



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

43rd PARLIAMENT, 2nd SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 028**

**PUBLIC PART ONLY - PARTIE PUBLIQUE SEULEMENT**

Wednesday, May 5, 2021

---

Chair: The Honourable John McKay





## Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

Wednesday, May 5, 2021

• (1550)

[English]

**The Chair (Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.)):** I don't think we really need to go through the drill of all the various things that you do to open a meeting, other than to say that this is the 28th meeting of the public safety committee.

With that, welcome back again, Mr. McGuinty. We look forward to your report—

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC):** Chair, I'm sorry to interrupt you.

Before we start and get to Mr. McGuinty...and I agree about the crucial information we need to hear from him. I wish we could have him here for eight hours, actually, although that's not very considerate of his own life.

I just had a [Technical difficulty—Editor] other night with our forthcoming schedule, and if that's been circulated or it could be done right away.

**A voice:** It was circulated earlier today.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Fantastic. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Maybe it didn't quite make it to Alberta.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** I don't know. Would anything surprise us?

**The Chair:** No.

We're really keen to get to Mr. McGuinty, Mr. Motz.

**Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC):** I know we are, Chair. It's about that.

I'm wondering whether there would be a will to extend the chair's time today to be able to hear the Q and A for at least 20 minutes to half an hour, if possible.

**The Chair:** The chair...?

**Mr. Glen Motz:** No, the chair of the NSICOP.

**The Chair:** I see. I didn't think you wanted to hear from me. That would have been a bit of a surprise.

I'm rather hoping to get through three rounds of questions, which would probably take us through more than the allocated hour. If Mr. McGuinty is available, then I'm sure that members will be accommodating.

Mr. McGuinty, you may also be accommodating, I hope.

Let's get launched for the first hour and see where that leaves us, but I think there's probably an appetite to go beyond the allotted hour, based on his last appearance here and that we had a lot of interest on the part of members.

David, please start your presentation.

**Hon. David McGuinty (Chair, National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Honourable members of the committee, thank you very much for the invitation to appear again today at this committee.

[Translation]

It's a great pleasure to speak with you about the 2020 annual report of the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians, or NSICOP.

[English]

Joining me today is Sean Jorgensen. Mr. Jorgensen is the director of operations for the committee's secretariat and is here to assist with answering questions and providing technical information.

Colleagues, since 2017, NSICOP has conducted seven reviews, which were included in three annual reports and two special reports. We are currently conducting two new reviews, one on the security and intelligence activities of Global Affairs Canada and another on cyber defence, and we've initiated yet a third on the RCMP's federal policing mandate.

This 2020 annual report is the only consolidated overview of national security threats to Canada.

[Translation]

I would like to emphasize that NSICOP reports are unanimous and nonpartisan. We prepare and finalize reports through consensus. All members agree on final content, assessments and recommendations.

[English]

Let me now turn to the Jim Judd report, completed pursuant to the critical election incident public protocol.

As the committee documented in its 2019 review of foreign interference, a number of states tried to interfere in Canada's electoral processes. They used a number of methods, including covertly trying to influence, for example, riding nominations or trying to promote one candidate or undermine another. It may involve illegal campaign contributions and efforts that seek leverage over officials to apply pressure.

This happens to all parties, across all orders of government. Officials may be wittingly or unwittingly subject to foreign interference activities. In the cyber realm, it could involve foreign efforts to amplify social divisions, stoke hatred online or sharpen partisan differences.

That latter point is important. Foreign states try to use partisan groups, even political parties, to pursue their own agendas.

[*Translation*]

As a result, NSICOP supported Mr. Judd's recommendations to re-establish the critical election incident public protocol well in advance of the next federal election, and to extend the protocol's mandate to the pre-writ period.

NSICOP also believes that the government should consider four other issues.

[*English*]

Number one, ensure that the mandate of the protocol includes all forms of foreign interference.

Number two, consider including prominent Canadians as members of the panel. If a foreign state is trying to manipulate partisan groups, it may be more effective for a prominent, respected Canadian to alert the public about what's happening.

Number three, absolutely ensure that all political parties understand the purpose of the protocol and the process for raising a potential issue.

Number four, consider how the panel would actually inform Canadians about an incident of foreign interference. This is important. Foreign states try to stoke partisan differences, and we will want to be careful about publicizing such efforts and attributing behaviour to particular countries.

I will now turn, Mr. Chair, to the annual report's overview of five national security threats to Canada: terrorism, espionage and foreign interference, cyber-threats, organized crime, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

I will focus on the first three as they have changed the most since 2018 when NSICOP first addressed these threats.

- (1555)

First is terrorism.

[*Translation*]

The defeat of Daesh in Syria and Iraq in 2019 was a significant milestone in global efforts to counter Salafi-Jihadist terrorism. However, it created other problems. We're wondering what to do with Canadians who had travelled to the area to support terrorist

groups. As NSICOP knows well, those individuals may continue to pose a threat to Canada and its allies.

[*English*]

At the same time, we've seen the growth of other ideologically motivated violent extremists. These include individuals and groups that embrace xenophobic violence, anti-authority violence and gender-driven violence.

While the restrictions imposed as part of the COVID lockdown, such as limitations on travel, have disrupted terrorism facilitation efforts, the pandemic and the concurrent anti-racism protests have increased anti-government rhetoric connected to ideologically motivated violent extremism.

Regarding espionage and foreign interference, I should be clear that espionage and foreign interference are quite distinct. Espionage involves the theft of information. Foreign interference involves the use of clandestine means or threats to promote a certain position or objective. However, the security and intelligence community usually treat them as a single threat because the perpetrators, foreign states, often pursue them in tandem.

In 2019, the committee found that foreign interference posed a significant threat to the security of Canada, and that continues today.

[*Translation*]

The most significant change has been to the threat posed by espionage. Foreign states are increasingly targeting Canada's science and technology sectors.

The pandemic created opportunities for foreign states, including Russia and China, to target Canada's health sector, most notably in the area of vaccine development.

[*English*]

Regarding malicious cyber-activities, there are a wide array of cyber-threats facing Canada. In terms of sophisticated, state-sponsored threats, Russia and China remain the most significant.

These countries continue to target government and non-government systems, including those that provide critical infrastructure within Canada, and more recently those involved in vaccine developments.

[*Translation*]

We've also seen state actors conduct online disinformation campaigns in Canada and among our allies. Those same actors also use sophisticated methods to target, harass or threaten dissidents within Canada.

[English]

Mr. Chair, in conclusion, threats to the security of Canada are fluid and they are changing. These are all things that we, parliamentarians from across the political spectrum, should continue to pay attention to and seek ways to address through our hearings, our work on legislation and our engagement with Canadians.

I'd be happy to take questions, Mr. Chair, through you to the committee members, reminding committee members that members of NSICOP have waived their parliamentary privilege, so of course I will have to be circumspect in answering questions with any detail that might take me into classified information territory.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1600)

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

This will start our first round of questions of six minutes.

Mr. Kurek is having difficulties with the gap between the translation, and we're not quite sure what the issue is. There does seem to be a bit of a lag between when you switch languages from English to French or French to English.

Mr. Motz, I see your hand is up.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Yes, thank you, Chair.

It's something that we mentioned previously. When the speaker is done speaking French and then whoever makes the switch between the volume from the French translation to the actual English pickup of the speaker.... There is a lag of sometimes eight, 10 or 12 seconds and you have to crank up your volume or sometimes you can't even hear what they're saying. It's not the first time we've had this experience. It happens in the House as well.

**The Chair:** The clerk is looking into it to see if we can shrink that timeline. That's the best I can do under the circumstances, but we are on it as best we can.

