



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 109

Tuesday, March 19, 2024

Chair: Mr. John Williamson



Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Tuesday, March 19, 2024

• (1530)

[Translation]

The Chair (Mr. John Williamson (New Brunswick South-west, CPC)): Good afternoon. I call the meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number 109 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

[English]

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, including today's witness.

All comments should be addressed through the chair.

[Translation]

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(g), the committee is resuming consideration of report 1 of the 2024 reports of the Auditor General of Canada, entitled "Report 1: ArriveCAN", referred to the committee on Monday, February 12, 2024.

[English]

I would like to welcome our witness.

David Yeo, business owner, is joining us, as I've said, by video conference.

Mr. Yeo, I appreciate you making yourself available to us today. As discussed with the clerk, you have an opening statement of up to five minutes. Please go ahead.

Mr. David Yeo (Business Owner, Dalian Enterprises Inc.): I would like to start off by saying thank you, Mr. Chair and honourable members of the committee.

This land that we gather on today is the traditional, ancestral and unceded territory of the Anishinabe Algonquin Nation and is now home to many other first nations, Métis and Inuit peoples.

I am a descendant of treaty-signing chief Robert Franklin, who is my great-grandfather and was past chief of Alderville First Nation. He was also a World War I veteran. I hold the Alderville First Nation community near and dear to my heart, as this is what forms my indigenous ancestry. I have family who live there and my father is also buried there next to my great-grandfather.

I, too, am an indigenous veteran. I served in the Canadian army for 14 years, from 1987 to 2001. Following this, I joined the Cana-

dian Armed Forces reserves for another 10 years, from 2001 to 2011.

From September 1991 to February 1992, I was deployed to Cyprus as part of a UN mission with the 2nd Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment. I was a C9 machine gunner and driver along the front lines for six months.

From August to November 2010, I was deployed to Afghanistan as a contractor for the Department of National Defence to deliver a high-assurance security capability to Kandahar. We also went outside the wire to all the forward operating bases as well. I received a Command Commendation for my contribution to Task Force Kandahar.

I am a tactical security specialist, with expertise and certifications in high-assurance guarding technologies for the Canadian Armed Forces on both mobile platforms and specialty areas within the CAF.

In 2002, I founded Dalian Enterprises, which is a hardware and software cybersecurity company. The Government of Canada is Dalian's primary customer.

From 2002 until September 2023, I was not an employee of the Canadian government in any capacity, but a contractor providing IT professional security services through Dalian to the Department of National Defence.

Since 2002, Dalian has been regularly audited by Indigenous Services Canada to confirm compliance with all requirements of the procurement strategy for indigenous business. The company has passed every one of them, including one just recently in February 2024.

The PSIB is designed to help indigenous entrepreneurs like me start and grow a business by providing them access to procurement opportunities from the Government of Canada, either directly or through partnership. The PSIB has been successful in helping many indigenous-owned companies, including Dalian, to launch, grow and prosper.

In late September 2023, long after the completion of all work on ArriveCAN by Dalian, my professional relationship changed with the Department of National Defence. It changed from that of a consultant providing IT professional security services to a public service employee with the PIPSC union. That happened on September 19, 2023.

Due to this change, I took steps to address any conflict of interest concerns by entering into a confidentiality, non-disclosure and non-access agreement with Dalian, in which I agreed to refrain from participating in any Dalian proposals, projects, contracts, ventures or any other activity relating, directly or indirectly, to the Department of National Defence.

Since becoming a public service employee of National Defence, I've honoured that agreement. I have not been involved in any management or operations at Dalian and have not had access to Dalian confidential information of any kind.

I also made the appropriate conflict of interest filings with the Department of National Defence, resigned as a director and officer of Dalian and put my Dalian shares into a blind trust.

Unfortunately, no one from the media ever contacted Dalian or me before publishing reports late in February that suggested that I was a public service employee for decades. This resulted in an unfounded allegation at DND that I was in conflict of interest.

I understand that DND has now made a statement that there was no conflict of interest, but I had already made the choice and resigned from the public service after just 168 days, mostly due to this very difficult situation.

• (1535)

Even more disappointingly, no one from the federal government had ever contacted Dalian or me before undertaking the unfounded action of terminating all contracts with Dalian—hardware and software, and professional services—suspending security clearances, suspending Dalian and Coradix from continuing current work and competing for future opportunities with the Government of Canada, their primary customer for 22 years and 29 years respectively. This all happened within 48 hours, without due diligence or, in our concept, due process.

There has not been a single review, investigation, audit, report or study that has indicated Dalian or Coradix did anything wrong or illegal during ArriveCAN or the ArriveCAN project, or any other government project that we've been involved with.

Despite this and as a result of these unfounded terminations and suspensions, hundreds of employees and consultants are already out of work, or soon will be, from both companies. Neither company has done anything wrong or different for the past two and three decades of working with the federal government.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you very much. That went a little over time, people might recognize, but I did want to give you an opportunity to get your words on the record.

Mr. David Yeo: I appreciate that.

The Chair: Turning now to our first round, we have Mr. Barrett. You have the floor for six minutes, please.

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): On what date did you start your employment with the Government of Canada?

Mr. David Yeo: The Government of Canada start date was September 19, 2023.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Okay. I'll circle back to that.

On what date were you first employed in any capacity with the Government of Canada, including in the Canadian Armed Forces?

Mr. David Yeo: That would be a start date of December 17, 1987.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Have you been employed by any other departments other than as a regular reserve member of the Canadian Armed Forces and the Department of National Defence?

Mr. David Yeo: The short answer is no, but I'm assuming you're talking about my consulting work.

Mr. Michael Barrett: We'll get to that.

Mr. David Yeo: Okay.

Mr. Michael Barrett: You mentioned the date of September 19, 2023. On that date what did you say happened?

Mr. David Yeo: That was the date I started as a public service employee.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Did anything else happen on that date that's noteworthy for the work of this committee?

Mr. David Yeo: Not that I'm aware of, no.

Mr. Michael Barrett: In the documents that the committee has received it says that the department signed a contract with you on that very same date. I find that interesting that on September 19, 2023, you were awarded both a contract and a job in the public service.

Does Dalian have contracts that are current with the Government of Canada?

Mr. David Yeo: Not currently, no...because they were all terminated.

Mr. Michael Barrett: The number is zero.

Mr. David Yeo: The number is zero.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Is Dalian able to fully do business with the Government of Canada or bid on work?

Mr. David Yeo: No, we are not. We have been suspended from all security clearances, obviously, pending this discussion and other discussions that are ongoing. All of our contracts have been terminated. By virtue of that, there is no ability to execute....

• (1540)

Mr. Michael Barrett: How many subcontractors do you have?

Mr. David Yeo: That is a really good question.

From a professional services standpoint, I would actually have to get back to you on that. From a hardware and software perspective, we have four or five we use.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Sir, if you're going to get back to us with the number, can you also provide the committee with the names of those subcontractors?

Mr. David Yeo: Absolutely, for sure.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Perhaps you could note that for us, please, Chair.

The Chair: It's noted.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Was GC Strategies ever a subcontractor of Dalian?

Mr. David Yeo: Again, I spent a large portion of my time with the defence department, whether it was my 168 days as a public servant or my consulting time at the department. To answer your question, the obvious answer is yes, but on the aspect of their working with us, I'd have to get more detail for you.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Can you provide us with the when and on which contracts?

Mr. David Yeo: Yes.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Okay. Thank you.

We know, of course, that they were. I appreciate your indicating an even tertiary awareness of it. They were caught not following security requirements for government contracts.

For all of your contracts with the government, knowing that GC Strategies did not meet security requirements, are you able to guarantee the security of all of the contracted work that you have done with the Government of Canada?

Mr. David Yeo: Again, the short answer would be yes, because we are ISO certified in our processes. A large part of this happens to be with our...as a prime contractor with the federal government, whether it's an aboriginal set-aside contract or not, because we've had both in the past. I would say in retrospect to that, if they have some misgivings on their security clearances, that would be tracked through, and we should have an awareness of that at our own security shop. I've never been told of any issues with the security clearance side of things with GC. Again, I've just been read into this file over the last number months, and it hasn't come up as an issue.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Are you aware of the reports I'm referring to where GC Strategies did not follow the security requirements for contracts with the Government of Canada?

Is that something you've been aware of prior to my speaking of it with you just now?

Mr. David Yeo: No. You'd have to give me more details on the actual security requirements that were not followed, because I'm not aware of any.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Have you or your partner at Dalian ever provided any hospitality to any Government of Canada employees?

Mr. David Yeo: Not that I'm aware of, no. I certainly haven't.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Have you or your partner at Dalian ever met with government employees outside of government offices?

Mr. David Yeo: I know I have not. This is not something that is even remotely looked at from an internal perspective, but as far as I'm aware, no.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Did you ever meet with Kristian Firth of GC Strategies?

Mr. David Yeo: I have not met Kristian once.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Have you ever spoken to him?

Mr. David Yeo: No.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Have you ever spoken to his partner?

Mr. David Yeo: No.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Has your partner ever spoken to Mr. Firth or his partner?

Mr. David Yeo: I would assume yes to that question. Obviously, there was a subcontract that was put together for the CBSA for this effort. I would imagine there would have been dialogue that would have had to have happened, yes.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Is Dalian registered anywhere outside of Canada?

Mr. David Yeo: No.

Mr. Michael Barrett: You stated previously that you are constantly audited to ensure you're eligible for the indigenous set-aside when winning bids as a joint venture with Coradix.

Who is conducting these audits, and when was the last audit done?

Mr. David Yeo: The audits are done by ISC, which is Indigenous Services Canada. The last one was done in February 2024, just a few weeks ago.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Barrett.

Next, we have Mr. Chen, for six minutes, please.

Mr. Shaun Chen (Scarborough North, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Yeo, how many years has Dalian been working on federal contracts?

Mr. David Yeo: I started the company in 2001-02. We won our first contract within the first year, so shortly after that.

• (1545)

Mr. Shaun Chen: Could you describe the nature of your contributions to the ArriveCAN application?

Mr. David Yeo: I'm very much two gates deep at DND in what I do, or what I did at the department before I had to resign after 168 days. The upshot is that when it comes to ArriveCAN, and I've been read into the file now and have been for a while, the aspect of revenue, from what I understand, is \$4.9 million. That's basically \$1.6 million per year for the three years the contracts were open. From what I understand, that went through a staff augmentation contract at the CBSA, so it wasn't actually an ArriveCAN app, it was a directorate or a department level standing offer through TBIPS, or, in this case, BASD. From my understanding, that's the staff augmentation contract that was used to facilitate this. It was 20 contractors for three years for approximately 100 days per year, which is basically part-time.

Mr. Shaun Chen: Could you describe your relationship, if any, with GC Strategies and also Coradix?

Mr. David Yeo: I don't have a personal relationship or a professional relationship with GC. I mean, from my understanding and getting read into the file, it was part of the communication from the CBSA that there was a task authorization coming that needed to be fulfilled through GC. As a prime contractor and a general contractor for that contract, we facilitated that. That was basically my interaction with GC, which was nil. I haven't spoken to any of the principals. I've just been read into the file, and this is what I know.

As far as Coradix is concerned, it's a much different relationship. I've been with it since 2001-02. I first started this company from Barrhaven on my kitchen table. Going after the first indigenous contract that I was awarded in the first year with the RCMP and Bell Canada was to provide hardware to the RCMP.

Obviously, being one guy trying to start a business, I partnered with Coradix, because I know some people. We've had a very good relationship since then. It's been a shared services model between two companies. Coradix does much different work than we do at Dalian as far as security is concerned, so it seemed like a good fit. It's been a 22, 23-year relationship with Coradix, yes.

