a government, as a Parliament and as Canadians as a whole.

Specifically, we have heard from a number of the witnesses who are listed on this motion that they don't have anything to add. They don't have anything to say on the specific content and the matter that this motion is addressing. For example, Mr. Dion has said in the past, when he was asked, "Seriously, I have no opinion on that." I don't know how it would be beneficial to our committee for us to have a witness who has proactively said, "I don't have an opinion on that," and to spend so much time listening to what he has to say, knowing well in advance that he really doesn't have anything to say at all.

One thing that I think we should be addressing is the importance of bringing in witnesses who actually do have things to say or contribute to the matter that is addressed in this motion.

Second—and I can just go down the list—Mr. Konrad von Finckenstein has said the same. In fact, they appeared together. They really don't have much of a comment on this issue.

Finally, I don't think Mr. Butts has anything to add to this issue, either.

I realize that we want to spend three meetings on this. I'm also very grateful to Mr. Villemure for adding the amendment to his original motion to say that the TikTok study takes precedence over this, but I think we can nuance this.

We can say that this decision was made by the RCMP and it should be the RCMP that comes forward to explain why they made that decision. We should not include people who had no impact on that decision. We can be efficient with the time that we have in our committee and absolutely hear from the RCMP, to hear what they have to say, to hear how they came to the conclusion they did. We need to understand, however, that inviting people who really don't have a say in any of this, who didn't have any say in the decision-making and who don't have any jurisdiction in the decision-making either is not a good use of this committee's time.

First, in the body of the text where it says "devote three meetings", I would delete "three" and add "one": "devote one meeting to this study". I understand Mr. Villemure's point about including the former conflict of interest commissioner, but again, as I said, he's gone on record saying that he has nothing to add to this, so I would further amend this motion by deleting part (a). Then, I would also further amend this motion by deleting part (f).

Sorry, I have the previous text. I'm not sure if that's the same.

• (1550)

**The Chair:** As a matter of process here, can we deal with one amendment at a time? Your first amendment is to go from three meetings to one meeting, Ms. Khalid, so can we deal with that?

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Absolutely.

**The Chair:** You have explained your rationale for that.

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Yes, absolutely, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Green is next.

Go ahead, Mr. Green, on the amendment.

**Mr. Matthew Green (Hamilton Centre, NDP):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I certainly appreciate my friend from the Bloc bringing this motion forward. As you'll recall, although there have been multiple world crises happening since this took place, it was the issue of the day, and in fact a pretty significant issue in the 2019 election. I think it is quite reasonable and timely, given the reprimand issued by the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner, to have some overview on this from this committee.

I would say, to Ms. Khalid's comments about the Ethics Commissioner not having an opinion on something, that having an opinion or not having an opinion is not the same thing as being able to provide this committee with facts. What I would like to see, should we go down this road, is that we have the opportunity to put questions to witnesses. I wouldn't presuppose that Ms. Khalid knows exactly what questions people would ask around the table, nor would I presuppose that she would know the answers.

Therefore, before we go down a road of shortening the meeting, having fewer witnesses and having less oversight, I would say, Mr. Chair, that I would support, at least in this preliminary way, the motion in its entirety.

I do have a question, through you to the mover, if you would allow me that.

**The Chair:** Yes, go ahead, Mr. Green.

**Mr. Matthew Green:** Thank you.

I just want to note that I've sat through many of these types of motions that regard highly politically sensitive actors: chiefs of staff, prime ministers, high-level ministers. They were all fair game when trying to explore the decision-making.

There has been a lot of conjecture about why Mr. Butts left, but certainly, the timing coincided with this affair, and certainly, he would have an opinion, as would many others. Only he would know, ultimately.

Through you, Mr. Chair, I am going to assume that the mover has included Mr. Butts and not the Prime Minister in hopes of providing some type of sworn testimony or accountability as to the facts relating to the possible involvement of the PMO's office in the SNC-Lavalin affair and ultimately the potential for criminality to be pursued by the RCMP.

Is that correct, or can you provide us with the rationale for wanting to have Mr. Butts here, who has already ostensibly lost his job from this affair and has moved on to other things?

• (1555)

[Translation]

**The Chair:** M. Villemure, could you answer that question?

**Mr. René Villemure:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I thank my colleague for his question. Indeed, there is room for clarification.

When a decision is made, there are always two sides to the story. Obviously, the RCMP will tell us its version of the facts. That's what we want. However, as the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner was involved, I wanted some clarification from the people around the Prime Minister, without requiring his presence. We could have asked the Prime Minister to appear, but I didn't think that was reasonable.

So, we're looking for information relating to the flip side of the story, from the inner circle.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Green, go ahead.

**Mr. Matthew Green:** Mr. Chair, I appreciate that.

Many members will know the time that I spent on the Emergencies Act joint review committee. I would suggest that, when it comes to getting strong, factual, direct answers, sometimes political actors are not the best witnesses. I'm wondering, through you, Mr. Chair, to Mr. Villemure, if there was a consideration of other people who may have provided direct advice to the Prime Minister, for instance the Privy Council Office. Would that be a potential for an exchange?

I'm trying to avoid a political circus that has no substance. Ultimately, I know, having worked with Mr. Villemure, that he's going to want to see some kind of recommendations out of this to ensure that the firewall that Ms. Damoff has mentioned between the RCMP and the highest office in the country is upheld, supported and reaffirmed, potentially, or, if there were gaps or if there were any possible influences, be they direct or indirect, from the Office of the Prime Minister to the RCMP, that they are immediately addressed.