With that, Ms. Stubbs, you have six minutes.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Thanks, Mr. McGuinty, for being here, for your testimony and your very important work with the other members of your committee.

I know that China has recently released its 6G strategy, which called for every action user to be registered, traceable and exposed to censorship. It seems that China seems completely undeterred by western bans and maybe western countries' domestic decisions. I note too that your report says that one cyber-tool could be used to track individuals in 45 countries.

I wonder if you would expand on that issue to the degree that you can, and if you have any thoughts about what is needed at this time to prevent countries like Russia and China from employing that type of censorship and manipulation. Also, could you comment on whether or not a ban goes far enough or if there are other actions western countries could take?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** I think I detected an oblique reference to Huawei in this question, but I want to be clear that the committee

has not conducted a review of this issue. We have been briefed by CSE officials on the measures CSE has put in place to test Huawei products that are present in Canada's existing telecoms market, but I can't comment further than that on that particular issue.

I also want to point out to committee members that the report is replete with references to China. That is a deliberate choice by committee members. In fact, in many different contexts, in 15 separate paragraphs, there are direct references to China and the activities they may be pursuing in a Canadian context.

I can't go much further in giving you more detail on how the government or the security and intelligence community might respond more appropriately. It is important to remind members though that we did make a major recommendation to the Government of Canada in our 2019 report, asking the government to bear down on questions around the activities of China and to come to the fore with a whole-of-government approach. It seems that the Minister of Public Safety, Minister Blair, has begun that process, but we are waiting to see more information from the government eventually, to see, Ms. Stubbs, what that whole-of-government approach looks like.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Certainly your report, as your testimony has done, outlines the clear threats of foreign intervention and interference in Canadian national security and economic security, threats to us as a country as a whole and to individual Canadian citizens, and it repeatedly mentions Russia and China as consistently bad actors.

It seems, in the case of China, that it's been happening for a long time, but do you have any comment or can you comment on whether there has been a difference or an uptick or a change in China's approach to Canada since the arrest and extradition, and then also the imprisonment of the two Michaels? Can you make any comments on that?

• (1605)

**Hon. David McGuinty:** I don't think our report examined the foreign actor scenario from 2018 to 2020 in terms of the quantum of activity by China. I might ask, if I may, my research colleague Sean Jorgensen to respond to you, Ms. Stubbs, if that would be helpful. I think he might have a bit more detail for you.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Sure.

**Mr. Sean Jorgensen (Director of Operations, Secretariat of the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians, National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

If I may, Madam Stubbs, I would point to the 2019 report, in which we identified a particular period of 2012 when Xi Jinping became essentially the president of China and took a very different approach to foreign interference globally.

We documented, for example, some very specific threats to Canada in which Chinese officials were coming to Canada to apply pressure on either Canadian citizens of Chinese origin or people who had come to Canada in their immigration process. That was a very distinctive change in 2012, which, as I understand it, continues today, not just in Canada but among some of our closest allies as well.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Thank you.

On page 18, your report notes that “Foreign states are increasingly targeting Canada's science and technology sector,” and it points to China's thousand talents program as a perpetrator and says that, through that program, “intellectual property is often transferred to China”.

Your report notes an increase in that. Can you expand with any details on that point?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** I would welcome the opportunity to do so, but beyond what's in the text, Ms. Stubbs, under the rubric of “Espionage”, it's very difficult for me to go into more detail.

I think it's fair to say that increasingly our science and technology community in Canada, our academic community in Canada, is becoming more aware of the inherent risks. We understand that CSIS is now reaching out on a regular basis to brief academic experts and academic administrators on the reality of the situation. We hope that this will raise the profile of the need to address this and to be aware.

That's a very important question. Thank you for raising it.

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

I'm advised by the clerk that this is a system-wide problem. If those speakers who are switching from English to French or French to English could just give a little bit of a pause to let the system catch up as they switch languages, it would be helpful to everyone.

Mr. Lightbound, you have six minutes, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Joël Lightbound (Louis-Hébert, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank our witnesses for joining us today.

Mr. McGuinty, thank you for joining us. One thing that stands out in your report is the changing nature of the terrorist threat in Canada. You spoke of the growing threat of ideologically motivated violent extremism in Canada. You specifically referred to the rather disturbing 320% increase in incidents related to this type of extremism from 2013 to 2018. That's not counting the tragedies in Christchurch, El Paso and Germany, which are linked to ideologically motivated violent extremism.

At the same time, you said in your report that this type of extremism differs from the extremism inspired by ideologies such as that of Daesh or al-Qaida. The extremism is less tied to one group and less centralized. It often involves constellations of dispersed actors.

This is a new threat. The threat is organized differently from the somewhat more traditional threats that we've seen in recent

decades. What challenges does this present to our intelligence agencies in Canada and to our allies?

How are our agencies adapting to this threat, which you describe as growing?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** Thank you for the question, Mr. Lightbound.

In the report, we tried to clearly convey what we heard from the security and intelligence community on this issue.

What surprised us the most in 2020 was the increase in the activities of ideologically motivated violent extremists, or IMVEs. The dynamics behind these activities don't seem to be slowing down. On the contrary, they seem to be moving faster and faster and involving more and more groups and participants.

We know that extremist dialogue isn't necessarily criminal. However, we also know that Canada has an increasingly broad base for recruitment. Extremists can look for more and more people who are susceptible to possible radicalization.

Our security and intelligence services are concerned about the situation in the field and about the increase in activity. We've seen it abroad, such as in New Zealand. Several of the incidents brought up in paragraph 35 occurred in Texas and in Germany, in two instances. There's also the issue of involuntary celibate groups.

• (1610)

[*English*]

These extremists are also posing a growing threat. We know that it's increasingly overlapping with other IMVE-type extremism. Of course, we saw a van attack in April 2018. We saw a stabbing in June 2019 in Sudbury. We saw another stabbing in Toronto by an individual motivated by the incel ideology in February 2020.

This is perhaps the most striking thing about this review for us, Mr. Chair, in terms of monitoring the trend. Mr. Lightbound rightly points out that it's a surprise to our security and intelligence community, but they are very much seized with this based on what we've seen and the information we've obtained.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Joël Lightbound:** Have you seen an acceleration as a result of the pandemic? I think that this was noted in your report.

People are spending more time online, and there are more conspiracy theories, for example.

Has this affected radicalization and the rate?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** For each of the five topics that we covered in the report, we tried to provide, at the end of a chapter, an analysis of what has happened since the COVID-19 pandemic and the impact on the five areas.

[English]

In that analysis, we know there has been a decrease in mass gatherings. We know there has been a closure of public spaces and limits on travel. These things may have had a bearing on driving activity further online.

This is something the RCMP is examining. They believe it could result in people looking for advice or information over the Internet and accessing what we call extremist echo chambers. We believe that COVID-19, more social isolation and more financial hardship during the restrictions have likely put more of this type of IMVE and incel activity online.

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

Madam Michaud, please go ahead.

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I also want to thank you, Mr. McGuinty, for joining us and for your work. It's very valuable. We greatly appreciate it.

In order to frame my questions properly, I first want to make sure that I understand the role of NSICOP.

Is NSICOP's role to take stock of the situation and the threats, and then make recommendations to the Prime Minister?

I gather that you aren't responsible for what the government does with your recommendations and for the solutions that it implements. Is that right?

• (1615)

**Hon. David McGuinty:** Yes, you're right. NSICOP addresses the major issues that it chooses. We have a very rigorous approach to selecting topics for review. We conduct the reviews, and the reports are then sent to the Prime Minister. The reports may be released to the public in the House of Commons and the Senate.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** You always talk about terrorism as the number one threat. You also talk about cyber threats, espionage and foreign interference, which are growing issues.