Mr. Shaun Chen: I'd like to hear, in your view, the timeline of the events. We've been talking about various dates already in this meeting. What is the timeline of events that has led us to this point?

Mr. David Yeo: Again, I'm buried two gates deep doing high-assurance security, trying to get it out to our war fighters, so getting right into this file was probably my first shot, back in October of last year, realistically, when we got the notification that we needed to go and talk to OGGO. From a timeline perspective, that's where I sit, from getting right into the file.

However, after gaining some knowledge on it, my understanding is that this goes back to 2019. We had a very good contract with the CBSA, a staff augmentation contract through PSPC, and we were doing some good things over there. The intent of the CBSA was actually to bring over 25% of its server applications from the CBSA on-prem to the AWS cloud. I think that's where it started in 2019.

Then, obviously, in the early 2020s, we had this whole COVID-outbreak thing happen and all of this craziness that happened with the ramp-up to getting ArriveCAN out the door. We were a small part of that; we were \$4.9 million of that—\$1.6 million per year and 20 part-time contracts. From that perspective, that's where I think it started.

When it finished was May 2023, from what I understand, and that was certainly well before I started with the public service.

Mr. Shaun Chen: Have you spoken to the RCMP on anything to do with government contracting?

• (1550)

Mr. David Yeo: No. The RCMP has not been in contact with me at all.

Mr. Shaun Chen: Have you spoken to anyone else on this issue, to anyone who has been looking into the matter—for example, the Auditor General?

Mr. David Yeo: No, I have had no interaction with the Auditor General at all, other than I know that our staff noticed the discrepancies within the Auditor General's report. They notified the Audi-

tor General on January 30 of this year of the discrepancy, that it wasn't \$7.9 million but \$4.9 million, but that never made it into the report.

Mr. Shaun Chen: You mentioned discrepancies in the report. You just mentioned one of them. Are there any other discrepancies that your staff or you have noted in the report that you brought to the attention, or plan to bring to the attention, of the Auditor General?

Mr. David Yeo: As it sits right now, I have read the report. I am a certified contract and procurement specialist. That's what I did for my first 100-some-odd days with DND, and I've been around contracting forever, so I understand it completely.

What I can say out of the gate is that when I read through the Auditor General's report, I see that it's a good report, but it has vagaries and discrepancies in it. There is incorrect information in it. One of those incorrect areas is in our revenue stream because \$7.9 million is not \$4.9 million, and \$4.9 million is not \$7.9 million. There's a \$3-million difference, and it's a 60% delta. From that concept right there, it's definitely a different aspect.

The other side of it is that, under "Findings", there is a paragraph in there that says, "We found that 18% of invoices submitted by contractors that we tested did not [provide enough information] to determine whether expenses related to ArriveCAN or another information technology (IT) project."

I have a good number of notes on this. I've gone through the entire thing. I have a lot of questions and things like that.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Chen. That is your time.

[Translation]

Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné, you have the floor for six minutes.

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné (Terrebonne, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Yeo, how many employees has Dalian had since 2008?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: I tried to understand a bit of that, but unfortunately there was no interpretation in my ear.

The Chair: Apparently there is a globe on the bottom of your screen. If you click on that, it will probably give you interpretation.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Are you going to reset the clock, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: Yes, absolutely.

[English]

Do you see anything like that, Mr. Yeo?

Mr. David Yeo: I do, yes, absolutely.

The Chair: If you click on that, you might get the various options.

Mr. David Yeo: Okay, I have it on “French” right now. Do you want to try it again?

The Chair: You might hear me in French.

[Translation]

Can you hear me in English or in French? Is it working?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: I'm on “English” right now.

The Chair: Can you hear me in English? Did you hear what I said in English?

Mr. David Yeo: I did.

[Translation]

The Chair: Okay.

Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné, you can start from the beginning. Please go ahead for six minutes.

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Yeo, I have a quick first question: How many employees does Dalian have and what is its employment history since 2008?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: We had, I believe, up to seven or eight full-time employees during the 2008 to 2012-13 time frame. The reason behind that, obviously, is that we were growing. That was a good time for us, but SSC came in during the 2012-13 time frame and changed a lot of our abilities to execute with the government. Therefore, there was a lot of downsizing after that, and a lot of consolidation.

We've now moved down, as a matter of fact, to two full-time employees. However, where this gets off the rails is..... Because we have a partnership with Coradix, we have a shared services model. We were doing shared services before Shared Services became a thing.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Yeo.

According to the timeline provided to us by the Department of National Defence, you started your job on September 19, 2023, and a contract was signed on September 28, 2023. Only nine days later, you signed a contract while you were a full-time employee of the Department of National Defence.

Mr. Yeo, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that, when public servants take up their positions, they must comply with the Values and Ethics Code for the Public Sector. The code states very clearly that you must declare any appearance of a conflict of interest to a superior. Did you do so on September 28, 2023?

• (1555)

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: Again, being buried two gates deep in DND in what I do with hired security there.... Also, on the 19th and even prior to that, I started to devolve myself from the company. I gave the ability for...as I was moving through the aspects of divestiture with my lawyers and everything else. It took some time. I will agree. That timing is not charitable to your timeline of only a few days.

However, the short answer is this: No, I did not inform anyone at the department that I signed anything. Then again, I did not actually sign it. I had a signature available for the staff at the office to use after the 19th—

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Sir, you know very well that in court, a signature has legal effect. If your signature was put to a contract by someone else, you are responsible for it. I hope you are aware of that, because you are responsible for the contract that was signed on September 28. It's your signature, so you're accountable.

Apparently, you did not inform a supervisor that there was at least a very strong appearance of conflict of interest.

We learned through the newspapers that, according to the Public Accounts of Canada, Dalian had received nearly \$150 million in total for contracts since 2008. I understand that there are subcontractors. The fact remains that, for a company that has had at most 10 employees, that's a lot of money.

Why did you accept a position that paid less than \$100,000 with the Department of National Defence when your two-person company had made \$150 million in a few years?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: That's a good question, and I appreciate it.

Yes, we had some great years between 2008 and the run-up to Shared Services. We had some pretty lean years between 2013 and now, basically, from a hardware-software perspective, for sure. You know, my reasoning for getting back into the department was not based on money. I did 36 years with the department in varying capacities, whether regular forces, reserves or by contracting time plus my 168 days as a civil servant.

However, I got back in primarily to drive capability and high-assurance guarding solutions towards the war fighters who are in harm's way on the eastern flank of NATO. That was my job there. That was my claim and what I did at the department. Because I was there for so long, I understood it, and I was at the pinnacle of my technical abilities. It made sense for me to get in and drive technology down to the war fighters who need it the most.

That's primarily the reason, because I didn't do it for the money.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: During that time, a contract was nevertheless awarded to Dalian by the Department of National Defence to carry out work, and that contract was signed by you.

How many hours of work did you do? How many hours of work did Dalian carry out on the last contract I mentioned, the one signed on September 28, 2023? What work did Dalian do on that contract?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: Again, I got right into that part of it just recently because it was a very small contract. I think it was \$40,000 or maybe \$49,000, from what I'm aware of, but it was attached to a hardware—

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: The average annual salary of a Quebecer is \$40,000. That is not a “small contract”. If I were you, I would choose my words carefully.

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: Yes, but 75% or 80% of it goes back to the consultant doing the work.

To answer your question, though, there is precedence for how you handle conflict of interest within a 60-day period or windows of that time frame, and I did put in a no-access, no-contact, no non-disclosure with Dalian within that 60-day period. I signed that on November 10, 2023, which was within the 60-day window.

After that, we were working with lawyers and getting our stuff together as far as forms and everything were concerned, getting my divestiture done and that sort of stuff during the time frame, and that has already been submitted to DND as well, but, due to the hype and everything else around this particular ArriveCAN app, I ended up having to put in my resignation. I was still on probation because I was only there for 168 days.

• (1600)

[Translation]

The Chair: You still have time for a short question, Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné.

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: No, that's fine.

Thank you.

The Chair: Okay, thank you.

[English]

Next up is Mr. Desjarlais.

You have the floor for six minutes, please.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank the witness for being with us today. It's a very important topic.

My colleagues asked some questions, but I'll have you reiterate some of the responses you gave in relation to the origin of your company.

When did your company start under the name Dalian?

Mr. David Yeo: Well, I started it myself in 2001-2002. I don't have the exact date on me, but there are documents that stood up the company at that time, and I named the company myself.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: When did you begin bidding on government contracts?

Mr. David Yeo: It was very shortly thereafter. I was talking with Terry Matthews here in town at a breakfast meeting, and he mentioned to me that I should go after indigenous business because that was something he was aware of.

At that point I looked into it, and I found an indigenous contract that I could go after, and I won it within the first year that I started the company.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: How large was your company then, and how large is it now?

Mr. David Yeo: It was only one person then, because it was from my dining room table in Barrhaven, but we have grown.

It grew in 2008 to 2010 to 2012, and then we've obviously contracted a lot because our hardware business has all but dried up. We still do some professional services.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: How much total money in public contracts has your company received?

Mr. David Yeo: From 2015 until now, we have had \$91 million in contracts on TBIPS basically, the professional services contracts.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: What is it exactly that your company does?

Mr. David Yeo: We're a hardware and software company as well as a professional services security company.

Basically, we go after government contracts as a general contractor. When it comes to our professional services, we hire our contractors through either subcontracting or potentially a JV with another company.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: How many subcontractors does your company operate, given particular contracts, on average?

Mr. David Yeo: On average, not many. We usually do them ourselves, especially the hardware and software contracts.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: How many subcontractors do you operate right now?

Mr. David Yeo: Again, that's a great question. I don't have that on the tip of my tongue, so I'll have to go back to the shop and ask them.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Yes, it would be great if you could supply that list as well.

Mr. David Yeo: For sure.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: I want to turn attention to statements that were made by a firm known as Botler.

Their chief executive named Dutt told MPs in another committee that she feared Dalian's procurement policies were “another example of monetization and theft using the trauma of marginalized communities.”

Why do you think she said that?

Mr. David Yeo: I have my own opinions—there's no question about that—but I'm not sure I can give them here.

It's really an irrational statement, to be honest with you. I've been operating for 22 years with the government, with top secret clearances and top secret facility clearances. We are not a bricks-and-mortar company. I have an office on the seventh floor of 222 Somerset Street downtown, and Coradix is down on the fifth floor.

I believe that Botler, for what they've brought to this situation, were hired for four or five deliverables. They got through two of them, and CBSA cancelled their task authorization for whatever reasons.

We got that cancellation of the task authorization. We passed it on to GC Strategies, and it floated down to Botler, and they've been not necessarily the kindest to Dalian since.

The costing of this is small with respect to the ArriveCan application project.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Botler made clear that they were not certain your firm or other firms, in particular GC Strategies, were aware that there were that many subcontractors.

When did you become aware that there were subcontractors like Botler engaged in the same project you were?

Mr. David Yeo: I'm two gates deep in DND on a pretty much daily basis, helping them over there, getting the right capabilities into the right hands of the war fighters. I got right into this as quickly as I could in the fall, especially when Botler was making the waves they were, which I think was inappropriate.

No, as far as I'm concerned, it's unfortunate that Botler took that tack.

I don't know if I answered your question. I apologize for that. If I didn't answer your question, ask it again, please.

• (1605)

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: I'll ask it in a different way.

The issues that were brought forward by Botler include layers of subcontracting that hide key details about who is getting paid for what and the cozy ties between private staffing firms and, of course, those public servants who ultimately influence that decision.

Please comment directly on your knowledge related to the subcontracting and whether in your mind key details about who was getting paid for what were clear.