Would there perhaps be consideration for people with a legal background who understand their legal responsibilities to the public versus a political actor who would, I would say, be very experienced in presenting a political response, perhaps, rather than a factual one?

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Villemure.

[Translation]

**Mr. René Villemure:** Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for his comment.

In my opinion, it's very important to find out what happened and to learn both sides of the story. As Ms. Damoff said, I'm not presuming there was interference. We just want to verify if there was.

In response to my colleague's direct question, I'll respond in the affirmative. If someone can suggest a name that would satisfy the desired requirement, I'll obviously be very open to it.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Green, go ahead.

We're still on the amendment, Mr. Green, just so you know.

**Mr. Matthew Green:** We're on the first amendment.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Matthew Green:** For the first amendment, the line of questioning I have is germane, because it would determine the scope in

terms of timelines. I can't, with full information, support or reject Ms. Khalid's amendment if I'm not clear about where we would land in terms of the full complement of witnesses.

I would say to the committee that, in dealing with Ms. Khalid's amendment, I would not be supporting it. I would seek to maintain, at this moment, three meetings.

I would suggest, as a show of good faith to both parties—to Mr. Villemure, who has put forward a very comprehensive motion and to the governing side, which, I believe, is open to exploring and studying this—that, in the interim, at the appropriate time, I put forward an amendment that we switch out Mr. Butts for the top person in the Privy Council Office, not a junior staffer or anybody else, and that we keep it open. Should we not have, in the first two meetings, adequate and necessary responses to have the full picture, then, at that point, Mr. Villemure could reintroduce a motion to invite Mr. Butts to the third meeting.

At this point, I will not be supporting Ms. Khalid's amendment, and, at the appropriate time, I would put that forward as a compromise.

● (1600)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Green.

We'll go to Ms. Damoff next.

Go ahead.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you, Chair.

**The Chair:** We're still on the amendment.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Yes.

Can I ask a question of Mr. Villemure as well, Chair?

**The Chair:** Go ahead.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** In your motion, you have said you want us to undertake a study on the RCMP's decision not to pursue a criminal investigation. From this, and from the newspaper reports that came out fairly recently about their decision not to pursue an investigation, I'm assuming that's the focus of what you want to study, not the entire SNC-Lavalin, which was already done in the past.

Looking at the conflict of interest commissioners, both past and present, a valid question to them would be, was it referred to the RCMP? That's certainly a question. But in terms of decisions—and I'll go back to this again—on whether or not charges should be laid, why they didn't lay charges and what their reasons were, that fully rests with the RCMP and those who work there.

I don't think Mr. Green's amendment is necessarily a bad one, but I think as a committee we need to decide what it is we want to study, and, really, it's the RCMP. If they give us information that we need more information on, that's one thing. But I don't think any of us would suggest that Mr. Butts interfered in a criminal investigation. The RCMP put out a statement through the deputy minister in March 2023. Mr. Butts has been gone for several years. They made the decision on their own.

I think there are valid questions to be asked of the RCMP, but I support Ms. Khalid's amendment that one meeting with the RCMP would be sufficient. If, once we hear from them, we determine that there are more meetings we need to have, then I think that's valid. But in terms of the initial meeting, if that's what we want to study, I think one meeting with the RCMP would be sufficient to get the answers we're looking for.

Thank you, Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Ms. Khalid, go ahead on the amendment.

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Thank you, Chair. I appreciate that.

Listening to my colleagues.... As I said before, we are absolutely open to having the RCMP come before us and help us understand what exactly happened here. I know I have proposed an amendment to Mr. Villemure's motion with respect to one meeting versus three meetings, but I think that's really part of the whole debate as to the scope of what this motion is covering.

Chair, I'm not sure what the procedure looks like. I'm wondering if we can just encompass all of the concerns we have within one amendment, as opposed to having an amendment on just the duration of this study or the number of meetings we're going to have. I look to you, Chair, to help me understand if I can have unanimous consent to remove my amendment and propose another one that is all-encompassing, just to be a little more expedient with respect to our debate today.

**The Chair:** Okay.

I was listening to what Mr. Green said. Mr. Green said he's not sure that just one meeting will suffice in this situation, given the scale and the scope of the potential witnesses who may have to come forward. If I'm mistaking what Mr. Green said, I hope he would tell me, but I know there was a concern about one meeting.

I'd like to deal with one amendment at a time, frankly. You've proposed what I see are three amendments. There's one amendment right now that we're debating, and that's to deal with the study from three to one meeting; one would be to remove the current and past ethics commissioner from the study; and then the last one would be the removal of Mr. Butts.

I believe I heard you correctly on that one.

• (1605)

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Chair, I don't think I moved all of those collectively.

**The Chair:** I know, but I understand that's where you're going with this.

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Having understood what Mr. Green has said, I would like to propose a little bit of a variation, if that's okay, Chair. Or I can allow—

**The Chair:** If you withdraw your amendment, then you can—

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** That's exactly what I'm asking for. I'm asking for unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Amendment withdrawn)

**The Chair:** We're still on the main motion, unamended.

Go ahead, please.

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Thanks, Chair.