Do you see these new threats as a new form of terrorism? I'm thinking in particular of cyber threats, the situation on social media, and foreign interference with intellectual property.

**Hon. David McGuinty:** In the security and intelligence community, Ms. Michaud, risks are divided into five categories, as we outlined in the report. These include terrorism and cyber threats.

I don't know whether we can say that we're seeing terrorism shift online right now, if that's what you're asking. However, we know that the current situation surrounding COVID-19 seems to be driving a number of actors to speed up or increase their online activities.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** I'll come back to this, because it's worthwhile. In your opening remarks, you said that travel restrictions during the pandemic, for example, may have reduced terrorism or some terrorist efforts.

Can you tell us more about this?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** We clearly stated in the report what we heard from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, or RCMP, and other agencies. We heard that the very sophisticated terrorist threats seem to have slowed down and that the risks are more associated with what we call soft targets, meaning public locations, places where people gather. Obviously, nowadays, this doesn't happen very often.

My colleague Mr. Jorgensen could elaborate on this, if that's fine with you.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Okay.

[English]

**Mr. Sean Jorgensen:** The only thing I'd add for Ms. Michaud is that the reduction in travel also means, of course, a reduction in air flights, which are, as you know, one of the key threat vectors for terrorism. We've also seen very significant reductions on immigration, with another vector, for example, into certain countries, being people illicitly coming into countries under the guise of immigration. There have been a number of restrictions imposed on the travel and movement of people that have in turn restricted certain activities of terrorist groups as well.

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you.

I want to address the issue of the rise of the extreme right, including groups such as Proud Boys. Canada has listed Proud Boys as a terrorist group, although the group appears to have been disbanded. We aren't immune to situations such as the ones that occurred in the United States, and several experts have said so.

I'm thinking, for example, of networks such as QAnon. Statistics show that Canada is among the top four countries generating QAnon-related content on Twitter, along with the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia. I think that more and more people are joining these types of groups that spread conspiracy theories. This is becoming worrying. Canada isn't immune to this.

In your opinion, is Canada prepared to respond to this very modern threat that hasn't really been faced in the past?

How should Canada prepare for this?

• (1620)

**Hon. David McGuinty:** There's work to do.

[English]

As of 2015, at least 100 white supremacist and neo-Nazi groups existed in Canada. The vast majority of these are ideologically motivated violent extremism groups. However, in our research—and this was also new to us—more recent estimates suggest that there are closer to 300 such groups across Canada. There has been a major increase in neo-Nazi groups—active and growing—and clearly, as you rightly point out, Madam Michaud, the threat of IMVE, ideologically motivated violent extremism, is growing around the world. It increased by 320% from 2013 to 2018.

It's a very serious matter for Canada, a very serious matter for our security and intelligence organizations, and it's a very serious matter for parliamentarians.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Madam Michaud.

Mr. Harris, you have six minutes, please.

**Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East, NDP):** Thank you, Chair.

Thank you to our colleague, Mr. McGuinty, for joining us today. It's a very interesting report.

You've called your report an update of a threat assessment first undertaken by your committee in the 2018 report.

First of all, I'm one of those people who's not very happy to have a committee such as yours—made up not of Parliament but of parliamentarians who report to the Prime Minister—that redacts the report, and we get to talk to you instead of your reporting to Parliament.

That being said, if you were doing threat assessments, shouldn't Parliament require that these agents table an integrated and unclassified, unredacted threat assessment to the members of Parliament and that it go to Parliament in the same way that it is done in the United States by the director of national intelligence there?

Is that not a proper method of ensuring that Parliament is aware of the threats to this country?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** Thank you, Mr. Harris, for the question.

I think committee members would consider that the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians is a proxy group for the whole of Parliament, both the House of Commons and the Senate. They have been cleared to a sufficiently high level to be able to hear the classified information, for the first time in Canadian history, and to work on behalf of all parliamentarians to hear the information, deliberate in a completely non-partisan setting and then deliver up a report, which is classified, to the Prime Minister. From there, it goes through the normal Canada Evidence Act process of redaction, and then it's ultimately tabled.

We felt, as a committee, it would be helpful for Canadians—parliamentarians and Canadians writ large—to provide a single source of authoritative information on the threats to our national security, hence the update from the 2018 first foray into producing that assessment.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** We know that the redactions are those related to national security. Surely, if the redactions involve national secu-

rity, then we're not getting the actual threat assessment. That would be my view, sir.

You referred to ideologically motivated violent extremism-inspired attacks. You mentioned the incel attacks and various other ones.

Would you include crashing through the Rideau gates with a heavily armed pickup truck and seeking to arrest the Prime Minister because of gun legislation that the person disagreed with, an ideologically motivated violent extremist approach, and something that would be considered a priority investigation, by the RCMP, for example?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** That's an excellent question, Mr. Harris, but it's not one that the committee turned its collective mind to.

The timelines for this report, I don't think included—and perhaps Mr. Jorgensen could confirm—that particular event.

● (1625)

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Does it seem to you, sir, to fall into that category? I'm not asking for—

**Hon. David McGuinty:** It may very well—

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I'm not asking for the CSIS assessment or the RCMP assessment. What would yours be?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** It may very well, but I can't comment with credibility. I don't have the information that backstops whatever investigation is taking place with respect to that particular...

**Mr. Jack Harris:** That would come under the rubric of a security threat of some kind to the country, if someone is trying to arrest the Prime Minister based on the activities that are publicly known. It's no secret. You don't need an investigation to know what was going on.

That would be a security threat to the country, would it not?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** I would think it would be a security threat. Our security intelligence folks would be paying very close attention to it, yes.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** We see that in other countries that have similar bodies such as yours.... The U.K., for example, gives out a report noting the amount of effort that is devoted to particular topics. We've been told the U.K. report provides thoughts about the allocation of effort with MI5, which is similar to CSIS, and says that, as of March 18, they were devoting 67% of their efforts to investigating and disrupting Islamist terrorism.

Do you think it would be useful and helpful for your committee to be assessing that kind of effort so that we would have an idea, as members of Parliament and the public, as to what effort is being placed against particular activities? Is that something you would consider doing in the future?



**Hon. David McGuinty:** It may very well be something the committee considers. One of the opportunities coming from Parliament soon enough is the five-year review of the statute that creates the committee. That may very well be something the House may want to debate or consider in the statutory authority. The ISC in Britain has a slightly different structure from ours. We choose topics based on a series of criteria we arrived at early on when the committee was first created.

I think your question, which is really important, also raises, Mr. Harris, the question of recommendations from the committee to the government, and whether the government is responding adequately or not. We said something about that as well in the report.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Harris. Unfortunately, your time is up.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Thank you, Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Kurek, you have five minutes, please.

**Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. McGuinty, for your work and the leadership provided on this important file.

The report notes that some ISIS sympathizers were not active combatants, but I imagine that most of those captured would make that claim—ISIS terrorists who participate in fundraising, planning, recruitment and propaganda. I'm sure that over COVID a lot of this has been moved online, but I would suggest that's a pretty big threat as well. The 61 individuals identified as having returned to Canada, have they faced repercussions for those crimes?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** That's a really important question, Mr. Kurek. The committee, obviously, looked at this very closely, but it did not review the issue of repatriating foreign fighters or the broader issue of extremist travellers as a part of this annual report.

We do of course speak, from paragraphs 24 forward—I think that's what you're alluding to—about the international terrorism environment. We have named the numbers. What we're presenting here are the accurate numbers: those who were detained, those who are at large and those who are dead. The numbers remain unclassified, so we were in a position to do so. That's as far as the committee was able to go in this particular area that you're raising.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** I appreciate that. It deals with such interconnected and complex issues.