Mr. David Yeo: Subcontracting happens all the time. We are the prime contractor on a lot of contracts, and then we sub out a lot of our work to other subcontractors. It happens in every industry. It doesn't matter whether it's for pencils—

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: But the government is very particular. This is public money. It's very important to understand that we pay the utmost attention to the integrity of our public service.

Do you believe there were key details being hidden by way of multiple layers of subcontracting?

Mr. David Yeo: I'm not aware of that, no.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: In my next round of questions, I'll speak to you directly with respect to your knowledge on subcontracting, how many other subcontractors there were, and the numbers associated with those subcontracts, as well as the task authorization process.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Desjarlais.

We're opening our second round.

Mr. Brock, you have the floor for five minutes.

Mr. Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant, CPC): Thank you, Chair.

Good afternoon, Mr. Yeo.

I understand from earlier testimony that you became a public servant with DND on September 19, 2023. You last testified before a committee on October 31, 2023, approximately a month and a half after you secured full-time employment as a public servant.

I've read the transcript of your previous testimony. At no point in time, despite being asked several questions about the nature of your employment—you focused squarely on your directorship and your shares within Dalian—did you say anything about the fact that you were a public servant.

It begs the question: Why would you withhold that information from Canadians?

Mr. David Yeo: I appreciate the question.

This needs to be analyzed a little more. It was on September 19 that I joined the public service. It was 42 days later that the meeting came to us and we were invited as Dalian. I was invited to come to you and speak at OGGO as Dalian.

The understanding was that Dalian holds a top secret facility clearance. Those who know what a top secret facility clearance is know. I hold and I did hold a higher than top secret security clearance for Dalian. As well, in my short time of 42 days with the department, I also had a top secret clearance there and a secret clearance.

By virtue of that aspect and the fact that this had zero to do with DND, zero to do with what I was doing during the day as a high assurance specialist for the department and zero to do with my employment there, as well as the fact that—

Mr. Larry Brock: Sir, I'm going to stop you there. My time is limited.

I don't accept your response, and I think most Canadians don't accept that response. After a month and a half, you were divesting your interests in Dalian. You had resigned as a director. You put all of your interests in a blind trust and you were working on a full-time basis with DND. Correct? You had no interest in Dalian, yet you gave the impression you were still an active participant in this two-person company. So, sir, with respect, I completely disagree with your word salad of an explanation because it just doesn't add up.

Now I'm going to move on to a monetary aspect.

You confirmed to my NDP colleague you've received \$91 million in federal contracts since Justin Trudeau essentially took over government in 2015. What is your commission rate of that \$91 million?

Mr. David Yeo: As a business, from Dalian's perspective, and these were TBIPS, professional services contracts—

• (1610)

Mr. Larry Brock: Sir, just the commission rate, please.

Mr. David Yeo: Sure, but I need to preface that to make sure the committee understands—

Mr. Larry Brock: No, you don't. I'm asking for a number, sir, or a range. What is your commission?

Mr. David Yeo: Most of the time it ranges between 12% and 20%, and in this case for the ArriveCAN aspect—that \$91 million wasn't ArriveCAN, by the way—it was 18.2% from what my staff told me.

Mr. Larry Brock: That's 18.2% for—

Mr. David Yeo: That's correct.

Mr. Larry Brock: —for ArriveCAN. And you said you disagree with the AG's report—

Mr. David Yeo: I do.

Mr. Larry Brock: —and that you only received \$4.9 million—

Mr. David Yeo: Yes, \$1.6 million a year.

Mr. Larry Brock: Okay. So your 18.2% of \$4.9 million—I can't do the quick math—was that shared between you and your partner?

Mr. David Yeo: No. You have to understand that's gross profit, right?

Mr. Larry Brock: Sir, was it shared between you and your partner? Is it a fifty-fifty share operation with your other partner?

Mr. David Yeo: It's a gross profit. When it gets to be a gross profit, you have to factor in expenses: employees' wages, commissions—

Mr. Larry Brock: I understand that, sir. Were you sharing—

Mr. David Yeo: But at the end of it, sure.

Mr. Larry Brock: We're you sharing in the profits fifty-fifty?

Mr. David Yeo: No, not fifty-fifty. I'm a majority shareholder in Dalian. Why would I share fifty-fifty?

Mr. Larry Brock: So what was your share of the \$4.9 million?

Mr. David Yeo: It's not \$4.9 million, though. It's revenue. That's \$4.9 million in revenue. It's different.

Mr. Larry Brock: Okay, let's not play games. What did you take home? What was your commission for ArriveCAN? Give me a number, please.

Mr. David Yeo: There is no number because—

Mr. Larry Brock: Why not?

Mr. David Yeo: Because when you own a business and you have multiple—

Mr. Larry Brock: You have to declare this as income, sir—

Mr. David Yeo: Sure. Of course.

Mr. Larry Brock: —so why would you not have this number?

You're going to provide this committee, sir, within seven days, your actual remuneration or bonuses on the ArriveCAN app. Okay?

Mr. David Yeo: It we get asked to do that, sir, we will absolutely provide it. It's not an issue.

Mr. Larry Brock: And then over and above that \$4.9 million, I want to know—

The Chair: Mr. Brock, you're out of time. You've asked for some documents.

Mr. Yeo, you received a request from a member to provide some financial documents. Is that something you're prepared to do, is that something you can do, within a reasonable amount of time?

I say that because often witnesses will agree to provide information that is requested by the committee. I think you said if you are asked by the committee, you would do so. We can formally do that, but we try to avoid that.

The information Mr. Brock asked you to provide us, could you do that?

Mr. David Yeo: Yes.

Like I said, I'm willing to support the committee on anything and everything you need to be able to get to where you need to go.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. David Yeo: So if there's a request for what kind of remuneration would have come out of \$4.9 million in ArriveCAN, then we will provide that for sure.

The Chair: Okay. I appreciate that.

Also, Mr. Brock mentioned seven days. I'm a little more generous. You have a couple of weeks to get that before you begin to get some calls from my assistant on this committee.

Mr. David Yeo: I can assure you we'll get back to you.

The Chair: I believe you will. Thank you very much.

We move now to Ms. Yip.

You have the floor for five minutes, please.

Ms. Jean Yip (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): Thank you.

Mr. Yeo, could I also ask that when you send in the documents for that you also include your commission on the contract between DND and Dalian in 2013?

Mr. David Yeo: Could I ask for a few more details about that? That's somewhat vague. I'm not sure which contract you're talking about back then, 10 years ago.

Ms. Jean Yip: TRM Technologies.

Mr. David Yeo: TRM Technologies, okay. You must be talking about my consulting. Is that what you're asking for?

Ms. Jean Yip: Yes.

Mr. David Yeo: Okay—

The Chair: I'll just pause the clock.

Is that clear, Mr. Yeo?

Mr. David Yeo: Well, I think it's clear. I think she's asking for my consulting contract from TRM back in 2013.

Ms. Jean Yip: Yes.

The Chair: Thank you. Very good.

The clock is rolling again, Ms. Yip.

Ms. Jean Yip: Okay. Thank you.

Was Dalian on your résumé when you applied to DND?

Mr. David Yeo: Absolutely, yes. And, as a matter of fact, just from that perspective, I've been a consultant at DND for 22 years. It's been through Dalian, and they're very well aware that I contract through Dalian, yes.

• (1615)

Ms. Jean Yip: Let's go back and look at it step by step through the hiring process and the ethics and conflict forms that you signed. Can you tell us what you signed?

Mr. David Yeo: Through the public service, there's a natural progress. That was followed to the letter as far as the department was concerned. I did receive a letter of offer on September 5, and then we went back and forth a little bit. I signed it shortly after that, with a start date of September 19.

Within that offer is obviously the level that I went in at, which was an IT-3—everybody can look at that and see what that level is—and also, obviously, a bunch of background information on the whole aspect of DOADs and codes of ethics, and the rest of it. Yes, that was all in there.

Ms. Jean Yip: You did sign a conflict of interest.

Mr. David Yeo: No, I didn't sign a.... I signed the offer, but within the offer, they described multiple paragraphs, and one of them had to do with conflict.

Ms. Jean Yip: Okay. Dalian signed a contract with DND after you became an employee again in fall 2021. This is obviously a conflict of interest. Why did you not feel you were in conflict?

Mr. David Yeo: At that time I had my hands off the wheel of Dalian—even before September 19—and that's why I provided my signature to the staff so if there was something going on, I would not even be aware of it. In all honesty, I was not even aware that this smaller contract had even come through until I started reading into this file for our meetings.

Ms. Jean Yip: You said there were lots of paragraphs in your contract dealing with conflict of interest. Can you just explain a little bit more about that?

Mr. David Yeo: There weren't multiple paragraphs dealing with conflict; there were multiple paragraphs just describing my relationship with DND at it related to the PIPSC union, as it related to health care and a bunch of different things that you would normally have on an offer. However, there was one paragraph in there, for sure, on conflict.

Ms. Jean Yip: Are you satisfied with your work on ArriveCAN? Do you feel that Canadians got good value for money there?

Mr. David Yeo: That's a great question.

As not only a certified high-tech consultant, but also a security specialist certified in many different areas, from purely an IT perspective I believe that the aspect of putting all of that together—getting the coding done, getting it on an AWS landing spot, getting all of the cybersecurity, all of the other health care, PII information that needed to be adjudicated and coded into the application.... Is it fair value? I would have probably booked it in at about \$25 million to \$30 million with probably a 10% or 15% contingency, which is around the number that it would come in at—around \$40 million or \$45 million over the three years.

Ms. Jean Yip: Have you ever belonged to a political party?

Mr. David Yeo: Yes.

Ms. Jean Yip: Which one?

Mr. David Yeo: There are two, actually. I've basically been a PC supporter for a long time, but during the 2021 election period, I did move over to the PPC, and then I moved back to the PC party after that.

The Chair: Very good.

That is your time, Ms. Yip.

Ms. Jean Yip: Oh. Just when it was getting good.

[Translation]

The Chair: We will now go to Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné.

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to continue with my previous line of questioning.

Mr. Yeo, you don't remember exactly how much money you made from the contracts for ArriveCAN. I can help you remember that. The money may have been deposited in accounts in tax havens.

According to information uncovered by La Presse, you have opened accounts in tax havens in your name twice since 2011.

What's going on here? How much money did you deposit in tax havens, Mr. Yeo?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: First of all, La Presse came out with its fake news about my having been an employee of the government for decades. You have to take that for what it's worth.

In reference to that, this goes back to my Afghanistan days. I'll be honest with you. In 2008, 2009 and 2010, before I went to Afghanistan, I was travelling all over the world and basically going to NATO operational planning meetings in Germany and in the U.K.—

• (1620)

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: People don't usually open bank accounts in places they travel to, Mr. Yeo, even if they go there for diplomatic purposes.

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: Yes, but I was a consultant back then. It gave me an awareness of international.... I'm an entrepreneur first, I'm a soldier second and I'm the owner of Dalian third.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Can you answer the question, please? I'm asking you how much money has been deposited in recognized tax havens.

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: Zero.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: You opened accounts, but there is no money in them. In that case, why did you open the accounts?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: I was getting to that. As an entrepreneur, I am very interested in international business. When I came back from Afghanistan, I looked into trying to understand how to do international business. That's what led to me figuring out how to do an IBC and how to do international bank accounts and things like that.

It was purely an exercise in my own entrepreneurship and trying to figure out stuff. There's no smoking gun there. There's nothing down there.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Your answer is mind-boggling, Mr. Yeo: To engage in international business, you opened bank accounts in tax havens. Frankly, it is mind-boggling.

I'll move on to other questions.