In that case, first I would put forward an amendment to delete altogether the words “that the committee devote three meetings to this study”, so that after we've had the first meeting, the committee can decide, perhaps, if that's what they would like to do or not.

Second, I would delete point (a), which is inviting the former conflict of interest and ethics commissioner, Mr. Mario Dion. I would also delete point (b).

In point (e), as per Mr. Green's suggestion, I would replace that point with inviting the former Privy Council clerk, Mr. Wernick.

**The Chair:** Just so I'm clear, are you asking for those three meetings? I understand the other amendments, but are—

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** What I'm asking for, Chair, is for us to delete that whole phrase, “that the committee devote three meetings to this study”, from the motion.

I'm asking to have the first meeting, and then decide as to how we're going to proceed as a committee. I'm asking not to put a time limit on it. I know that's perhaps quite dangerous, but I'm going on good faith here, because I know that there's really not much to be seen.

**The Chair:** The way I'm reading this, it would mean that we'd still have one meeting on this. That's the way I'm reading it.

You have to help me out here, to quantify how many meetings you want to have.

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Can we do that amendment last, then?

Maybe take that out. Once we've settled with everything else, perhaps we can come back to how much time we need to spend on this.

**The Chair:** Ms. Khalid, we need some clarification, because the clerk and I are confused.

We understand the removal of (a), (b) and (e), but we don't understand where you're going with the meetings. I need some clarification on that.

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Chair, in that case, if there is any doubt, then I think we should still have just the one meeting on this.

**The Chair:** You want one meeting. Okay, that clarifies things.

We're going to deal with this in its entirety right now, because we couldn't do it one by one. We're going to deal with it in its entirety.

The amendment from Ms. Khalid is to have only one meeting. In that meeting, we're going to have the RCMP commissioner; we're going to have the staff sergeant, who would accompany Mr. Duhome; and the former Privy Council clerk, Michael Wernick.

That's Ms. Khalid's amendment.

Mr. Green, you were first. Go ahead, please.

**Mr. Matthew Green:** I withdraw that, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Ms. Damoff, go ahead, on Ms. Khalid's amendment.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thanks, Chair.

I'm wondering, Chair, if you would consider voting separately on the amendments she has proposed on witnesses, or voting on that part first and then the number of meetings, because I really think the number of meetings is going to be determined by how many people are coming. I don't think any of us want to have five people for two hours. If we could separate that and leave the vote on the number of meetings to the end, it would give a lot of clarity to how many meetings are needed.

If Ms. Khalid's motion is defeated and everything stays on here, it's going to require more meetings. Then maybe we could debate the number of meetings, Chair, if you'd consider that.

• (1610)

**The Chair:** I appreciate that, Ms. Damoff.

The amendment was on the one meeting, with (a), (b) and (c), including Michael Wernick in there.

If that makes things easier, then I'll deal with it. We can deal with that now.

Mr. Green, go ahead.

**Mr. Matthew Green:** I'm going to go ahead and say it. If we're doing these amendments in good faith, then we wouldn't limit it to a day. If you want to go vote by vote, and then when it comes to your piece where you want to limit it to a day, you vote against the rest of the committee, then what's the point of our moving away from Mr. Villemure's original motion?

I don't want to be in a scenario where we support all these amendments and then have the Liberal side just turn around and vote against how many days we're having. It's these little procedural things that annoy me. If you're going to move amendments to change the list of witnesses, knowing that those witnesses are going to take three days, then I don't think it's in good faith to say that you want to limit it to a day.

I'm going to put to you, Mr. Chair, that the amendment stay as it is. Then we can go vote by vote, but you should start with the first day, and we'll see where they go, and then we'll go vote by vote after that. But they can't have it all ways.

**The Chair:** There's a part of me that agrees with Mr. Green on this. We have one day for what will amount to three witnesses. I think it's reasonable to expect that we could probably get two days out of this rather than one. I'm looking to this side for guidance on this, because two days is reasonable.

Go ahead, Ms. Khalid.

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** That's exactly what I was trying to say when I said to delete "that the committee devote three meetings to this study", because ultimately we want to determine how many meetings we are going to have based on how many witnesses we are going to have, based on the votes as to whether these amendments go forward.

I look to you for guidance, Chair. I'm wondering if we can perhaps withdraw the amendment changing it from three to one. Perhaps we need to suspend for a bit so we can talk amongst ourselves and seek a little clarity with each other as to what the text of the motion should be.

**The Chair:** I don't think we need to specify specifically how many meetings are going to occur. There could be a situation that comes up where, for example, Mr. Wernick is not available, so we're going to have to have a couple of meetings. If we can find a way to leave that open—

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Chair, I would appreciate a suspension for a minute, though, if that's okay.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Villemure, go ahead.

**Mr. René Villemure:** I'd like to ask for a vote on the amendment.

**The Chair:** We can't do that, because the debate hasn't concluded. I apologize, Mr. Villemure, but it's procedure.

[*English*]

I'm going to give until 4:20 to work this out, and then we can have a discussion after that. I hope we go to the vote right afterwards and figure this out. Thank you.

We are suspended.

• (1610)

(Pause)

• (1615)

**The Chair:** Okay, we're back from the suspension.

I think we could possibly come up with a solution to this, and that is, based on what Ms. Khalid had said, that the committee request to appear, for one hour per witness, (a) the RCMP commissioner, Mr. Duheme; (b) Mr. Frédéric Pincince, who is the staff sergeant; and (c) the former Privy Council clerk, Mr. Wernick.