I've noted that it's common to make mention of far-right groups rather than calling them what they are: hate groups. Certainly as I've watched Conservative and Liberal and other political parties' blogs and whatnot, you see the comments. There's hate coming from all sides, and it is absolutely tragic.

Is there any distinction, from your experience, between hate groups and the groups the report calls “ideologically motivated violent extremists”? Is there a differentiation?

• (1630)

**Hon. David McGuinty:** I know that there's a debate around the nomenclature and the choice of words to describe these. I really

would like to ask my colleague Mr. Jorgensen to jump in here for a second. I know he is tracking that for the committee.

**The Chair:** We seem to have switched to French all of a sudden.

Could we just back up on that, Mr. McGuinty, and start your response in English again, please?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** Sure.

I was saying to Mr. Kurek that there is an important debate, I understand, around the nomenclature and the language that is appropriate. I think Mr. Jorgensen would be best placed to give us an idea of where that now lies and whether it is something that has reached the committee for deliberation. I do not recall, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Sean Jorgensen:** Thank you.

Very quickly, Mr. Kurek, I think there's a very clear distinction between extremists and.... Over time, extremists have been identified as doing everything from promoting women's rights to urging equality for Black people in the United States, for example. There is a very clear distinction between those people and people who take any type of extremist position into a violent realm.

This is where I think that CSIS has worked very hard with its international allies and partners to essentially focus on the behaviour and not necessarily the motivation. We know that it's ideological. That's what makes it, for example, terrorism.

However, I see your point. It's not right wing; it's not left wing. It is “what's the violent basis for that behaviour?”

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** All right. Here is my last question, and I'll try to squeeze two in here.

One is about espionage related to Canada's research institutions. You noted this in paragraph 45 as a major target for foreign espionage, and certainly in the midst of COVID we've seen a changing dynamic related to that. That's my first question.

My next question is specific to the protection of our democratic institutions and the integrity of the electoral process, as well as the need to ensure that our elections are protected so that Canadians can trust that foreign interference is identified and stopped. Of course, we read the headlines, but it's often the more clandestine operations, and with the proliferation of online issues, there is certainly that threat.

I'm wondering, then, whether you could, in the short amount of time that is available, identify the threat to research institutions and also the actions that could be taken or the recommendations that could be made, whether to Elections Canada or to law enforcement, regarding the protection of our democracy.

**The Chair:** Mr. Kurek has stretched his five minutes quite magnificently.

Mr. McGuinty, could you respond to those very important questions in less than 30 seconds?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** I'll do my best.

Paragraph 45 onwards, for members and for Canadians, describes this question of espionage in the science and technology field. We talk about the thousand talents program. We talk about the threats from Russia and China. We talk about new technologies being increasingly the focus targeted by foreign states, and we talk about the risk to critical infrastructure—our electricity grid and beyond.

On the question of electoral integrity, This is precisely why, Mr. Kurek, we as a committee focus so heavily on the Jim Judd report, to assess whether or not the mechanism that was put in place by the government—a five-person panel to deal with foreign interference, primarily cyber in nature—should be expanded.

We made four or five recommendations. One was to include, for example, in-person, more traditional foreign interference, so that it would be caught. We also made some recommendations as to how that would be communicated to Canadians, if there were an occurrence, because this would happen in the context of a usually heated and usually partisan campaign context—healthy and normal.

However, we want to make sure that if this were to occur, as it has occurred in the United States and other jurisdictions, we're best prepared to deal with it.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. McGuinty. Neither you nor I know anything about partisanship.

Mr. Fisher, take five minutes, please.

• (1635)

**Mr. Darren Fisher (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank Mr. McGuinty for being here. I've been on a lot of committees and have sat in front of an awful lot of testimony. I have to tell you that none has been as exciting, frightening or terrifying as some of the testimony we're hearing from you. Thank you very much for the work you do on behalf of your committee.

I also want to give a quick little kudos to the members of this committee as well. I'm a new member, but I have to tell you that here we find very insightful questions and very respectful dialogue, and I'm nothing but impressed with this committee since becoming a new member.

Kudos to the chair, of course, for handling things in such a professional way.

**The Chair:** Get to your question, Mr. Fisher.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** Mr. McGuinty, in your committee's report, you reference the terror code listings process. Before 2019, there were no ideologically motivated violent extremist groups listed as territory entities, and now there are six white supremacist organizations, including the Proud Boys.

During your conversation with MP Michaud, you also said something about 100 organizations. Then you said you believe there may

be as many as 300. I'm interested in your opinion on what impact a listing process has.

**Hon. David McGuinty:** It's not something that the committee examined directly, Mr. Fisher. I think it's fair to say that listing a group is exposing a group. It is making more information available to the Canadian people about some of the activities that these groups pursue and what's at risk, which is what we've tried to capture in this report based on the classified information we've received on this front. It's not just one government that has listed. There have been other governments that have listed, and it's an important tool.

The proliferation of these groups is what I think also surprised us. It's the quantum leap in numbers that really had us as a committee, together. We have a member of this NSICOP committee on the public safety committee—Mr. Motz—who will recall that we all sort of shook our heads and thought at first that it was a misprint. This rapid increase in IMVE is of significant concern.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** Do you have any concern that by listing these groups it brings this relative fame and maybe encourages some groups to begin, to start the process of forming groups?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** I couldn't really say whether the infamy of it will drive people to participate or to sign up, but I think that in order for us as Canadians and as Parliamentarians to know what we're dealing with, we have to have this in the open.

A core message of the committee in this report is that this isn't going away. It's increasing. It's increasing in numbers. It's increasing in groups. It's increasing in online traffic. It's a source of recruitment. It's a source of radicalization, and it would be very helpful for parliamentarians and for Canada to build on some really important work that's going on now, Mr. Fisher, to try to understand why this is happening.

This is not just happening in Canada. As the report sets out clearly, it's happening globally. It's happening in the United States. It's happening in France, Germany and the U.K., so we're going to have to wrestle this to the ground and have a better understanding. That's one of the reasons we wanted to give this an important profile in the report.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** How about online hate legislation like we see in Australia? Do you see the benefit of taking action against this type of online violence before it has real world implications?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** It's not something the committee has examined. It might very well be. It would be a very important issue for the public safety committee to examine, for example, whether that would be a contributing factor to help....

I want to repeat the message: This isn't going away. It's expanding in reach, size, scope and seriousness. I think we're going to have to deal with this now collectively.

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

Ms. Michaud, you have two and a half minutes, please.

• (1640)

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I can't help but make the connection between cyber attacks and the pandemic that we're currently experiencing.

Mr. McGuinty, as you said, China and Russia have been engaged in many cyber attacks in recent months. This includes not only information theft, but also disinformation campaigns. For example, in Europe, hackers stole and altered data on the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine. The European Medicines Agency confirms that confidential emails were stolen and posted on the Russian dark web.

Canada is a G7 country and will hopefully become a vaccine-producing country in the near future. We can assume that this isn't our last pandemic.

How can we counter these cyber attacks, which directly affect and threaten public health?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** Ms. Michaud, you're absolutely right. This phenomenon affects public health, research and development and the Canadian economy. These threats exist throughout our society. We've tried to clearly describe the situation in this area in paragraphs 64 to 67.

[English]

First, CSE has assessed that the number and sophistication of cyber-threat actors is increasing. Second, CSE says state-sponsored programs from China, Russia, Iran and North Korea pose the greatest strategic threat to Canada, likely attempting to develop cyber-capabilities to disrupt Canadian critical infrastructure: energy systems, water systems, our grid and traffic flow control. Third, CSE notes that state-sponsored actors continue to conduct commercial espionage against our businesses, academia and government to steal intellectual property. Fourth, CSE tells us that online foreign influence campaigns are ongoing and are not limited to major political events, like elections.