Let's talk about your affiliation with Mr. Bernier's People's Party of Canada.

You ran as a candidate in 2021. Is that correct?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: Yes.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: What is your relationship with Mr. Bernier? Have you known him for a long time?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: There's no connection.

Obviously, in dealing with the CPC and him going after the leadership during the Andrew Scheer days...that's my awareness of him, but I hadn't met him before, to be honest with you.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: You're saying you ran as a candidate for the People's Party of Canada without knowing the person who was recruiting for the party. Is that right?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: Can you say that again?

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: You ran as a candidate for the People's Party of Canada without knowing the key person who was recruiting candidates for the party. You don't know Mr. Bernier. Is that right?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: No. Of course I knew Max as a leader who was trying to be part of the leadership of the PPC.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Have you ever met Mr. Bernier personally?

The Chair: Your time is up, Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné.

[English]

It sounds like a no, but the question is whether you met Mr. Bernier.

Mr. David Yeo: Yes, absolutely. I met him on a couple of occasions.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné.

[English]

I'm going to pocket all this for relevance at a future committee meeting, when I'm being called on about relevance.

For now, we'll turn to Mr. Desjarlais.

Of course, it's my belief that members have a wide latitude to ask questions. This will be exhibit A.

Mr. Desjarlais, you have the floor.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I'll just follow up on that last question, and then I'll go to another question if I have enough time.

In relation to your political affiliation, you said you're an active member of the Conservative Party today.

Mr. David Yeo: That's correct.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Do you make donations to the Conservative Party?

Mr. David Yeo: Yes. I have since 2020.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Have you ever met with or lobbied on behalf of your company any members of the Conservative Party?

Mr. David Yeo: Absolutely not.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Have you ever registered on the lobbyist registry?

Mr. David Yeo: No, definitely not.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: You've never registered on the lobbyist registry.

Mr. David Yeo: No. I've never been—

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Have you ever spoken about your company to a government official?

Mr. David Yeo: No, definitely not.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Moving on, then, I'll go back to my previous line of questioning about your knowledge of the execution of contracts, subcontracting and task authorizations.

It's clear from testimony that we heard in prior committee meetings from Botler that they did not provide written consent of their knowledge, and that you executed a subcontract in their name without their knowledge. Is that true?

Mr. David Yeo: Yes. As far as we're aware, when it comes to Botler, we had a task authorization come from CBSA that was going to GC Strategies, and where it stops is with GC Strategies. They hired Botler as a sub-subcontractor underneath them, so our relationship was really with GC Strategies and Botler's relationship was with GC Strategies.

We didn't have a direct relationship with Botler.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: You feel that your relationship with GC Strategies in this case was your level of accountability to the task authorization and not to the other subcontractors of GC Strategies. Do I understand that correctly?

• (1625)

Mr. David Yeo: Yes. In normal circumstances, the prime contractor and the subcontractor have the relationship. If there are other things happening below that, then we have no influence on that.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Considering you're engaged in the same project, it seems unlikely that you did not have knowledge that GC Strategies had this sophisticated layer of task authorizations that hid the actual work that these subcontractors were doing, including your company.

I'll ask one more time: What does your company do? What did you do other than hiring other subcontractors?

Mr. David Yeo: It's a normal course of action for general contractors. You can find that in any [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: No. What do you do other than that?

Mr. David Yeo: What do I do other than that? Hmm. I'm trying to get to that.

When it comes to what we do, this was asked of me at the OG-GO committee as well, and I'm sure that's—

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Yes, and it's still confusing.

Mr. David Yeo: It happens with every company across the entire country.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: No, this happens with your company. I'm asking about your company, sir. What does your company actually do?

The Chair: Mr. Desjarlais, I'm giving the floor to Mr. Yeo for an answer, but your time is up. Please don't interrupt.

Mr. Yeo, I'll allow you to answer, and then we'll move on to the next person.

Mr. David Yeo: For every general contractor with the government, whether it is TBIPS contracts, PS Online or TSPS, it doesn't matter. We are the general contractor and the prime contractor for the government. We hire subcontractors to do the work. What we do is contract management, not the actual work.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Genuis, you have the floor for five minutes, please.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Yeo, it's good to see you again. You testified before Parliament on October 31 of last year. I did ask you at the time what you would say you do here. In one answer you gave in the course of that round, you said, "I am an executive on the board of directors for Dalian, and I maintain all of the governance as it relates to the PSAB".

Mr. Yeo, was that the truth as of October 31, 2023?

Mr. David Yeo: Mr. Chair, if I could just make a correction, it's Mr. Yeo, not Yao.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: How about you just answer?

Mr. David Yeo: I will answer you, for sure.

It ends up that we were in that time frame of dealing with lawyers and I had been in a director role for the company—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Sir, on October 31, you were before this committee. You answered my question in a particular way. Was what you said to the committee then assembled on October 31 the truth?

Mr. David Yeo: At that time, there was no divestiture because we were working on it, and also I had put in a—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Were you "an executive on the board of directors for Dalian"? Were you the one who maintained "all of the governance" on October 31? Was that true? Yes or no?

Mr. David Yeo: Sure. Yes.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It was true.

Mr. David Yeo: That's the answer you're looking for, so I'm going to give it to you.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, sir. I'm looking for the true answer—

Mr. David Yeo: The true answer is—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —just as I was on October 31.

Mr. David Yeo: We were in flux during that time period in order to.... Obviously, we had 60 days to get everything done and we did that with Dalian and got our non-disclosure in and our no-access agreement during that period.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Sir, you were not in flux. You either were on the board of directors or you weren't on the board of directors. A person is either pregnant or not. They're either on the board of directors or they're not on the board of directors. They're not half-pregnant, and they're not half on the board of directors.

You have said that, shamefully, the media have claimed that you were on the board of directors and a government employee at the same time without asking you. Maybe they didn't need to ask you because they foolishly assumed that what you told Parliament on October 31 was true.

Sir, your LinkedIn account says that you were a business owner at Dalian Enterprises from 2001 until present, and you were employed by the Department of National Defence continuously from 1987 until present. Again, to your truthfulness or not, was your LinkedIn account accurate in the description of those timelines?

Mr. David Yeo: If you look at LinkedIn, it is a non-authoritative source. First of all, it's LinkedIn. It's a web page. Second of all—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Why would we believe what's on the Internet, sir? It's your own LinkedIn profile, sir—

• (1630)

Mr. David Yeo: If you actually looked at it, you would see—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Why would we expect that you would put accurate information on your own LinkedIn page? That's outrageous.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis—

Mr. David Yeo: Mr. Chair, I'd like to answer that question, if I could.

The Chair: I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Genuis. It is his round of questioning.

We can all hear you quite clearly, so if you could just keep that in mind, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I am getting a little bit excited here because, Mr. “Yao”, you have—

Mr. David Yeo: It's Yeo.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Yeo or whatever your name is, sir—

A voice: Yo, man.

The Chair: Hold on.

Mr. Genuis, names are important. We all make mistakes, but if you could conduct yourself in a way that shows our witness respect, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Okay. It's “Genus”, by the way.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Chair: That's a good point. I realize—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Since we're insisting....

The Chair: You have a minute and a half left, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Sir, you have on your LinkedIn profile a claim that you were simultaneously working for the government and leading Dalian. You told a committee on October 31 that you were on the board of directors for Dalian. You were, at the time, employed by the government. You subsequently said that no, there was some flux going on.

You clearly were in a conflict of interest, weren't you, sir? You were clearly doing both at the same time. Now you're trying to weasel your way out of it after the fact, but you were clearly in a conflict of interest.

Were you not?

Mr. David Yeo: Okay, I need to answer the LinkedIn side of it first.

First of all, it's a non-authoritative source and it's on the Internet—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's your profile.

Mr. David Yeo: It did say 1987—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Did you write it?

Mr. David Yeo: It did not describe all of my service that I have done. I've done 14 years in the reg force, 10 years in the reserves and 20 years as a contractor. I've had 36 years in the department.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Did you subcontract the writing of your LinkedIn profile, sir?

Mr. David Yeo: I probably should have.

I need to answer your question. You asked me a question and I'm trying to answer.

The department has deemed—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Were you not in a conflict of interest, being on the board of directors of Dalian at the same time as you were an employee of a department that was giving contracts to a company that you, according to your testimony before Parliament, were on the board of directors of?

Mr. David Yeo: My understanding is that DND—

The Chair: I will allow for an answer, please.

Mr. Genuis, your time has expired.

You have the floor, Mr. Yeo.

Mr. David Yeo: My understanding is that DND has made a statement that there was no conflict of interest.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That puts it to rest, then.

The Chair: I'll turn now to Ms. Bradford.

You have the floor for five minutes.

Ms. Valerie Bradford (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Yeo, getting back to your aborted political career when you were a candidate for the PPC, which is a party that was against vaccine mandates, do you not see any hypocrisy in working on an ArriveCAN app that was designed to track people's vaccine records when you actually didn't believe in the vaccine mandates in the first place and were running for a party that actually took that position?

Mr. David Yeo: There's definitely a "why", as to why I was trying to become a member of Parliament, much like you folks around the table today. I wish somebody would ask me about that at some point during this time period because it's a much different answer than you'd think.

Second of all, when it comes to vaccine mandates, I'm very two-gates deep at DND and then on nights and weekends I'm doing work with the PPC for the election. From my side of it, I had no visibility into a low-level contract that was with staff augmentation—a contract with CBSA—and the work that was going on for ArriveCAN.

We were doing much more work than just ArriveCAN, so I had no visibility at the time.

Ms. Valerie Bradford: I just want you to go back again because I'm a bit confused.

I think a previous answer was that Dalian, and you personally, did no actual work on the ArriveCAN app. You subcontracted it all.

Is that correct that you didn't actually do any actual work on that?

Mr. David Yeo: We're prime contractors on a staff augmentation contract that staffs subject matter experts into CBSA to actually perform the work—to code the application, do project management, security and everything else.

Saying that we don't do any work is a little not true. At the end of the day, we do subcontract out that work to subject matter experts who do eventually make their way into CBSA to actually perform the work.

• (1635)

Ms. Valerie Bradford: You got an 18.2% commission rate on the \$4.9 million ArriveCAN contract.

Is that correct?

That's about \$890,000 in commission.

Mr. David Yeo: That's what my staff has told me. It was 18.2%.

Ms. Valerie Bradford: How much was your overhead and how much was the remaining profit?

Mr. David Yeo: I'd have to go and ask our CFO to try to figure that out, but my office in 222 Somerset has employees, commissions and everything else like that.

I'm not sure what the exact number is to be honest with you.

Ms. Valerie Bradford: But most of the work is subcontracted out to others.

Is that correct?

Mr. David Yeo: Absolutely.

In some cases, it's our own consulting bench that goes out to do this and in some cases we did some work with GC Strategies.

Ms. Valerie Bradford: If you're the majority shareholder in the company, what percentage of the net profit do you get?

Mr. David Yeo: Again, that's a question of how much expenses are within the company, but in a normal sharehold perspective, if you're a majority shareholder and you have minority shareholders, at the end of the year everybody's T5ed out as far as dividends are concerned if we have a profit.

Ms. Valerie Bradford: Going back to when you formed your company in 2001 or 2002, basically Dalian was formed to go after indigenous contracts.

Mr. David Yeo: Yes, absolutely, because of my background and heritage.

Ms. Valerie Bradford: Right.

If you subcontract everything else out to other companies, they don't have to be indigenous service providers.

Mr. David Yeo: No, not necessarily.

I helped Allen Frost, with a number of other companies, start the PSAB. He had already got it going but we had helped him formulate some of the policies back then.