It would be an assumption that Mr. Duheme and Mr. Pincince would come together for an hour, and then Mr. Wernick would come for an hour. That would effectively take one meeting.

If the committee deems that there is more that is required, any further witnesses, we can deal with that at that time. I'm hoping this will solve the standoff that we're in right now by at least having these witnesses appear before the committee, and that they appear for one hour per witness.

Mr. Villemure, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Villemure:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd be satisfied if there were at least two meetings. However, I want to confirm the list of proposed witnesses.

I'd like Ms. Khalid to repeat the names of those witnesses.



[English]

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Thank you, Chair.

Unfortunately, this has been a bit of a game. Although I have very clear notes as to what I would like to have amended, for some reason it has become a little more ambiguous as we're discussing it right now.

I am absolutely okay with Mario Dion and Konrad von Finckenstein.

**The Chair:** That's not the amendment that was proposed.

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** I'm sorry. Mr. Villemure just asked me which witnesses we would be okay with. I'm just answering his question. Is that okay?

**The Chair:** Yes, go ahead.

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** It would be Mr. Michael Duheme, Frédéric Pincince, and for the last one, the former PCO clerk, Mr. Wernick as the witnesses.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Mr. Villemure, is that acceptable?

**Mr. René Villemure:** It is.

[English]

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Two meetings would be absolutely great for me, if that's what Mr. Villemure is good with as well.

• (1620)

[Translation]

**Mr. René Villemure:** I would state “at least two”.

I'm leaving the door open, but that doesn't mean that there will be more than two.

[English]

**The Chair:** At least two meetings.... It stops it at two but the potential exists for more if the committee deems it.

Hang on a second, because there is some confusion here.

Correct me if I'm wrong on this. What we've come up with is that the committee will devote at least two meetings to this study. We agree with that. “That the committee request to appear, for one hour per witness”, do we agree with that? If I heard you right, that would include Mr. Dion; the current Ethics Commissioner, Mr. von Finckenstein; the RCMP commissioner; the staff sergeant; and the former clerk of the Privy Council, Mr. Wernick. Is that correct?

**An hon. member:** Yes.

**The Chair:** That's what we're dealing with.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Ms. Damoff, go ahead.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Do we need unanimous consent to withdraw Ms. Khalid's previous motion?

**The Chair:** We're just going to withdraw it. If this motion is correct and we're all in agreement, I don't think there's any need for further discussion on this.

Can we go to a vote, or do we have unanimous consent on this motion? What would you prefer?

[Translation]

**Mr. René Villemure:** I'm very happy with unanimous consent.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you, Mr. Villemure.

[English]

Is everyone good with this?

(Motion agreed to [See Minutes of Proceedings])

**The Chair:** That motion passes. Are you clear on this, Madam Clerk?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Nancy Vohl):** I am.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Barrett, you have the floor.

**Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC):** Thank you very much, Chair.

I have a motion that I would like to move. I'm going to provide it to the clerk for the benefit of our interpreters. I'm not sure if there's someone who can get it for them. It's very short, and I'll read it slowly.

I'll put it in the box. This is very old modern technology.

**Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC):** Is there anything else you should teach us?

**The Chair:** It's like a pigeon service.

Go ahead, Mr. Barrett.

**Mr. Michael Barrett:** That's right. It's trick or treat.

I move:

That, the committee order Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED) to provide unredacted copies of Raymond Chabot Grant Thornton's “Fact-Finding Exercise Report” for Sustainable Development Technology Canada by 8 p.m. tonight, Monday Oct 30 in both official languages and that Doug McConnachie appear at committee for two hours on Wednesday November 1st to answer questions regarding the report.

I have paper copies, but I don't think that works because we have people joining virtually.

While it's being circulated, can I speak to it, Chair?

**The Chair:** Yes. Apparently, the clerk has sent that to everyone already.

I'm going to remind you, Mr. Barrett, that the committee did agree to meet with a European Union delegation on ethics on Wednesday. I'm reminding you that it's already been planned. The delegation is coming to meet on an informal basis with the committee. Before you begin, I'm going to remind you of that.

**An hon. member:** Is the motion in order?

**The Chair:** Yes, I'm going to rule that in order.

Go ahead, Mr. Barrett.

**Mr. Michael Barrett:** Thanks very much, Chair.

This is all born out of the media reports about the \$1-billion SDTC green fund, which has now been revealed, through whistle-blower accounts, to be the subject of gross mismanagement and conflicts of interest.

The committee adopted a motion on this very issue. You identified at the start of the meeting, Chair, that we didn't set a date by which ISED would provide the committee with the report in both official languages.

However, something interesting has happened. I've been made aware, through communication with the whistle-blower, that they have been in contact with representatives from every party in the House of Commons. They have furnished them with a report and have tried to further the awareness of parliamentarians with this information.

We need to get the report from ISED. We need to get it unredacted, we need to get it in French and in English, and we need to get it soon.

The situation persists. Once we call witnesses—including, if we have the willingness, the whistle-blower, who's been reported in multiple media outlets—to come to committee, I think the committee will find that an invitation will be well received.

We need this information. The information that's been made available to members of the committee speaks to Mr. McConnachie's relevance to this. Also, his roles as ADM and as a CFO, as they relates to ISED, are why he's important as a first witness. Now, should we have the opportunity to also hear from the minister when he's in country and get to that, I think it's essential that we have the minister come to committee. We're also going to need to hear from other people.