[Translation]

This phenomenon is happening everywhere. We wanted to describe it for the benefit of parliamentarians and Canadians so that they can understand the scale of the situation and see that it affects all sectors of our economy and our universities.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Madam Michaud.

Mr. Harris, you have two and a half minutes, please.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Thank you, Chair.

Lots of questions arise, but I do have to ask one overriding question having to do with the mandate of your committee. My understanding, initially, was that there was a great deal of interest in having oversight of the various security and intelligence agencies that are operating in secret, as is their want and as is expected, and in making sure that they are following their policies and that their practices are in keeping with the law and in accordance with the expectations of Canadians.

What kinds of activities have you undertaken in that regard? I know you were talking about threat assessments, but what about that oversight? What's been done in that area?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** There was a debate, Mr. Harris, when this committee was first being contemplated in Parliament, of course. What is it? Is it an oversight committee?

Perhaps a better description would be that of the American congressional committee and the nature of that committee compared to a review committee, which NSICOP has become. The decision was taken by Parliament to make it a review body to look back over time, with a broad mandate to examine many issues, to get access to classified information, to ask the right questions and to call witnesses.

Each review brings 10,000 to 30,000 or 40,000 pages of material, and then, of course, we provide a report to the Prime Minister, as I mentioned, in classified form. It is then redacted and presented to Canadians. We haven't really focused so much on the question of anything but review.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** If there's a question of somebody misbehaving or doing something inappropriate, [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] as a Parliament or as a country we have to revert to such things like the O'Connor commission or the Iacobucci inquiry, rather than ask NSICOP to deal with questions of whether or not these things were appropriate, and what recourse individuals might have if they're handled badly in a negative way as we've seen happen with security activities in the past.

• (1645)

**Hon. David McGuinty:** These types of lawfulness questions, just-in-time lawfulness questions, can be dealt with by the National Security and Intelligence Review Agency, NSIRA.

**The Chair:** We're going to have to leave it there, unfortunately.

We'll move on to Mr. Van Popta, for five minutes, please.

**Mr. Tako Van Popta (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. McGuinty for being here and telling us about your national security and intelligence committee report for 2020.

In this report, you highlight the quantum growth of IMVE, ideologically motivated violent extremism. You've answered some questions about that already, so thank you for that clarification.

I'm trying to get a grip on how significant this growth is and whether individuals who are involved in these hate groups are identifiable. What's the nature of their communities? Are they just online communities, or are they real identifiable people? You make reference to a couple of geographical locations in Canada, like southern Alberta, southern Quebec and somewhere in Ontario, as well. What's the nature of these groups?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** I think the report, Mr. Van Popta, has made it clear that obviously there's an online virtual community that is growing in the number of groups and participants. The security and intelligence organizations have indicated to us that there are clusters in the country, so we've tried to represent that accurately.

Beyond that, I don't know if I can offer any more detail in terms of the individuals or names, so on and so forth. Most of that would have been, of course, removed.

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** It would have been redacted.

I'm not looking for names, but are there identifiable individuals who are involved in this subversive activity in Canada?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** There are and the concern the committee wanted to raise with Canadians is that this is a very large group. We found that Canadians are highly active across 6,600 identified right-wing extremist channels, pages, groups and accounts. The study that we looked at also pointed to one prominent message board on which Canadians are more active than American or British users.

What this means is that Canada has a very large base from which to recruit or seek to radicalize participants. That was a very big surprise to the committee as we received the information.

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** I think that's a very big surprise to all Canadians. It certainly is to me. I had not expected that, so thank you for bringing that to our attention.

The report makes reference to a couple of incidents in other countries like New Zealand, with the Christchurch shooting, and the copycat shooting in El Paso. I think there might have been one or two in Europe as well.

Are there any indications of that type of event happening in Canada? I know there's reference also to the three incel-motivated attacks in Canada. Are there any others that we should know about?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** Any event that we were able to present to Canadians, Mr. Van Popta, for the period that we were reviewing, we have presented.

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** Thank you very much.

Mr. Chair, I just have one comment. I want to put a motion to the meeting. I was so happy to see this report from the subcommittee on what we're going to study over the next couple of meetings.

As a new member of the committee, I was getting quite frustrated that things were going so slowly. I'm happy that we're getting close to the end of our studies on systemic racism, the parole board incident and the Bastarache report.

I'm happy to see this report, and I move a motion that the report be adopted.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** I would prefer not to deal with it at this point and to deal with it at the end of Mr. McGuinty's testimony. If that's acceptable to you, then we'll do that.

With that, we're moving on to Madam Damoff for five minutes, please.

• (1650)

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

Mr. McGuinty, it is an absolute pleasure to have you here.

As you know, I was on the public safety committee when we studied Bill C-22, which created the committee. It was my amendment that brought you here. It was Matthew Dubé who reminded me of that in the last Parliament, that I was the one who brought in that amendment. I'm just sitting here so proud of the work that you and the other members of the committee have done and how important it is for you to share the report with all of us and with Canadians. Thank you for that.

When I was looking at the report, Mr. Van Popta was asking what the groups are, and you mentioned this earlier. They are a form of extremism that "encompasses xenophobic violence, anti-authority violence, gender-driven violence and 'other grievance-driven'". Then it talks about CSIS saying that it's a common belief that "the success or survival of society/civilization cannot be separated from the need for ongoing violence against a perceived threatening group". These are, for example, "the elite, visible minorities, religious groups, corporations, immigrants, capitalists, the government".

I have noticed, over the last two years, certainly an increase in the tone of comments that I see online on posts that I make. I was really disturbed by the report when you mentioned how many Canadians.... The report that you mentioned from the Institute for Strategic Dialogue said that "Canadians are highly active across 6,600 identified right-wing extremist channels, pages, groups and accounts." Since they tend to organize online, it means that these messages are spread more quickly.

I'm just wondering what your thoughts are on how this online presence is contributing. Maybe you can't comment on this, and that's okay if you can't. How does an online presence allow these messages from these IMVE groups to spread quickly?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** I can't get into any more detail than what is in the report on this, but let me maybe repeat a few points.

This rapid growth of IMVE is of very significant concern for Canadians. We believe this is true among our closest allies, and it's true in Canada. We have had enough comparative information, classified as well, talking about what is going on in other places, and it's very concerning.

A number of these violent anti-authority groups were recently listed as terrorist entities, including the Proud Boys, which apparently announced this week they were disbanding. I understand. We have seen some unbelievable, horrific crimes against women committed by individuals motivated by misogyny. We have seen the growth of neo-Nazi groups, groups espousing hatred against immigrants, against racialized communities and the LGBTQ community.

Anything we can do as parliamentarians to raise the profile of this new, growing reality and to find ways to address it, I think would be very welcome today.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** You mentioned in the report, and you touched on it now, how the pandemic has impacted the number of people who have been drawn to this. The numbers you gave to us were actually frightening, a 320% increase, and I suspect that number is even higher given what you've seen during COVID.

I wonder if you could comment on that, please.

**Hon. David McGuinty:** There's not much to add except to say that what we tried to do in the report was to apply a COVID-19 lens at the end of each of the five core threat areas to say what really has happened here under the pandemic. It appears the evidence indicates that the activity is being pushed online. There's more subterfuge, more connectivity inside the country, between countries.

I think Mr. Jorgensen could add a little bit more to that, Ms. Damoff, if that's okay.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Yes.