It was basically for entrepreneurs who needed to have access to government contracts, so from that perspective it was all about having ownership in the company and having the ability to grow the company through government contracts and then potentially either start another company or potentially hire employees and keep growing your own business.

It's a very good policy.

Ms. Valerie Bradford: In your testimony, Mr. Yeo, you mentioned that you provided your signature to your staff to use when needed.

Do you think that was appropriate under the circumstances, looking back on it?

Mr. David Yeo: Absolutely.

I was divesting myself from the company, I had no hands on the business after September 19 and actually prior to that, and they still needed to get stuff signed.

You see that all the time in big corporations where the signature's provided.

Ms. Valerie Bradford: I think a person's signature indicates that you're personally tied into that contract or that deal.

I think people don't look at a signature thinking, that's not really Mr. Yeo, that's just somebody else who is signing for Mr. Yeo.

I think they would probably think that you were overseeing it or responsible to stand behind your signature.

Mr. David Yeo: Ultimately, I own the company and I'm responsible, right? I've taken that hit and I'm no longer with DND and my company's been terminated as far as all contracts are concerned, so I'm taking the direct hit on this.

What I can tell you is that this does happen.

The Chair: Thank you.

We're beginning our third round with Mr. Nater.

You have the floor for five minutes, please.

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Yeo, for joining us this afternoon.

I want to clarify a few things.

Can you confirm that you resigned from the public service on March 5, 2024? Is that correct?

Mr. David Yeo: That is correct, March 5, 2024.

Mr. John Nater: You said that DND had made a statement that there was no conflict of interest.

Was that made directly to you?

Mr. David Yeo: No, it was out in the media outlets.

Mr. John Nater: Did you ever receive a report from DND related to the conflict of interest?

Mr. David Yeo: No.

It was an alleged conflict that somebody put up, I guess. What I've heard in the papers—and I know in my own heart—is there was no conflict.

Mr. John Nater: So you never received a report on March 3 of a conflict of interest report from the Department of National Defence.

Mr. David Yeo: I did not. No.

Mr. John Nater: Okay, we will pull open that another time.

You mentioned that you had been a consultant for a number of years with the Department of National Defence. I think often we see examples of consultants who work within the department almost parallel to or often in conjunction and integrated with public servants.

Did you ever personally have such a relationship at DND in which you worked at DND HQ or worked closely with full-time, indeterminate public servants during your time as a consultant?

• (1640)

Mr. David Yeo: The way the consultant aspect works for most of the departments is that you are the subject matter expert player within the directorate. You have public servants who manage you on a day-to-day basis, so the interaction is there, yes, absolutely.

Mr. John Nater: That is very similar to an employment situation, although you would be on a contract rather than an employee of His Majesty's public service, is that correct?

Mr. David Yeo: I'm not sure I would go with the employment side of it. You're there as a contractor through TBIPS, SBIPS, PS Online, or one of these other staff augmentation contracts. There's a pretty clear line. You have zero ability to sign off, or do anything as a consultant.

Mr. John Nater: During that period, were you physically working at DND HQ?

Mr. David Yeo: Not at HQ, no. I worked for ADM(Mat), which is under DGLEPM and the army side of it.

Mr. John Nater: Did you work at a government office?

Mr. David Yeo: Yes. I was part of the whole directorate for 22 years.

Mr. John Nater: It was at a government office.

When was the first time you cashed a cheque, or e-transfer, for your ArriveCAN app work? When was the first time you received payment? You mentioned \$4.9 million over three years. What was the date of the first payment receipt?

Mr. David Yeo: Are you talking about a commission or something like that?

Mr. John Nater: No. What was the first payment from the government for your work on ArriveCAN?

Mr. David Yeo: I'm not sure of that. I'd have to check with our CFO shop. I don't have that detail on me.

Mr. John Nater: I'd appreciate getting that information on the first day it was received, as well as the last day. Are you able to approximately tell us when that last payment came through?

Mr. David Yeo: Absolutely. Our CFO shop would have all those details. We would provide that to you in a timely basis, for sure.

Mr. John Nater: I would appreciate that.

You mentioned in your opening statement how you were either putting your interests in Dalian into a blind trust, or you had already put them into a blind trust, when you joined the public service.

Can you clarify what you meant by a blind trust?

Mr. David Yeo: When you divest, there are lawyers involved. You have to divest your shares. You have to put them in to a trustee. There is a lot of documentation back and forth in order to facilitate that. We did start that right away.

My meetings with my lawyers and things like that happened in November all the way through into January. We put the non-disclosure and non-access in with Dalian at the same time. Eventually, we did put all of our documents with DND.

In hindsight—I'll be honest with you—knowing what I know now, and the whole situation that we've run up against here, there's a direct response from me that I should have put all of that in prior to signing the offer. I should have done all of that prior to even looking at the offer from the government. That one's on me, but, at the end of the day, all the information went to where it needed to go.

Mr. John Nater: I'm going to push you a little bit on this. When we hear the terms “blind trust”, it's tough to see how a blind trust would work when you are the founder and majority shareholder of a corporation named Dalian. You can't all of a sudden forget that you own it, whether its visible in a blind trust or not. You also used the terms “divesting your interests in it”.

I'm not entire clear which one you were trying to do. Were you trying to put your corporation into a blind trust? I'm not sure how arm's-length that could be, or were you divesting yourself of your corporation at that time?

We know now that you're back in full swing with the company, but what was actually your intent at the time? Was it to have it at an arm's-length, untouchable entity of a blind trust, or were you divesting? Were you selling off your shares? Were you divesting yourself of your corporation at that time? It's not clear what you were doing while you were active as a member of the public service of Canada.

The Chair: Mr. Nater, your time will allow for a reply.

Go ahead, Mr. Yeo.

Mr. David Yeo: Absolutely, it was not a divestiture, but a blind trust. I did acquire a trustee that I trusted to hold my shares. That's the course of action that we took. If I mentioned divestiture, that's not the case.

The Chair: Thank you. That is the time.

Mrs. Shanahan, you have the floor for five minutes.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.): Thank you very much, Chair.

Mr. Yeo, I think you've managed to do something that actually should happen here at public accounts, which is to have all members equally questioning what it is that we're hearing, and wanting to get to the truth of the matter for the sake of the public trust.

That's where I for one find that your story has a number of holes in it. Although, it does come together in one way.

You mentioned early on that you met a gentleman, Terry Matthews. Who was that?

• (1645)

Mr. David Yeo: He's a business owner in Kanata and a billionaire.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: Okay, so he's someone who knows how to make money, because you mention that you're not really in it for the money, but you met with someone who knows how to make money. He said you should get it on—how did you put it?—indigenous—

Mr. David Yeo: It was indigenous procurement that he became aware of, yes.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: So he put you on to something and, indeed, that's what business people do.

Now, you were not in business at the time. As you said, you had no experience with technical work or coding. What was your background? You were a reservist with the armed forces.

Mr. David Yeo: If you predate...my experience, I went through computer science, and I've been involved with computers my whole life. Certainly there's the aspect of my military career and my reserve career, and then eventually getting back into my high-tech world after all of that experience was the direction that I took, so I do have a background in both.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: Was it your intention then to start up a technical services company? Were you, as an indigenous person, as you have identified yourself to us, then providing services to the government of the time? This has covered, of course, a number of governments trying to promote indigenous businesses.

Mr. David Yeo: Yes, in fact, the company started out as a hardware and software company. We didn't really get into professional services until 2007-08, so my initial—

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: Was it your intention then, when you did get into professional services, to hire indigenous employees?

Mr. David Yeo: Absolutely.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: Can you say that you have used your access to indigenous contracts to hire indigenous employees?

Mr. David Yeo: Absolutely, and we did have indigenous employees in the shop.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: All right, well, at least there's that, but somehow it didn't work out. You had high points and low points. You weren't making money. At some point, you decided to get yourself hired again with DND. You entered into a contract of service.

Referring to your contract, there were a number of paragraphs there that refer to the code of ethics of the public sector and the conflict of interest code. In one such paragraph, there a form called the confidential report, form DND 2839, that talks specifically about conflict of interest. This is in your contract that you signed. Do you recall this form that you would have signed?

Mr. David Yeo: Yes.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: It does speak specifically to conflict, which is not something that you have been forthcoming about here in earlier testimony.

You seem to be an equal opportunity conflict of interest operator, because it goes on to talk about political activity, where federal public service employees have a right to engage in political activities while maintaining the principle of political impartiality in the public service, and there's information in that regard.

Is that something that you also recall signing?

Mr. David Yeo: It's definitely in the offer, but the political side of it was back in 2021.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: All right, and then going back to when you did decide to become a member of Parliament, I'd like to hear why you decided that, because, at the time, you were operating Dalian, and you had contracts with DND that were involved in the ArriveCAN, and, as other colleagues have pointed out, it's hard to believe that you did not know that Dalian was working on ArriveCAN.

Why did you decide to become a member of Parliament to run as a candidate?

Mr. David Yeo: In true form, on my indigenous heritage side of it, my great-grandfather signed the treaties in November 1923. In the spring of 1924, the colonials came back through and enfranchised my whole entire family. They enfranchised hundreds of people, and they enfranchised thousands of people—

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: You ran for the People's Party of Canada in recognition of your indigenous ancestry. Is that correct?

• (1650)

Mr. David Yeo: I'm definitely getting to my “why”, for sure, and that is that my entire family has been enfranchised, and I am caught up in the second gen cut-off rule. This is a politically genocidal article out of Bill C-31 that is still in the Indian Act today, and my entire family is caught up in it. Hundreds of thousands of Canadians are caught up in it.

My “why” as to why I wanted to get back in as a member of Parliament was to create a private member's bill that would allow that part of the Indian Act to be solved once and for all, which would not only help me but help hundreds of thousands of Canadians.

The Chair: Thank you.

That is your time, Mrs. Shanahan.

[Translation]

It is now over to Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné for two and a half minutes.

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Yeo, you previously stated that you had put the shares of your company into a blind trust, and you just said so again today.

Did you inform your team or your support staff that you were doing that?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: The team at Dalian is definitely aware that we are going through this process, yes.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Did those people understand that signing an agreement was the same as giving approval? With your signature on it, it was now your responsibility. However, if you were no longer supposed to be involved in Dalian business, you weren't supposed to be signing anything. That is just elementary.

By the way, who was the person who put your signature to things on your behalf without your knowledge?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: It would have been my staff that I directed. This is definitely on me. I would have directed my staff. I did direct my staff to.... While I was in this area of being able to work with the department and also put everything into a blind trust, I gave them the authority to go ahead and make sure. I trusted them.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Earlier, you said that Dalian had only two employees, you and your partner. Who are you referring to when you talk about staff?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: That's kind of where there's a misinterpretation of that.

We have two people on staff as far as our full-time employment is concerned, but we have a shared services model with Coradix that allows us to work with the CFO, HR, operations etc. It's been like that for 20 years.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: It was someone at Coradix who put your signature to documents without your consent, when you had asked that the shares of the company be placed in a blind trust. Is that correct?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: No.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Who signed your name on your behalf without your consent?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: No, it was one of my members of staff to whom I gave the authority to use my signature while I was at DND.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Okay, but you just answered that it was someone at Coradix.

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: No, I did not.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: You say that Dalian is made up of you and your partner. Was it your partner who signed your name without your consent? Why didn't he just sign, if he co-owns the company?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: He's not an owner. He is a member of my staff. I gave him the authority to use my signature while I was at DND.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: If I understand correctly, you are the sole owner of Dalian and you have no partner.

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: I have Coradix as a partner, yes, as a minority shareholder.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Okay.