It would be great pre-work for the committee to be able to receive this report and have a positioning meeting on the reception of that report by the government, after it's been prepared, in advance of later hearings on this.

Chair, hearing your comments and hearing other members in the room express concern about the proposal for Wednesday, I'd like the committee to seek to find another slot where we could do that. I'd welcome amendments on that. In that case, it wouldn't displace meetings that are coming up.

This issue is incredibly important. It speaks to massive sums of taxpayer money that are alleged to be the subject of mismanagement. There are allegations of conflict of interest that include the board chair and the CEO. We need to find out what the government has found out. This report is not published on websites, but I understand that the media have it, too. It's being circulated to members of Parliament, but the standing committee hasn't seemed to be able to get its hands on it.

Let's set a timeline. Let's get it from them today. If it's being sent to media, I'm sure they can send it to the clerk of a standing committee of the House of Commons.

Let's hear from Mr. McConnachie on his knowledge of the goings-on that have been publicly reported and that have been the subject of the information that's been shared with MPs.

• (1625)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I appreciate that, Mr. Barrett.

We have attempted several times to get the report, based on the original motion the committee passed several weeks ago. I think it was three weeks ago. I know there were concerted attempts last week by the clerk, on behalf of the committee, to try to get this report sent to us. We haven't received it.

As I said at the top of the meeting, I received it in my email. It was heavily redacted. There is no way I could share it with the committee because it was only in one language. I'm not even sure the report I got was accurate; I don't know. There has to be a sense of urgency on this. I can tell you that the information I've seen in the report could, and should, cause concern for members of the committee to deal with this issue as quickly as possible.

On the meeting with Mr. McConnachie, I would caution Mr. Barrett that, unless you want to have this meeting occur on the 6th, it may be awfully difficult for us to find another slot to have this meeting. If there was some direction to initiate this meeting on November 6, that would be helpful to me in organizing a meeting. In the meantime, Wednesday is set. I'm advised by the clerk that it may be difficult to find another slot. Obviously, the whips can work together, but it would be difficult. If we could look at November 6 as part of this, then I would appreciate that.

• (1630)

**Mr. Michael Barrett:** Chair, what I'd say to that is that if there is a willingness by this committee to turn this over to their whips, I think that would be very reasonable. If the time exists and the whips are willing to make it happen, then that's their role. If the time is not there and they're not able to furnish an agreed-upon time to the clerk, then we would look at the regular committee schedule.

For today, I don't think the substance of it needs to be, and I hope it's not, the subject of great debate. We already agreed to get the report. It was the suggestion of government members that we should be able to get the report, and I concur. It has already been prepared. Let's just get it in French and the official copy, and then we can move forward.

**The Chair:** To that end, I would agree.

I have Ms. Damoff, Ms. Khalid and then, Mr. Green, I see your hand.

Go ahead, Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thanks, Chair.

I would be curious to hear from the clerk what attempts have been made to get a copy of the report. Was there a timeline given on the requests to get the report?

**The Chair:** That's the issue we're dealing with: There is no timeline. Perhaps the clerk can advise us. There have been several attempts, not the least of which was the original motion.

Go ahead, Madam Clerk.

**The Clerk:** The clerk will not, on their own, decide on a deadline. The motion, and the amendment by Ms. Fortier when the motion was debated, was to ask for a copy, but there was no specific date. The clerk can only pass the motion over and say, "This was adopted, so we want a copy." I cannot, on my own, say, "I need this today."

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** That's fair.

From what I've heard.... Have you made multiple asks to get a copy of the report, or was there just the one ask for it?

**The Chair:** I have asked the clerk several times to contact the department for the report. We have not received the report at this point.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** How many times has the department been contacted?

**The Chair:** I would say there were at least three requests that I've made, Ms. Damoff, to have that report—

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Could I just get the clerk to confirm, though?

Were there three requests made to the department for the report?

**The Clerk:** I can tell you that I sent the invitation unofficially, as in, "I'm sending an email soon. Just so you know, this was adopted, and it's coming", so they knew already. Then, I sent a very official email. Then, as is always the case with officials from the department, we always do a lot of back-and-forth, and over the phone also. They said that they know the committee wants it, and the answer I get is, "It is forthcoming."

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** That's fine.

I have a problem with Mr. Barrett's motion. I don't know if this report is translated. If he thinks that in three hours a report can be received, translated and distributed, that is extremely unrealistic. It would be fair, from the original motion that we passed, to put a timeline on receiving the report and getting it sent out to us. However, this is an issue with the way we passed the motion in the first place, so putting a timeline on it is fair enough, but we've already passed a motion to hear from the minister and to hear from—I'm sorry, I don't remember the name of the company that did it—Raymond Chabot.

I'm curious whether or not the clerk has invited the minister and what the response has been to that.

I don't disagree with the motion to get the report, but I think the timeline is just crazy.

• (1635)

**The Chair:** Just for the sake of the committee, we can put a timeline on it. If the department comes back and says that in fact there is no translated document, then they can suggest a timeline in which they could translate it. I'm not sure what that would be, but we can make the request of the department. If the department comes back and says they don't have it in the two official languages, then they can tell us when they expect to have it translated. If they do have it in both official languages, then they can supply it when the deadline is indicated.