**Mr. Sean Jorgensen:** Thank you very much.

I would just make two points. One is the monitoring of extremism and how that is being pushed underground. You would recognize, of course, that the security intelligence organizations don't necessarily monitor extremism per se, because being an extremist may be vile speech but it's not illegal. They are actually identifying when that extremism becomes violent.

I think that's the second point I would make. The S and I community, security and intelligence community, has been very clear. It is very difficult in this environment to identify someone who has become radicalized, and then the time that takes them to become violent.

That time frame has reduced considerably, and I know that's something that security intelligence organizations really struggle with. That actually gets to your first point. What is the impact of that online hatred? I think that's one of the key issues.

• (1655)

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

Colleagues, that brings us over the hour that is allocated to Mr. McGuinty. I note that he is quite popular. Members are quite keen. Mr. Motz had seemed to hope that we would go a little bit beyond normal.

I'm in the hands of colleagues as to whether we have a third round, or some partial expression of a third round.

I see Mr. Kurek seems to be enthusiastic.

Pam.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Chair, I think it's important, given the testimony we've heard, that we deal with the 106(4) motion you have today, so I would say no to a third round.

**The Chair:** Mr. Harris.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I was going to speak in the other direction and suggest that we do have a third round. I don't think we're going to need all the rest of the time to deal with either the 106(4) motion or the motion from the subcommittee.

**The Chair:** Madam Michaud.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** I agree with Mr. Harris. I support the idea of a third round.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Based on that, I think we will have a third round.

In light of Madam Damoff's comments, we will just chop it in half. It will be two and a half minutes, two and a half minutes, a minute, a minute, and two and a half minutes, and two and a half minutes.

I'm assuming that's all right with you, Mr. McGuinty.

**Hon. David McGuinty:** That's fine, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Therefore, I'm looking for a representative of the Conservative Party for two and a half minutes, and then the Liberal Party.

I didn't know that anybody was that shy.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Mr. Chair, we're just trying to figure out a little bit of a surprise, which is never a bad thing. Thank you very much for this and the committee's willingness.

Specifically, Mr. McGuinty, my question is regarding organized crime and the fact that it seems, both from this report and other other things I've read, that Canada has become a haven for money laundering. International crime groups are using Canada to launder up to \$100 billion a year, and this seems to be a fraction of the massive amounts laundered per year globally, but still a significant issue.

Is money laundering a symptom of a growing number of criminal organizations, the product of the lack of concentration on this issue or a combination of both?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** Mr. Kurek, I think it's a combination of both. The report from paragraph 87 forward lays out the nature of what is happening—some of the changes, what's happening in the drug trade, what's happening with money laundering, the extent of that money laundering, the example of what took place in British Columbia in terms of the casinos and the B.C. real estate. We highlight what's been happening in the greater Toronto area in terms of real estate and its connection to money laundering.

We tried to put this out as well as this question of trade-based laundering to explain what the magnitude of this challenge is and whether or not FINTRAC, the organization that is seized with this ostensibly, does not necessarily have the legislative authority to collect a certain amount of the information it would need. We laid this out in pretty clear paragraphs to point out exactly what you raised, which is another growing area. It's something I believe we may end up addressing. I can't prejudge, but as I said earlier, the committee is going to be pursuing a review of the federal policing mandate of the RCMP.

● (1700)

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Thank you very much for that.

I would follow up. You half-answered this question, but certainly there are some complications between the investigative authority of the RCMP, FINTRAC and then our intelligence agencies. I'm hearing you say that a coordinated approach is something that hasn't been looked at but is something that may need to be looked at going forward.

**Hon. David McGuinty:** I think that's a fair statement. Absolutely.

**The Chair:** Okay.

We now have two and a half minutes for the Liberals.

Madam Lambropoulos.

**Ms. Emmanuella Lambropoulos (Saint-Laurent, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you very much, Mr. McGuinty and team, for being here with us today to answer our questions, and thanks for the work that you do on this committee to protect Canadians.

My question is about the spike in online hate and online hate groups. I can't help but notice the concern that people have with Bill C-10 and people's belief that it would infringe on their basic rights to express themselves and freedom of expression, which obviously our government has said it wouldn't do. Because this is the current fear, I'm wondering how our government could go forward. What would you recommend or what ways that could you see our government going forward with legislation to stop people who organize hatred online and push that kind of an agenda on social media and online?

In what ways can we limit the ability of these groups to have a negative influence on Canadians?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** Ms. Lambropoulos, I think you're raising the \$64,000 question: What is the appropriate balance between free speech and when that free speech crosses a line and becomes something else? It's not something the committee examined in terms of what's the remedy or what's the recommendation. In fact, this report was agnostic this year on recommendations. It wanted to present the magnitude of the risks, but we really hope that a committee like public safety, for example, might apply its collective mind to figure out what the best way forward is.

We haven't examined Bill C-10. It's being debated. We haven't applied it to this particular set of challenges, but we may have more to say about this when we release our report on cyber-activities, which we hope will be by the summer. We may also have more to

say about this when we are finished the review of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police's federal policing mandate, given their role as the national organization with the primary responsibility for national security investigations and organized crime, for example.

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

Madam Michaud, you have one minute, please.

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The report discusses organized crime and how its activities have become increasingly complex. However, the report states that the nature of the threat hasn't really changed since 2018.

It's still a scourge in Canada's largest cities, including Montreal, where a 15-year-old girl was shot and killed, probably by a street gang member who possessed an illegal weapon. In addition, a young man was arrested with nearly 250 illegally imported weapons at the United States border.

Aside from the fact that we already have all this information on organized crime, do you think that Canada is doing enough to address the illicit trafficking of firearms?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** This issue wasn't reviewed by NSICOP and wasn't addressed in this report. However, it will likely be considered when NSICOP continues its review of the situation regarding the RCMP's national security mandate.

[English]

**The Chair:** We'll have to leave it there.

Mr. Harris, you have one minute.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** In paragraphs 71 and 72 of your report, you talk about Russia, China and Iran having demonstrated an intention to develop cyber-attack capabilities. At the end of it, however, after suggesting that the Russians are already there, it says that CSE notes that "in the absence of a major crisis or armed conflict with Canada or the United States, the intentional disruption of Canadian critical infrastructure remains unlikely."

I don't know what that's supposed to mean or whether you agree with that. Surely it's only in a crisis that these types of things would happen. Are we up to the defence of that, or do you evaluate that kind of a statement, which was just repeated here?

● (1705)

**Hon. David McGuinty:** Mr. Harris, could I ask Mr. Jorgensen to respond to you directly on that?

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Sure.

**Mr. Sean Jorgensen:** It was, in fact, a CSE, Communications Security Establishment, assessment that this type of activity goes on all the time. In fact, we see that some of our allies in the Middle East do the same thing, and not necessarily in a crisis. That similar thing could happen in Canada; however, the assessment of CSE is that the intention of a major state actor would only be displayed in the circumstance of a war.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

The next questioner will be a Conservative—I don't know who the Conservative is—for two and a half minutes.

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** I can go.

**The Chair:** Mr. Van Popta, you have two and a half minutes.

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you again, Mr. McGuinty, for raising the issue of malicious cyber-activity. I was very interested to hear what your report had to say, and I also have to admit that I was very alarmed.

These are foreign entities breaking into our security and stealing our intellectual property, so my question is really about that. How big of a threat is that, of foreign entities, foreign companies, let's say, controlled by foreign governments, stealing our intellectual property and, in that way, threatening us economically?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** Mr. Van Popta, in the report, from paragraph 61 forward, for four or five paragraphs in a row, we describe that threat quite clearly. The committee was unanimous, as it is behind all these paragraphs, that it wanted to name specifically China, the Russian Federation, Iran and the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea.