Can you give me the name of the person who put your signature to things and failed to inform you that they were signing contracts on your behalf?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: I gave them the authority to use my signature.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Who is it? I'm asking for a name.

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: Yes, the member of my staff that I gave my authority to is Kyle Dixon.

I'm at a point right now where you have to understand that I'm trying to help you get to where you need to go and give you the answers that you need. If you want people's names in my staff, I'll give you all of the names of my staff.

[Translation]

The Chair: Your time is up, Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné. Thank you.

[English]

Mr. Desjarlais, you have the floor for two and half minutes, please.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

At the very beginning, Mr. Yeo, you mentioned that you were hired on September 29, 2023, so why did Corporations Canada have you listed as a director until March 2024?

Mr. David Yeo: It was September 19, 2023 when I started my employment with the public service. As far as Corporations Canada getting their updates, as I said, my lawyers were putting all of the

documents and everything together and staffing that for me. That's the date I guess that they have on record.

• (1655)

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: When did you first become interested in working in the public service—

Mr. David Yeo: When did I first become interested?

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: —after the incorporation of your company?

Mr. David Yeo: I've really been working with the department for 36 years. It was just recently that I decided—because, you know, I have five, six, maybe seven years left of working—that I would actually look to go back and provide more value to the department by driving some of their large projects.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: In that time, did you disclose a potential conflict of interest?

Mr. David Yeo: As a contractor, I've been working with the department for 22 years. The discussions about me moving over to the public service have been very recent. I just signed on September 19.

I'm not sure if I answered your question or not.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: From September to March.... In the time between those two dates—the time you left Dalian and the time you were a public servant—did you declare a potential conflict of interest at any moment?

Mr. David Yeo: To the department?

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: To the department.

Mr. David Yeo: We were in the process of doing that over the fall and into January—getting all the documents and paperwork together to put everything into a blind trust and that sort of stuff. That's on me. We probably should have done that way before September 19, and we didn't, so I'm—

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Therefore, you're aware there is a conflict, which is why you undertook that work.

Mr. David Yeo: DND has come back out and said there was no conflict because of the.... I don't know why they.... The whole idea of the conflict is a bit nebulous to begin with, because of my position in DND and the documents I put together for Dalian. I've had no access or visibility into what they've been doing since the 19th, so—

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Regarding that blind trust, who is the trustee?

Mr. David Yeo: It's Kyle Dixon.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: How do you know him?

Mr. David Yeo: He's a member of my staff. He's been a stalwart worker of mine for a long time.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: At any point during your discussions of the declaration of conflict and with this employee you have...was the conversation of the paperwork that never got done...? At what point did he bring that up as a potential issue?

Mr. David Yeo: The paperwork did get done. It just could have been done on a more timely basis and prior to my joining on the 19th.

If you could repeat your question, I'll answer it.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: I'll ask it in a different way, if I can, Mr. Chair.

Did you know there was a potential conflict before your trustee made you aware of it, or did you ask your employee to be your trustee in the knowledge there may be a potential conflict?

Mr. David Yeo: No, I didn't ask my employee about it.

I have to make sure I get this right: The whole idea of putting in the appropriate documentation and putting things into a blind trust happened over all of the fall and into the early part of 2024.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: I don't understand why you didn't make that clear before.

Mr. David Yeo: I'm sorry. Clear in what way...?

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: At the very start of today's discussion, one of my Conservative colleagues put a question to you about a potential conflict here, and you flat out said there was no potential conflict. Now you're saying that you obviously knew of the potential conflict and filed paperwork to that degree.

Mr. David Yeo: No, we didn't expect a conflict to happen at all, because of the level of position I went into at DND. It's a very low-level position. There was no conflict awareness at all. We were just putting in the safeguards to make sure that, if there ever were one in the future, they would be in place.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Is that your perspective?

The Chair: Thank you very much. I'm afraid that is your time, Mr. Desjarlais, but you'll get another round.

We're turning now to Mr. Barrett.

Mr. Barrett, you have the floor for five minutes.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Do you have any companies or interests in companies outside Canada?

Mr. David Yeo: No, sir.

Mr. Michael Barrett: No offshore holdings?

Mr. David Yeo: No.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Are any of your former colleagues at DND double-dipping?

Mr. David Yeo: I don't know if I know what that means, but I am not aware of any double-dipping going on.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Oh, it's what you do. It's working for the federal government as a public servant and also as a contractor concurrently.

Mr. David Yeo: Well, yes, I would assume there are a lot of people in the public service who have companies outside the public service. I'm not aware of any.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Who do work for the Government of Canada.... Do you think that's quite common?

Mr. David Yeo: I think it's fairly common, yes.

Mr. Michael Barrett: What do you base that on? Is it from your personal experience or conversations with other public servants?

Mr. David Yeo: I would say it's my own perception. I've been around the department forever and everybody has their day-to-day work and maybe a little side gig at night doing something else.

Mr. Michael Barrett: For the same department they work for...?

Mr. David Yeo: Oh, it's probably not that, no. If you're talking about that, it's no.

• (1700)

Mr. Michael Barrett: You talked about how you took this job to drive projects. What did you say your position was within the public service?

Mr. David Yeo: I am a tactical security specialist certified in high-assurance capabilities that go into the Canadian army at the very pointy end of the stick—in combat vehicles and on soldiers. I'm a soldier myself—

Mr. Michael Barrett: It's not about the technology, sir. I'm asking what level you are at in the public service.

Mr. David Yeo: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm an IT-3.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Okay.

Were you leading change as an IT-3? Is it common for IT-3s to be leading departmental and organizational change?

Mr. David Yeo: I certainly wouldn't put it up that high.

“Team lead” is the correct statement. As an IT-3, you're in charge of a number of projects. In this case, from my side, it was a high-assurance security project.

Mr. Michael Barrett: You said that the figure that the Auditor General attributed to your companies is incorrect. Is that fair?

Mr. David Yeo: This is what I've been read into and what my staff tells me, yes.

Mr. Michael Barrett: It's what you've been read into. Did you read the Auditor General's report?

Mr. David Yeo: Absolutely—all of it, so I have lots of comments.

Mr. Michael Barrett: That's great. By “read into”, you mean you read it.

Mr. David Yeo: Yes, a hundred per cent.

Mr. Michael Barrett: You read it and determined that the Auditor General—who is by definition a general, with an army of auditors, which should be easy for you to understand, based on your experience—and her whole army of auditors was wrong and this one-man army was right. But you've offered a series of assertions in your committee appearances that aren't true. Those have been highlighted by members of other parties and by my colleagues.

Even just today, you said that you're a member of the Conservative Party, and that's not true. You haven't been a member of the Conservative Party since 2021.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Michael Barrett: No, that's fine. We know how—

The Chair: Order.

Just one second. I'm going to stop the clock.

First, that is a prop and it is not allowed. Second, that is a donor card. It's not a membership card. We all get them to try to get money.

Mr. Barrett, you have a minute and a half.

Mr. Michael Barrett: So it's a donor card. Again, what you're offering is not an honest representation of what you're doing. I know that you thought it would be a great gotcha moment, but it demonstrated that you're not being truthful, sir.

When it comes down to your not knowing the difference between being a member of a party and making a donation to a party, should we really trust your assessment on whether or not the Auditor General of Canada is wrong in the amount of business you've done with the Government of Canada? I'm inclined to trust the Auditor General, just as I know that I can trust membership services: They knew that whatever it was you were going to hold up wasn't going to be what you said it was. While your misrepresentations vary, that's just another great example that we can't trust what you've said to be true. It gives rise to more questions than it does answers.

I'll cede my time back to the chair.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

I'll turn now to Mr. Jowhari.

Thank you for joining us, Mr. Jowhari. You have the floor for five minutes, please.

Mr. Majid Jowhari (Richmond Hill, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's good to be here once again.

Mr. Yeo, I'd like to go back to ArriveCAN. Can you kindly tell me how the contract for ArriveCAN came to Dalian?

Mr. David Yeo: My understanding is that we never had an ArriveCAN contract. This was all through staff augmentation contracts that were competitively awarded to Dalian on behalf of the CBSA. My understanding is that it was through staff augmentation contracts.

Mr. Majid Jowhari: On the staff augmentation contract that was awarded to Dalian on behalf of CBSA, how did that come about?

Mr. David Yeo: Again, I'm buried two gates deep at DND, and I don't have the exact aspects of how that actually transpired. I could ask our staff and get back to you.

Mr. Majid Jowhari: Yes. I would appreciate it if you could provide that to the committee.

• (1705)

Mr. David Yeo: Sure.

Mr. Majid Jowhari: Sir, you indicated that the amount of the contract was \$4.9 million. The amount for staff augmentation was \$4.9 million over three years for 20 employees at 100 hours. You called that part time. Is that correct?

Mr. David Yeo: Correct.

Mr. Majid Jowhari: If my math holds—\$1.6 million divided by 20, divided by 100—you are charging about \$815 an hour, whereas GC Strategies, for ArriveCAN, was charging \$1,200 plus. Can you explain why? Can you tell me what your team, that 20-person team, was doing for CBSA?

Mr. David Yeo: I'm not exactly sure of their specific tasks, because this goes into staff augmentation. The people who went into it were in software development, testing, project management, technology architecture and cybersecurity. Once they got over to the CBSA through the staff augmentation contract, it was really up to the technical authority to drive whatever business needs were happening on that side.

To get to your question about the 20 people on the contract, my understanding, from what my staff has provided me, is that the bill rates ranged from \$540 to \$1,000 per day, depending on the service.

Mr. Majid Jowhari: Okay. That is pretty much aligned with what the Auditor General was talking about as a rate, but that's very different from the rate that GC Strategies was charging.

Was Dalian dealing directly with the CBSA, or was it through another organization?

Mr. David Yeo: My understanding is that Dalian was the prime contractor for these contracts, so yes, we were dealing directly with the CBSA.

Mr. Majid Jowhari: Okay.

Of the 20 employees who worked on that project, how many of them were indigenous?

Mr. David Yeo: There are 20 IT professional consultants—not employees—but I would have to check with our staff to see if any of them are actually indigenous.

Mr. Majid Jowhari: Of the projects that you have worked on with the Government of Canada, whether as a subcontractor or whether it was your employer, how many of them have been indigenous?

Mr. David Yeo: I know there are a number out there—

Mr. Majid Jowhari: Would it be five, 10, 20, 50?

Mr. David Yeo: This is a challenge that we have with our indigenous culture. We don't have enough trained, technical people coming out of the indigenous side of things. I don't know the exact number.

Mr. Majid Jowhari: How much investment has your company made into training indigenous people?

Mr. David Yeo: From a training perspective, I would say that we have had experiences with Algonquin College in the past. I have given out an aboriginal achievement award to technical people who have passed the bar at Algonquin. I've brought them in for a 12-week placement at the company, and then they have either stayed or have moved along.

Mr. Majid Jowhari: Would it be fair to say that because of your claim of indigenous status, you're very comfortable taking...under the procurement allocation or under a set-aside contract, yet Dalian's investment into either hiring or training and building capacity within that indigenous group is non-existent?

Mr. David Yeo: The PSIB—the PSAB at the time—is not actually in the spirit of that aspect. It's in the spirit of trying to get access to government contracts and being able to compete against bigger companies.

Absolutely, we've done what we've done in the past with Algonquin and have tried to hire indigenous people, which we have as internal staff and also as contractors, but I just don't have the current number of how many indigenous contractors we have today.

Mr. Majid Jowhari: Can you kindly provide that?

Mr. David Yeo: We can, for sure.

The Chair: Thank you. I appreciate that, Mr. Jowhari.

We'll look for that response, as well, Mr. Yeo.

This is now our fourth and last round.