We can go to Mr. Barrett to provide some context. He said he has some context here that may help you out, Ms. Damoff.

Go ahead, Mr. Barrett.

**Mr. Michael Barrett:** The version of the report I have received in English is less than 30 pages, 27 pages, in terms of translating time. My understanding is that it is in the department's possession translated by the government, just for reference.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you, Mr. Barrett.

I haven't seen the report, so I have no idea. I'm not quite sure how the chair.... It was sent to you, but I haven't seen it. I don't think any of my colleagues have seen it.

I appreciate the clarification, but I would be curious to hear from the clerk in terms of the invitations for the minister. Before we start hearing from ADMs, who I understand are the ones he's asking for now, I think we should be hearing from the report's author and the minister.

I would be curious where we stand. I did see your statement, Chair. I'd be curious to hear from the clerk when the minister was invited and where we stand with that.

**The Chair:** I can answer that, if you'd like, because I directed the clerk to invite the minister. He was invited last week. My understanding is that he's out of the country, and he was unavailable this week to appear before the committee.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Was another invitation sent to him?

**The Chair:** There would have been another invitation, again understanding that he's out of the country, for him to appear before the committee next Monday, but again, that was all predicated on the fact that we would have the report in front of us, Ms. Damoff. I believe the committee having the report in front of us would give us the ability to question the minister based on the content of the report.

It was all under the caveat that the minister will not appear unless and until we have that report. That report becomes critical for the committee to do its work, in my opinion.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Chair, when are we going to finish the TikTok social media study, then?

**The Chair:** We were thrown for a bit of a loop here this week because of Mr. Dufresne last week, and then we had other witnesses, some of whom were unavailable. I'm going to try to get to that as quickly as I can, but on this issue particularly, Ms. Damoff, I believe it is not just in the committee's best interest but also in the country's best interest to deal with this issue as soon as possible.

Just remind me, Madam Clerk, did we have up to two meetings scheduled for this?

**The Clerk:** The motion was amended for two meetings.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** For two meetings on...?

**The Chair:** It's for two meetings on this particular issue.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I wasn't here when you passed the other motion. Just having heard TikTok appear here, having had one meeting on it and hearing about privacy issues when it comes to kids, I don't think you can say that one issue is more important than the other, Mr. Chair.

Even at the last meeting, you indicated, when we passed the motion, that we would be doing this after we finish what we tend to call the TikTok study, but it's much broader than that. It's about privacy concerns that Canadians have about social media and TikTok, particularly around our kids. Keeping our kids safe, Mr. Chair, should be something this committee is also really concerned about, and I think we are.

My understanding was that we were going to do the social media/TikTok review and the privacy concerns we have with that before we did the next motion. It seems like, now with Mr. Barrett's motion, we're prioritizing the other study. I don't disagree with putting timelines on it, and I think that's a good idea. You've obviously invited the minister for November 6, which, again, bumps the other study that we're doing.

I can't support Mr. Barrett's motion as it's written. I would also remind you that we need to prioritize the other study. Let's just get it done, and then we can move on to the next one.

• (1640)

**The Chair:** Okay, thank you.

Ms. Khalid, you're next.

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** Thanks, Chair.

I hope you can appreciate my frustration. I've been waiting since 2021 to look into and to study how social media and its privacy concerns impact young kids in my constituency, how they impact young kids across our country, adults and seniors, and their safety, security and privacy.

In fact, Mr. Chair, I hate to do this, but I'm just going to quote you. You said, on October 18, talking specifically about this issue:

Thank you, Mr. Barrett.

The motion has been moved. I'm going to deem it in order, but I will caution the committee that, whichever way we want to go with this, as you stated, it's not going to start in the next couple of weeks. I want to make that clear because we have committed to and are focused on the social media study and that's the actual game plan that we have mapped out between the clerk and the analysts.

Then, you go on to say in that same meeting:

Okay. What I will do, with the help of the clerk and the analyst, is find out when the expected date of this report is to be released publicly, and if we can find out an answer to that. As I stated earlier, we're not going to start this study if the motion is adopted as amended in the next couple of weeks.

Chair, you have committed to this committee, time and time again, that you will prioritize the study on social media and its impact on the privacy of Canadians and young Canadians. So far, since 2021, we have had, at maximum, an hour and a half on this study. That's an hour and a half, Chair, out of three years. Now, today, I hear you say, "Oh no, we have other concerns that Canadians are concerned about." I'm so sorry, Chair. Very respectfully, that is not your decision to make. It is the decision of the committee. The committee has decided this is a study they want to pursue.

For us to continually bring up motion after motion of political stunts, or whatever, to delay this study that is impacting young people in my community.... I've had two kids commit suicide this year, Chair. Two kids committed suicide in my riding, one of whom was a friend of my nephew, who went to school with him.

Chair, perhaps you don't understand how important this study is on what kids are going through nowadays. I would sincerely invite you to take a look at how kids and all Canadians are feeling about the impact of social media on their lives, given what is happening across the world right now. This study is probably the most important study we can have in our Parliament at this given time, given the graveness of what is happening across the world right now.

For us to revisit and to rehash these issues is absolutely insane to me. I can't begin to tell you how much my constituents are suffering. For me to have to sit here and have to explain why, again and again, for three years, Chair.... I can't begin to express to you what my frustration is. I want our government to take action on the impact of social media on Canadians: their privacy, safety and security. It matters to me, Chair. I really hoped it would matter to you and to members of this committee.