CSE's information, which we re-present here, says they “continued to see cyber activity consistent with each actor's national strategic objectives, including in cyber activity against Canadian government networks, private sector systems and critical infrastructure systems.”

We've looked at enough evidence to conclude that “China and Russia continued to be the main drivers of cyber threat activity targeting the government since 2018”, since we last looked at this, and it's focusing across a whole series of government sectors. I can't go into any more detail than that.

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** That's fair enough. Thank you for that.

Are these state-owned enterprises controlled by the Chinese communist government or the Russian government, or are they private actors? To what extent is it a nation-to-nation issue?

**Hon. David McGuinty:** I don't think I'm in a position to give you any more detail than the fact that the report refers to Chinese and Russian actors.

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** That's fair enough. I respect that. Thank you.

Is that my time?

**The Chair:** Yes, you're pretty well done.

The final two and a half minutes will go to a Liberal questioner, failing which I'll take it, if no one else will.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Why don't you take it, Chair?

**The Chair:** Mr. McGuinty, first of all, thank you for coming. You've only hit the tip of the iceberg in terms of the overall threat assessment, and you have some limitations.

I'd like you to delve into the nature of the threat to our democracy. We saw in the last four years that the Russians were very successful at setting Americans off against each other, exaggerating

their differences, if you will, and imperilling the actual expression of American democracy.

I'd be interested in the way you see both the Russian and the Chinese activities and how they operate to threaten our democracy—in some specificity, please.

● (1710)

**Hon. David McGuinty:** I wish I could be, Mr. Chair, more specific. We've been as specific as we possibly can be in the report in the Canadian context.

I would, however, repeat that the evidence indicates that this is happening in the context of every political party in this country at all levels of government. It's about the deployment of individuals on Canadian soil directed by a foreign state actor.

I would point committee members and Canadians to paragraphs 70 and 74 as an example of the extent to which a foreign actor will go. We lay out what has ostensibly happened in the likely launching of a cyber-attack against the Australian Parliament and its three largest political parties, likely by China, prior to the Australian general election in early 2019.

We then go on to describe what happened in June 2020 when China likely conducted another large-scale cyber-attack against Australia and Australian companies, hospitals, schools and government officials.

In the case of the United States, in paragraph 74, since our report was published the U.S. justice department and Homeland Security confirmed that their voting machines weren't necessarily tampered with, but Russia clearly tried to influence the election by using sophisticated online disinformation campaigns.

We've captured that in the report to point out the nature, the extent and the level to which some state actors will go to disrupt the democracy that we have, which is why we made four or five major recommendations to the Prime Minister around the five-person panel that is there to help blow the whistle, if and when major irregularities should occur during a Canadian election. We think it should be expanded. We think the membership should be varied, and we think the way in which Canadians are informed should be handled very carefully.

**The Chair:** Thank you. As for the limitations to your answer, I understand them, but it's also frustrating to not understand the nature and extent of the threat to both our economy and our democracy in a more specific way.

Thank you, though, for your presentation. As you can see, there's a huge appetite from the members for the work of your committee. I think, speaking on behalf of the members of the public safety committee, that not only you and Mr. Jorgensen are to be thanked, but also, if you'd thank them, the other members of Parliament who have joined you, including our Mr. Motz, who I'm sure has contributed to your deliberations.

Thank you.

With that, we'll suspend for a minute or two to let Mr. McGuinty and Mr. Jorgensen leave. Then we'll ask Madam Damoff to present her emergency motion, and then we'll deal with the subcommittee's report.

• (1710) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1715)

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I have a point of order.

This is not to challenge the chair directly, but to point out that a motion was moved by Mr. Van Popta when he had the floor at this meeting. It wasn't ruled out of order. It was just postponed, so I think that motion is on the floor. That would be my understanding.

**The Chair:** The emergency motion may also trump, in positioning, any other motions that are on the floor. If there can be a collegial way to work this out, I'm perfectly happy to do that.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I'm not sure if the intent of the emergency motion was to supersede everything else the committee is doing. Maybe Pam can enlighten us about that.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Actually, yes it does, Jack. The date in the motion, as you see, is to begin a study immediately—no later than May 10.

I think it would be wise to do the work plan after we've debated the 106(4) motion, especially after what we've heard in the testimony today from Mr. McGuinty and all of us who have read the report. I think his words were that this is a very serious matter for Canadians. It's a very serious matter for parliamentarians.

When we get to debating the 106(4), I will speak to it more, but I do think we would be wise to wait to deal with the work plan until we've dealt with that. If the other members don't want to do that, then so be it.

**The Chair:** We'll go to Kristina and then Shannon.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** I wanted to speak afterwards regarding the motion related to Standing Order 106(4). However, I gather that we won't be starting the debate right away.

The order doesn't really matter to me.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Shannon.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Chair, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the 106(4) motion hadn't actually been moved yet. The motion for the adoption of the subcommittee report was moved first, so it actually is the first thing we should deal with.

**The Chair:** I'd be delighted to correct you if you were wrong, but I'm happy to deal with both in whatever order. I think Pam does make a very good point, which is that if the committee does choose to adopt the 106(4), it would potentially affect the work plan report.

Glen.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Thank you, Chair.

I would just point out that I agree with Mr. Harris and my colleague, Shannon, on the need to deal with the motion that's on the floor. Let's have the conversation on 106(4). It may not be as difficult as what I suspect some might anticipate.

There are a lot of things we have to finish. There are a lot of comments I'm sure we all have with respect to Pam's motion and the 106(4) in regard to this and how we proceed with it. I will leave the comments specific to it for then, but I would say let's deal with the adoption of the motion on the floor and then let's deal with Pam's motion that has yet to be moved, which is the letter to the committee.

That would be the proper procedure, Chair. I would confer with the clerk if there is any other way to do it.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Let's just vote on the motion that's on the floor, Chair.

**The Chair:** Okay.

The motion on the floor is to accept the subcommittee report as presented by the committee.

Jack.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** For recommendation number one in the report, which refers to the consolidation of certain motions, I believe subsection (c) of that was in fact modified during the subcommittee meeting that we held. Subsection (c), which is "reports of sexual coercion and violence by officers against female inmates", was actually changed to "reports of sexual coercion and violence in federal prisons".

Pam, can you confirm that?

We did discuss it as a committee and the consensus was—

• (1720)

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I have the same note, Jack.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** If that could be amended.... I don't know if we need to move that we amend this report to remove the words "by officers against female inmates" and replace it with the words "in federal prisons".

**The Chair:** I think the clerk has already taken note of that.

Is there an agreement that this correction or change be made to the report? Okay.

Is there any other debate about the report as amended?

Kristina, did you want to debate further?

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** I just wanted to know whether we had access to the written motion, because I don't remember receiving it, or maybe to the amendment as amended.

I just want to be sure of what we're voting on.



[English]

**The Chair:** It's not a new amendment. It's a correction to section (c) of paragraph 1, to amend it the way Mr. Harris wanted it amended. The subcommittee report was sent out to all members earlier in the day.

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Perfect.

I have it in front of me.

[English]

**The Chair:** Okay.

Jack, your hand is up.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I have another point of contention.

**The Chair:** Are you making an additional point? I thought we were asking for a vote at this point.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** No, this is by way of debate, sir.

**The Chair:** About the report...?

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Okay. I thought we had already.... We were asking for a vote as amended.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** No, I want to amend it, but I just want a clarification on item number 7. It states:

That, the committee commence its study on the management and control of Canada's borders (opening and closure) and the government directives issued...following the study on the Correctional Services Canada.