Mr. Brock, you have the floor for five minutes, please.

Mr. Larry Brock: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to pursue this line of misrepresentations, Mr. Yeo.

I know that Mr. Barrett and other members have asked you some questions that, in my opinion, really challenge your credibility.

Both you and the president of Coradix, Mr. Wood, testified on October 31, 2023. Both of you were quite emphatic that both businesses are regularly audited by Indigenous Services Canada with respect to the procurement strategy for indigenous business and that you both had been receiving clean audits.

However, that was a misrepresentation. It was a lie because Indigenous Services Canada said that all it does with respect to the set-asides that both of your companies operate under from time to time are pre-audits. It doesn't do post audits.

Do you agree with that assessment from Indigenous Services Canada?

• (1710)

Mr. David Yeo: I would absolutely agree with that, yes, for sure.

Mr. Larry Brock: However, you didn't qualify that to the committee.

Mr. David Yeo: Well, it's your policy. I understand that we go through audits, but I think that's a normal course of action for ISC in its entirety, not just for our company.

Mr. Larry Brock: I think it's a pretty big deal, sir, when you lead the committee to believe that you're running a clean business, that your indigenous set-asides are legitimate and are not operating under a phantom scheme. I know that you've been heavily criticized by a number of indigenous organizations that you're running this.

In fact, Botler even made the same allegation, so these are real concerns. I think you have to be honest with committee members, sir, because although you haven't been sworn to tell the truth, there is a presumption that you will tell the truth at committee. There are consequences when people do not tell the truth at committee.

Ultimately, we're going to find out by the end of this summer through Indigenous Services Canada, which is going to audit everything you have done and that Coradix has done for the last eight years, hopefully, if not longer, with respect to all the indigenous set-asides. I think Canadians deserve to know whether or not indigenous Canadians have benefited from this particular government operation. If they haven't, sir, then you'll have some questions to answer. I put that out to you, sir.

The other aspect that concerns me is your relationship with GC Strategies. Is it accurate, sir, that the one and only time you worked with GC Strategies was on the Botler task authorization?

Mr. David Yeo: That I would have to ask our staff. I'm not exactly sure if there was anything else in relation to working with GC Strategies. I'd have to ask our staff about that.

Mr. Larry Brock: Let's talk about Botler for a moment, please. You do know that Kristian Firth from GC Strategies testified that on not one occasion but upwards of five occasions he deliberately and intentionally doctored work experience for both of the Botler partners. He claimed it was a mistake.

Given my former background as a Crown attorney, I can tell you that all accused persons, all criminals, claim they made mistakes.

What in fact Mr. Firth did was to commit forgery, and it was a fraud on the government. What concerns me, sir, is that The Globe and Mail recently reported that both your company Dalian and Coradix received those doctored résumés, those fraudulent forged résumés, and you in fact forwarded those on to the government. That was recent news to me and perhaps to this committee, because we were all led to believe that it was Kristian Firth at GC Strategies who delivered those directly to the government.

It really begs the question: If you had only a limited amount of time with GC Strategies, why would you accept their material at face value? Now you're implicated as part of a joint venture, as a party to the offence of fraud and forgery. It's no wonder the RCMP is currently investigating your company and Coradix. Just because you haven't been contacted doesn't mean you are in the clear.

You talked about having quality management systems in place. Why didn't the quality management systems catch these fraudulent résumés?

Mr. David Yeo: Yes, for sure it's a good question.

First and foremost, we're as dismayed as the rest of the committee with the findings on GC Strategies. We were definitely not aware of what was going on below our subcontractor. The contract between us and GC Strategies is exactly that. We have no reference to Botler in this case and what information was being provided by GC Strategies to us.

There are aspects—I will be honest with you—of third party verification of employment and that sort of thing, but there's no industry standard that everybody uses in the entire professional services market.

What we've learned from this is that, even though we do our due diligence on security clearances and putting the CVs together, and the categories and the grids, and staffing those up to CBSA, we likely need to put third party verification of employment in place to allow us to smoke out this kind of stuff. We just weren't aware of it.

• (1715)

The Chair: Thank you. That is the time.

Mr. Chen, you have the floor for five minutes.

Mr. Shaun Chen: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Yeo, you've had a long career. You joined the Canadian Armed Forces in 1987. You were a reservist from 2001 until 2016. You were hired, as we heard today, by National Defence in 2023.

Earlier today in your testimony you said that it was fairly common for many government employees to have a company on the side. You said that was your own perception. Could you elaborate on what informed your perception that many government employees run side-hustle businesses?

Mr. David Yeo: I can tell you this. In Canada with our taxation system and everything being so expensive with inflation and everything else, whether you're a government employee or whether you're someone else not working with the government, there's likely a chance that you might have something else on the side to help pay the bills and put groceries on your table.

I'm an entrepreneur. I try to start things all the time. I'm looking for multiple sources of income, and I'm sure many Canadians are in the same boat, whether they're working for the government or not.

Mr. Shaun Chen: With all due respect, sir, that was not my question.

You said earlier that your perception, your own perception, was that many government employees have corporations on the side.

My question to you is what informed your perception that other—not you but other—government employees, and in fact many of them, as you stated, have corporations on the side?

Mr. David Yeo: Again this is my own perception. Whether they have corporations or whether they have things after hours, that's their own business. I can tell you that from my perspective, I'm out

doing what I need to do for the government during the day, but then I'm an entrepreneur at night and trying to do other things.

I can't imagine that others aren't similar.

Mr. Shaun Chen: You talked earlier about how you got into securing government contracts. In fact, you said that you “go after” them.

I want to hear from you, Mr. Yeo, about how easy or how difficult has it been for you to secure government contracts. Would you consider yourself successful at being able to secure government contracts for work through your company?

Mr. David Yeo: In my opinion anyway, Dalian has been a very good success story up until recently with all of this hype about me being an employee prior to the ArriveCAN days and during ArriveCAN. This is what PSAB actually does for us. It allows us to be able to be a part of the solution with the government as far as indigenous companies are concerned and to learn about how to interact with the government through contracting, through procurement and through staffing and all of the other aspects that go along with that, so absolutely, yes.

Mr. Shaun Chen: You understand, as a former employee of National Defence and as somebody who has had many interactions with government over the years, that public servants play a fundamental role in serving this country and their conduct is carefully watched. It's important to uphold public trust, because Canadians put their faith in the government to deliver programs and services, and that includes the people who are hired within that public service to act in the most transparent, accountable and ethical ways.

Would you say that it can be seen as a perceived conflict of interest when you have been able to be so successful and yet I hear a very different narrative on the ground from people who are everyday Canadians unable to access government contracts and from companies that are doing good work and innovative work that have told me they're unable to even crack the door open? Do you find that there is a perception that there is something that is allowing you to have access that other people cannot? Also, there is the fact that you have said today that it's common for people working in the public service to have corporations, as you have?

The narrative I hear from everyday people in my riding is that they can barely get home in time—going through traffic, working 10 hours a day—to prepare a meal for their family, and the last thing on their minds is to set up a corporation and have a side hustle where they can make more money and be able to afford the things they need.

I'd like to hear your comments on that, Mr. Yeo.

• (1720)

Mr. David Yeo: I appreciate the backdrop.

It's been difficult. There is no easy button when it comes to working with the government. Many corporations die on the vine because of the fact that they just can't handle the actual process for actually winning contracts. I agree with you on the fact that Canadians are struggling and that some of the people don't understand how to actually process successful contracting mechanisms, but in the end, it's very competitive. It's supercompetitive. Our hardware and software business has shown that: In the last five or six years, we have put in multiple RFPs and not won them.

Certainly, learning the process, whether it's under PSAB or whether it's under a non-indigenous side, and how to interact with the government, is very long, very arduous and extremely complicated.

The Chair: I'm afraid that's your time, Mr. Chen. We've gone well over. Your side does have another spot left. I know you have more questions.

I will move on to Madam Sinclair-Desgagné.

[Translation]

Over to you for two and a half minutes.

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Yeo, how long have you been working closely with Mr. Wood from Coradix?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: I believe that Colin came into Coradix a number of years ago, but again, I've been working at DND two gates deep for a long time and have not had exactly a lot of interaction with Colin.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Earlier, you mentioned that Coradix and Dalian had been operating under a shared services model for a number of years.

How long have Dalian and Coradix been working so closely together?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: Since the beginning. I came to them in 2002 with my first contract.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Did you not know Mr. Wood before he was with Coradix?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: No, I did not.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Did you know that just before he was with Coradix, Mr. Wood had worked at a firm called Veritaaq, which was convicted on February 23, 2009, of bid rigging for contracts with the Canada Border Services Agency? Were you aware of that?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: I wasn't aware of that. Sorry.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Apparently, Mr. Wood hid that the company he worked for just before arriving at Coradix was engaged in, oddly enough, the same bid-rigging schemes that Dalian, Coradix and GC Strategies are accused of today. Other charges were brought against Veritaaq shortly after 2015. Mr. Wood then left the company and moved over to Coradix, which works very closely with Dalian.

Do you see a link between the potential bid rigging revealed in the Auditor General's report and the schemes engaged in by a firm where Colin Wood was the director of sales at the time?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: I can only attest to what I know, and that is I've known Colin since he came to Coradix. I was not aware of his previous employment.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Okay.

Are you still considering working with Mr. Wood now that you know that the firm he worked for and for which he was the sales manager was convicted of bid rigging?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: It's always a conversation. It will always be a conversation. Yes, I'll have a conversation with Colin.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Is that normal, in your opinion?

[English]

Mr. David Yeo: No, it's not normal. Of course not.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Okay.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné.

[English]

Mr. Desjarlais, you have the floor for two and a half minutes.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I do want to return to the comments you made in relation to one of my colleagues' questions on the doctored résumés.

What do you know about these résumés?

• (1725)

Mr. David Yeo: Not much, to be honest with you.

In the end, if you talk about what happened between Botler and GC, they could put anything on there as far as their experience is concerned. Our relationship is with GC and with the Crown, with CBSA, as our subcontractor.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: How involved were you in the review of Botler's résumés?

Mr. David Yeo: Me personally, zero. I was at DND to—

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: What about your company?

Mr. David Yeo: My company, obviously. It was a JV, so we obviously had interaction with GC Strategies in performing the task authorization requirements, yes.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Did GC Strategies speak to you as to their use of the company Botler?

Mr. David Yeo: I'd have to check with our staff and ask them that. I'm not aware. Obviously they had to have some interaction between the task authorization request and our relationship with GC, but I'm not aware of the details of what they discussed as far as Botler is concerned.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: These forged résumés that gave preferential access and eventually the awarding of the bid are tremendously disingenuous and are defrauding Canadians.

I want you to know how serious this issue is and to understand that providing any assistance from your company to the forgery of documents is illegal.

Do you understand that?

Mr. David Yeo: Absolutely. That's why we're just as dismayed as everybody else as to why and how we could have gotten this information wrong.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Whose letterhead were these résumés on?

Mr. David Yeo: I would expect that given our relationship as the prime to CBSA we would have staffed up the package for the task authorization to them as part of the requirements package. It would have gone on Dalian letterhead, but I'm not sure exactly what the interaction or documents or letterhead was between Botler and GC—

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: You're misrepresenting facts, Mr. Yeo.

That's completely disingenuous to then say your company never had any access to Botler, that your only relationship was with GC Strategies, and then you just now confirm that the résumés that were forged were on your company's letterhead. Is that true?

Mr. David Yeo: Again, I am not—

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Can you repeat that? Is what you just said true? Are the forged résumés on your company letterhead?

Mr. David Yeo: I can give you the process. I have never seen anything—

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Mr. Yeo, can you please answer yes or no to the fact that you just submitted.