For me to sit here and to have to explain again why we should not have any meetings scheduled on whatever else is next on the agenda before we finish this study.... Chair, I'm baffled. I am absolutely baffled.

• (1645)

I'm really hoping, Chair, that Mr. Barrett can withdraw his motion and look at the timelines of his motion, instead of saying, "Oh, look, today we're meeting at 3:30 p.m., but by 8 p.m. I want this and this from X, Y and Z" and having these unreasonable timelines, knowing and understanding that we've already set aside the next committee meeting for this delegation to come and speak to us, to meet with us, knowing and understanding that we have passed a motion that prioritizes what Canadians are looking for, a motion that I care deeply about and that I know members across this committee care deeply about. Do we have to play politics with that, Chair?

I would very respectfully ask Mr. Barrett to withdraw his motion, to reconsider his timelines on that motion, knowing and understanding what the committee has already committed to and what Canadians are expecting this committee to do for us to ensure that we are working towards finding positive solutions for Canadians, including children, first and foremost, and their safety online and with social media. I would ask Mr. Barrett to withdraw his motion, look at those timelines and perhaps come back at a later time with a more reasonable timeline as to how we proceed on this committee.

Chair, I am not willing to put aside the study on social media for political games that the opposition may want to play. For me and the kids in my community who have committed suicide and those who are on the brink of mental health challenges because of social media issues, I am not willing to put this aside any longer, Chair.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Green, go ahead, please.

**Mr. Matthew Green:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I hadn't intended to be as active as I have been in this meeting today. Certainly, being remote and not having been at the last meeting, I think it is important for me to say that, up to this point, we've been working fairly well in terms of planning meetings with the executive and the subcommittee on the work we're supposed to be doing. I think you've done a commendable job in being non-partisan in your application of the work.

I do need to voice with you, on the record, my disappointment in what transpired last week as it related to what I would consider only a chair's prerogative to direct the schedule of this committee.

Committees, as you know, decide and direct the body of their work. You'll recall, in the last session, the concerns I raised around the haphazard manner in which we had two and three and four studies happening at the same time. This is a very serious committee, and one that I think deserves the kind of consistency and integrity around how we go about our work.

I do believe that Mr. Barrett presents really important motions that, I think, deserve study and deserve scrutiny by this committee. What I'm not on for is being at the whim of the Conservative caucus in terms of the application of the schedule. You'll note that Mr. Villemure and I, being third and fourth parties respectively, also have, within the subcommittee, valuable and important input on what the priorities of this committee should be.

I would say to you, sir, that what transpired last week, with the livestreaming and the circus and the fundraising that happened in that committee, is a problem. I'm going to say on the record, not in camera but in a very public way, that if that is going to be the tenor and the approach of this committee, you can expect a very different type of participation from me as a New Democrat.

I would hope that we could continue to unpack the critical issues being presented in a way that is thoughtful and that creates a basic amount of professional courtesy. I would also caution you, sir, not to use your chair's prerogative to supersede the will of this committee when decisions haven't been made for this committee. I would caution you against that.

I have a tremendous amount of respect for you, John, but I think it's important to state that, because I wasn't here and it certainly put my replacement in a bit of a predicament. It's now becoming a bit of a pattern over these couple of weeks. We're getting table-dropped this stuff where your urgent and important.... It's not you as the chair, but the Conservative caucus's motions become urgent and important, and we're seeing this in other committees too.

I'm not going to go on and on about this, but I think it's important that I publicly state, not having been here last week and seeing where this one is going, that Mr. Barrett knows this is something I absolutely support in its spirit. However, if there is a continued failure to consult, whether in a subcommittee capacity or what have you, on the schedule and the priorities of this committee, then you're not going to find a lot of co-operation from me.

That's the caution that I give. If it's the will of the mover to push it ahead anyway and to go out and say, "Look at this and let me raise money", then, fine, by all means, do that. However, if the mover of the motion is serious and wants to get to work on this, then let's talk. Let's find a schedule where this works.

I'm saying this, Mr. Chair, as somebody who—as all the members will recall, except for the new ones—supported the Conservative opposition in continuing the work that we needed to continue when it was my opinion that the Liberals were using TikTok to pivot away from other important issues of the committee. I'm certainly trying to be consistent with the integrity I have around keeping focus, and I would ask him to do the same.

Thank you.

• (1650)

**The Chair:** Mr. Kurek, I have you next.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Thanks very much, Chair.

Certainly, it's been interesting. I think each person around this table would highlight priorities they have. We've been able to do a great deal of work over the course of the last number of years I've had the privilege of being on this committee, and I look forward to continuing that work.

Specifically in regard to Mr. Barrett's motion, I think something that needs to be highlighted here is that if we had a government that was forthcoming with information that was requested of it, we wouldn't have spent the last—

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** I have a point of order, Chair.

**The Chair:** I have Ms. Khalid.

**Ms. Iqra Khalid:** I don't think those kinds of comments are relevant with respect to the discussion we're having on this motion.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Go ahead.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** On a point of order, Chair, I think it's entirely relevant. If the member is concerned about the lack of forthcomingness.... She sits in the same caucus as the minister who has been requested to appear.