Mr. David Yeo: I understand what the process would be because I understand task authorizations, but I have not seen any of the paperwork personally.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: You have not seen the paperwork but you just said you know the forged documents are on Dalian letterhead.

Mr. David Yeo: I can assume that, obviously, with us as the prime and giving the CBSA this documentation as part of the task authorization, it would have gone on Dalian letterhead—

The Chair: Thank you very much.

I'm afraid that is your time, Mr. Desjarlais.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Mr. Yeo, it has been extremely disappointing to see this level of misrepresentation.

The Chair: We're turning now to Mr. Genuis. You have the floor for five minutes, please.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Yeo, your company has two people. Is your partner indigenous?

Mr. David Yeo: He is.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: He is. Okay.

You got \$7.9 million for ArriveCAN alone, even though, as you've testified, you didn't do any actual work on the app.

How many indigenous Canadians, besides you two, benefited from that big, fat cheque the government wrote Dalian for ArriveCAN?

Mr. David Yeo: Our interpretation is that it's \$4.9 million, but the aspect of—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Your interpretation is that you know better than the Auditor General.

Mr. David Yeo: I'm just telling you the facts from our side.

We actually went out to the Auditor General on the 30th—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I think that's absurd, sir.

I want to focus on the indigenous procurement component of it. How many indigenous people, besides you and your partner—

The Chair: Let me just stop the clock, Mr. Genuis.

I will remind everyone, because this has come up time and time again, that the Auditor General's terms do not allow her to go into companies like Dalian, which is the one before us.

You sent her documents. From her perspective, they could have been irrelevant.

You will all recall that the Auditor General noted that she came up with these numbers based on what the Government of Canada provided her. That's just a point of clarification for the committee.

It doesn't change any of your questions, Mr. Genuis. I just wanted to put it out there that this is an ongoing debate about the scope of ArriveCAN, and I think it is an important one.

We don't know what the answer is. That's why these committee meetings are happening.

Mr. Genuis, you have the floor for four and a half minutes.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Yeo, besides the two people at your company, how many indigenous people benefited from the \$7.9 million that the Government of Canada gave you for the work you did on ArriveCAN?

• (1730)

Mr. David Yeo: In reference to the \$7.9 million, which is actually \$4.9 million, our actual representation of profit in that not only helps our staff, but helps with our staff augmentation with Coradix as well, because I have a shared services model—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: How many indigenous people...?

You're not answering my question. You're talking about your staff, but there are two of you.

Okay. There are two indigenous people who benefited. They are you and your partner—

Mr. David Yeo: Yes.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —but how many other indigenous people benefited from this particular outlay from the Government of Canada?

Mr. David Yeo: Well, we do work with Algonquin College on staffing bursaries and things like that. I have outreach back to my own reserve in Alderville. However, as far as benefiting from this—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: What does that even mean though? You have reached back, so when you make a lot of money....

How do indigenous Canadians benefit from you getting this deal?

Mr. David Yeo: The PSAB process and the piece of policy...it's a government policy that we favour, because it's a great policy. It's not made to—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm sure you think it's a good policy.

I'm sorry, Chair.

Mr. David Yeo: —help indigenous communities across the country. It's made to help the entrepreneur who's trying to get government contracts to grow his business.

In that context, it's not made to help out indigenous communities across the country.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You just said that the government's indigenous procurement policy, in your view, is not made to benefit indigenous communities across the country; it's made to benefit the particular entrepreneur.

Mr. David Yeo: It's made to help the entrepreneur get access to government contracting that would allow them to grow the company in whatever fashion they want.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Your position is that the policy made you money. Therefore, it's achieving its objective, regardless of the impact on indigenous communities across the country.

Mr. David Yeo: That could be your interpretation, but it's not the reality. The reality is that there are a lot of government—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm sorry. I'm just repeating what you just said.

Mr. David Yeo: No, you weren't repeating what I just said.

In the context of the PSIB, it's spread out across the entire country, and there are lots of people who are working within the framework of that. All of this—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Sir, that actually isn't what you said before.

To broaden this out, from what I understand, your company has received hundreds of millions of dollars in contracts from the Trudeau government since 2015. That was under the framework of a policy that I thought was intended to actually elevate the conditions that indigenous peoples in this country are living in. You're saying, "Well, no. It's good enough that the process made me money."

Surely, that would seem to go against what Canadians expect of the policy.

Mr. David Yeo: My understanding of the value that you put out was \$91 million. I've got it in front of me. It was from 2015 until now. At the same time, you can look at the PSAB and PSIB policies, and nowhere will it state—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm sorry. My time is about to run out, Chair, and I'd like to move a motion:

That the committee write to INAN to recommend that they investigate abuses in the indigenous procurement system.

I think the need for this motion is self-evident from the testimony we've received.

The Chair: Is there any chance you sent that motion to the clerk?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I did send it in advance.

The Chair: Could you distribute that when ready?

It's done. Perfect.

Mr. Desjarlais, you have the floor.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to speak to the motion, Mr. Chair, and the potential misrepresentation by Mr. Yeo about PSAB contracts. As a matter of fact, 33% of all contracts by PSAB must be completed by indigenous service providers, including when work is subcontracted.

Mr. Yeo, you've spoken a great deal about your experience in working with subcontracting, and your expertise at being a contractor of this great magnitude, and how you can solve all the government's problems with all this great general contracting, but you don't actually know the policy.

The Chair: Just a point of clarification, we've now moved into debate on the motion. The witness is not to enter debate on this motion. It's for members to consider the motion. You can ask rhetorical questions, but the witness will not be engaged in any of this discussion.

I see your hand is up. Is that on a point of order or to speak?

• (1735)

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: I just want to finish that.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: This leads me to believe that, including in the motion made by our colleague to refer this to INAN for further investigation, we should confirm, by way of letter, Mr. Chair, to you, the nature of the PSAB contract policy, and refer that with the motion. It will help the officials a great deal, because they're not used to this kind of stuff, I don't think.

The Chair: Are you proposing a suggestion to the Chair, or an amendment to the motion?

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: It's not an amendment. It's a suggestion to the Chair. If this motion passes—

The Chair: Let's cross one thing at a time. I hear what you're saying.

Mrs. Shanahan.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: Chair, I would like to speak to this motion, but I'd also like to have just five minutes, so we can discuss it. Again, this goes to show that this is a committee that's working together. We find elements of this motion very interesting, but we'd like to discuss it with the members, so we can come to something pretty—

The Chair: Yes. I will suspend for five minutes maximum. In the meantime, we'll try to get additional resources.

Mr. Yeo, I'm going to have to ask you just to kind of hold firm for a little while longer, because we might come back to you with some questions from just one last member.

I'll suspend for five minutes.

• (1735) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1740)

The Chair: I call our session back to order.

Mrs. Shanahan, I believe you were first on the speaking list on the motion that is before us.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: Thank you, Chair, for giving us those five minutes to speak with all colleagues, because I think it's pretty clear that the testimony we heard today is leading us all in this direction—to have a request for further investigation by INAN.

I think the wording of the motion is satisfactory to us, but I don't know if my colleague has something he wants to add.

The Chair: Mr. Desjarlais, I see your hand.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: To Mrs. Shanahan's point—and to your point, Mr. Chair—it's actually in relation to the content of the letter contained within the motion. I'm not sure if you want to hear my advice on that now or after the vote.

I believe the letter sent to INAN should include the PSAB policy, so they understand this is our concern—that there is a significant breach of what is in the policy.

The Chair: My preference is this: By coincidence, we have a subcommittee meeting on Thursday. Let's bring it up then. We can probably even get some language drafted by the researcher before that. Then we can look at it. I will certainly incorporate the views of all members, given that I hope it's going to be a unanimous motion.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 10; nays 0)

The Chair: Thank you very much. That concludes this bit of business.

I'm going back to finishing up with our questions.

Mr. Yeo, I'm going to call you back up for your presence.

Ms. Yip, you have the last round of five minutes. It's over to you.

Ms. Jean Yip: Thank you, Chair.

I'll be sharing my time with Mrs. Shanahan.

Mr. Yeo, you said repeatedly that DND said there was no conflict, and you keep talking about this document.

Can you provide a copy to the committee?

Mr. David Yeo: I see in the papers that DND made a statement indicating there was no conflict. It's a protected B document, but I have no issues with supplying you with anything.

Ms. Jean Yip: Okay.

Do you think there is anything wrong with the Auditor General's report on ArriveCAN?

• (1745)

Mr. David Yeo: It's a good report, but they had trouble putting this together because of the exact nature of how contracting works with TBIPS and SBIPS in professional services. They're all staff augmentation contracts. There potentially could be direct contracts for ArriveCAN only, so they have a challenge against them in trying to decipher all of this data.

Even though we sent an email back to the Auditor General on January 30 indicating that the \$4.9 million versus \$7.9 million attributed to ArriveCAN.... They themselves have even attributed to.... In paragraph 1.21 on page 5, they indicated that CBSA “expressed concerns that \$12.2 million of the \$59.5-million estimate could be unrelated to ArriveCAN.”

It's a challenging report, and it was a challenging effort to put it together.

Ms. Jean Yip: Regarding your time in Afghanistan, how long were you there?

Mr. David Yeo: I was there for four months.

Ms. Jean Yip: What was your role there?

Mr. David Yeo: I was delivering a high-assurance security capability to Kandahar and to all of the forward operating bases out in Afghanistan.

Ms. Jean Yip: Can you tell me what that means?

Mr. David Yeo: Basically, our effort was to ensure that all the pieces and parts were in place so all of our coalition members knew exactly where our friendly forces were, along with a couple of other capabilities.

Ms. Jean Yip: Thank you.

It's over to you, Mrs. Shanahan.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: Thank you very much.

I have a few more questions, Mr. Yeo, to clarify who you are, your background and so on.

How long have you been a member of the Conservative Party?

Mr. David Yeo: Well, I've been a member for my entire life. I've always voted Progressive Conservative. At the same time, I believe my last membership was for five years, after my very short stint with the PPC. I came back to the party.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: You did show a card at some point. Can you just show that—

The Chair: No.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: —or hold it up to the camera or perhaps table it—

The Chair: No, no.

Mrs. Shanahan, that is a prop. The clerk is reminding me that it's not permitted.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: —as a document with this committee?

The Chair: You're welcome to send it in.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: That would be greatly appreciated, because it does seem that there's some confusion between whether it's a membership card or a donation.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Yes, Mr. Genuis, go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's quite evident that Mr. Yeo does not have a Conservative membership card; therefore, I don't object to the tabling.

The Chair: Thank you, all right.

Mrs. Shanahan, you have two minutes.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: Do you see how well we work together, Chair? It's so much appreciated.

Can you tell us, as you are a donor, roughly how much money you have donated to the Conservative Party?

Mr. David Yeo: I'm not sure if I can disclose that, but it's not a great amount, that's for sure.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: All right, and just for the sake of parity, have you ever been a member of the Liberal Party of Canada?

Mr. David Yeo: I have not.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: Well, there you go. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Is that it?

Mr. David Yeo: Maybe in my future, who knows?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: I should ask maybe one last question. Concerning the People's Party of Canada, you said you're no longer a member. Can you give us the duration of how long you were a member of that party?

A voice: Is there overlap here, too?

Mr. David Yeo: It was maybe five months from start to finish, because originally I was in line to be the PC candidate for Ottawa West—Nepean, but I moved over to the PPC after Mr. O'Toole's policies came out.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: I think that concludes my questions, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Yeo. You are excused. I appreciate your coming before us today.

To everyone else here on committee, we'll see you Thursday.

This meeting is adjourned.

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>