Chair, I think it would be incumbent upon us. This is a practical measure. I have not yet heard an amendment to extend the deadline to try to work collaboratively among parties, to try to figure out a path forward that could actually get this information, so that we could get the answers that Canadians are certainly seeking. I could speak at length, certainly, about what my constituents share with me on a daily basis about the priorities that the ethics committee should be looking at. I have had that opportunity in the past and certainly look forward to it again.

Chair, I think that as we approach this subject, we're now going on with a fairly lengthy debate on what is a motion to simply add some parameters around information that this committee has already requested. Had the government been forthcoming, we wouldn't be here. They haven't been. Therefore, we're saying that it's time to be forthcoming. I think that it is not only reasonable but incumbent upon us to ensure that happens. If members of the Liberal Party or other parties have a suggestion as to what that should look like.... Certainly, I won't pretend to speak for my colleagues here, but I think there would be a willingness for us to entertain that as a conversation, so that we could continue doing the work that we've all talked about at length around this committee table and that we want this committee to do.

With that, Chair, let's continue to do the work that we've been talking about.

Thank you.

• (1655)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Kurek.

I'm just going to remind the committee that there are a couple of sensitive issues we need to deal with in camera as well, some sensitive issues related to previous witness testimony, so I would like an opportunity to do that.

Ms. Damoff, I have you next. Go ahead.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you, Chair.

I'm going to suggest some amendments to Mr. Barrett's motion: changing the time and date to 5 p.m. tomorrow, October 31; asking the person he has asked to appear, the assistant deputy minister, to appear with officials when the minister comes—he would probably be here anyway, but that's just to ensure that this individual is with the officials when he appears; and also, Chair, that you call a subcommittee meeting to get a work plan for us.

We just passed a motion from Mr. Villemure about having the RCMP come. That issue was so important to you last week, Chair, that you called a meeting without consulting any of us, and Mr. Barrett proceeded to post on Facebook Live and to post all of our email addresses. Do you know, Mr. Barrett, that we had to create a misogyny subfolder in my inbox because of the type of emails we got after you posted that? I don't know if you're aware of just how horrific were the emails that we got. I could send some of them to you, Michael, but based on your using that meeting, which was your number one priority last week....

Those are the changes I'd like to see, Mr. Chair: that you call a subcommittee meeting; that the time be amended to 5 p.m. tomor-

row; and that the ADM—I don't remember the gentleman's name—be asked to appear with officials when the minister appears.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Damoff.

The amendment is on the floor to change the deadline for the report to be given to the committee to 5 p.m. tomorrow; to call a subcommittee meeting, I assume as soon as is reasonably practicable; and then the other one is to have Mr. McConnachie appear when the minister appears.

Is that correct?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** With officials when the minister appears.... I don't think we want to take time away from the minister himself.

**The Chair:** Well, typically, if the minister does accept an invitation, he would come for an hour, and then we'd have officials right after that.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** That's right, yes, and they're usually at the table when he's here anyway, but I don't want to say that he is appearing with equal status with the minister.

**The Chair:** I see. Okay. Thank you.

We have an amendment on the floor.

Mr. Green, go ahead, please.

**Mr. Matthew Green:** Thank you very much.

I appreciate that intervention. Actually, it's been my experience that it's better to have those two complements together in the same meeting. Otherwise, you have a minister saying that they don't have the information and they have to hear it from the senior official, and sometimes the other way around, so it's good to have them both in order to make sure there's clarity in the answers provided on the day of the meeting.

I do appreciate the subcommittee. That's the basis of the point that I had, which is around the courtesy of working through a work plan so that we don't end up with six concurrent studies all happening at the same time.

I also want to be clear about the demand for documents. Those of you who've been around the table will know that I share the concerns around the delays on the demands for documents. It does, however, require us to be clear in the motions as drafted. If you do not give a deadline, you will not get a response. I think that's a teachable moment for the mover of the motion, who's quite learned. Hopefully, on a move-forward basis, we'll have that.

I do think it's a problem when anybody—ministers, prime ministers, departments, department heads, RCMP, I don't care who it is—flouts the will of this committee. It is a significant problem when it comes to our parliamentary privilege to demand documents.

I support this as is. I certainly look forward to seeing those responsible submit the documents as demanded. It's a demand for documents. That's what we're doing. For all the ADMs and people who might be tuned in and watching this meeting, know that you've been put on notice. If you fail to meet the will of this committee, then you should expect to be called forward for that.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Green.

I'm sure you'll recall that the original request would have led to probably thousands and thousands of documents. The starting point for the committee was in fact the accounts report.

We have the amendment on the floor. I don't see any hands up for any further discussion on that.

Do we have unanimous consent on the amendment?

**An hon. member:** I'd like a roll call vote.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Madam Clerk, please take a vote on the amendment.

As a reminder to the committee, the amendment is for the department to provide the documents by 5 p.m. tomorrow; to have supporting staff, including the ADM, come when the minister comes; and then to call a subcommittee meeting of the committee.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 3 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** We will move on to the motion as amended.

Is there any other discussion?

Seeing none, is everyone in favour? Perfect.

We have unanimous consent on that, Madam Clerk.

(Motion as amended agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** I'd like to go in camera. It will take about five minutes. There are a couple of sensitive issues that we need to discuss.

I will now adjourn the public portion of the meeting.

Thank you.

[*Proceedings continue in camera*]

---







Published under the authority of the Speaker of  
the House of Commons

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

---

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité  
du Président de la Chambre des communes

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

---

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :  
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>