I think there was a bit of a nuance to that in terms of what the committee decided, and it may influence people's decision as to whether to support this report. The intention was, given the fact that there had been an Auditor General's directive and report since the pandemic occurred, that there needed to be a bit of time to determine whether perhaps we should evaluate that those directives have been followed or have worked. I believe that was Pam's suggestion.

I think it was on that basis that it was agreed that we might have a single meeting sometime after.... It wasn't on May 27 or whatever date was proposed, but we would give it a little time and pick a date to have a meeting to do that evaluation.

That doesn't seem to me to be the same as saying that we shall commence the study that was proposed by the motion that Madam Michaud had proposed some time ago. I think that's a nuanced understanding that we had.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Can I call in our clerk at this point? He's much more up on this than I am.

Did you have an amendment or a clarification, Mark?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Mark D'Amore):** Yes, Mr. Chair.

If the committee is so inclined, we can always add a reference specifically to the Auditor General's report that was indeed discussed on Monday.

**The Chair:** Would you put that in after "Correctional Services Canada"? Where would you put it?

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Mr. Chair, since this would be one meeting instead of a full study, perhaps we could put this before the study on the Correctional Service of Canada. That way, the agencies that were criticized by the Auditor General would have time to respond.

• (1725)

[English]

**The Chair:** Jack, did you want to respond to that?

First of all, let's deal with where the clerk would propose putting in this clarification. Then we can debate it from there.

How would it read, Mark, in your opinion?

**The Clerk:** If I understand correctly, if it's the committee's desire for a meeting to look at the Auditor General's report on the border management issues during the COVID-19 pandemic, we can just phrase it that way.

**The Chair:** Is it that the committee have one meeting, then, on the management and control of Canada's borders? I'm not quite sure I'm following this.

**The Clerk:** I'm sorry. It would be that the committee have a meeting to discuss the Auditor General's report, or to invite the Auditor General. It's however the committee wants to do it, because the discussion involved seeing what the fallout of the Auditor General's report would be after that time had elapsed.

It's a question of how to frame it. The discussion was within the context of the study that was agreed to by the committee last fall, regarding the border situation as impacted by the pandemic.

**The Chair:** I recall a conversation, but I don't recall whether this captures the conversation, though.

Pam, please go ahead.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Yes, it was to have one meeting. I thought it was to discuss the Auditor General's report and the response to that report on the management and control of the borders.

**The Chair:** Is that the sense of the subcommittee members?

Jack, please go ahead.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Yes. We talked about the fact that there was an Auditor General's report, which was fairly new, and that it would be useful to understand whether or not the government had improved things or done anything to fix the problems identified.

However, to do it right away might be too soon. If we waited until the second week in June, or the end of the first week in June, or something like that, we might be able to get a proper assessment as to whether or not things had improved or changed. I'm not trying to put it off, but I want to provide enough of a gap to allow that to happen.

If the committee believes we're ready to that now, not to hear from the Auditor General but to find out whether or not the Auditor General's recommendations have been, in fact, implemented or taken into account.... I don't know if we need to hear from the Auditor General in that regard. We would presumably just look at the report.

**The Chair:** I'm a little lost on what the framing should be. Is it that the committee dedicate one meeting to study the management and control of Canada's borders, following the Auditor General's report?

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I would say, "in light of".

**The Chair:** Does that capture it?

Shannon, please go ahead.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** I think I'm probably not going to magically solve this issue here, except to reiterate what Jack has said. That is exactly my recollection of the discussion at the subcommittee. Kristina and I certainly were suggesting that we should move very quickly on studying that issue, because of the significant impact that it has on the everyday lives of Canadians and because it is an urgent issue in real time right now.

I know that Pam didn't want to go to that study soon and was wondering why we would do that, but then I had said....

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** On a point of order, that meeting was in camera.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** I'm sorry about that.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** We don't discuss what members said in camera.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** I apologize, although I guess we just have been for the past five minutes.

However, the conclusion was that, since the Auditor General's report has clarified that there have been problems in terms of border management and a lack of training—this is all public, right—and clarity for border agents managing the border during COVID, we agree that, in order to allow for action to be taken, [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] after the rest of this schedule, as Jack has said. We would then meet to examine what progress or changes have been made.

• (1730)

**The Chair:** Kristina, please go ahead.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** For the sake of simplicity, as you said, Mr. Chair, we could just write: "That, in light of the Auditor General's Report 8...the committee will dedicate one meeting to the study of the borders..."

We could talk about a meeting on this study. We would then work out the details of that meeting. I don't know whether we should do so now. However, I think that, if we say that a meeting will be dedicated to the study, that may be sufficient.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Pam.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I think that's fine, Chair. One meeting to look at it is fine.

**The Chair:** How would we frame paragraph 7, then? Is it "That the committee have one meeting to study the management and control of Canada's borders"?

Is that fine?

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I think "in light of the Auditor General's report" would be fine. We don't necessarily need—

**The Chair:** Okay. Do you want to start the sentence with, "In light of the Auditor General's report, that the committee have one meeting to study the opening and closing of Canada's borders"?

Is that good enough?

**Mr. Jack Harris:** It's good with me.

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** Should we make reference to the date of the Auditor General's report so that we know we have the right one?

**The Chair:** I don't know what the date is, but....

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** I'm sure we'll find it.

**The Chair:** She can't be making that many reports on the border.

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** I'm sure we'll find the relevant one.

**The Chair:** As the amendments have been put forward, is there a will to accept the subcommittee's report?

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

**The Chair:** Seeing no objections and the unanimous enthusiasm of the committee to accept the subcommittee's report, that's dealt with.

The final item is the emergency motion.

With that, I'll turn it over to Pam.

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

I think all of us are upset and troubled by what we heard from Mr. McGuinty, and when we read his report. As a result, the Liberal members sent to you a letter under Standing Order 106(4).

In the letter, we quote CSIS in their report in 2020, which said:

Since 2014, Canadians motivated in whole or in part by their extremist ideological views have killed 21 people and wounded 40 others on Canadian soil—more than religiously motivated violent extremism...or politically motivated violent extremism....

The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated xenophobic and anti-authority narratives, many of which may directly or indirectly impact national security considerations. Violent extremists continue to exploit the pandemic by amplifying false information about government measures and the virus itself on the internet. Some violent extremists view COVID-19 as a real but welcome crisis that could hasten the collapse of Western society. Other violent extremist entities have adopted conspiracy theories about the pandemic in an attempt to rationalize and justify violence. These narratives have contributed to efforts to undermine trust in the integrity of government and confidence in scientific expertise. While aspects of conspiracy theory rhetoric are a legitimate exercise in free expression, online rhetoric that is increasingly violent and calls for the arrest and execution of specific individuals is of increasing concern.

That's from the Canadian Security Intelligence Service. We just heard from Mr. McGuinty, the chair of NSICOP, that the very serious and striking thing about the review to him was this exact rise in IMVE—a 320% increase in the number of groups.

We are the public safety committee. We sent this letter prior to Mr. McGuinty's testimony, but in light of his testimony, I think it makes it even more urgent for the committee that is seized with looking after the safety of the public to vote in favour of this.

I think it was Mr. Harris who asked about the man who tried to breach Rideau Hall to arrest the Prime Minister. Mr. Harris's leader, Jagmeet Singh, was subjected to someone who followed him last summer, making threats. Mr. Singh, in the House, said that the government needs to use all available tools to address the proliferation of white supremacist and hate groups. In fact, it was his motion in the House that called for the Proud Boys to be listed as a terrorist entity.

This is not a partisan issue at all, but it is one that is of extreme concern to Canadians. There are real world threats out there right now. I know that other committees in Parliament have studied on-line hate. There was a study about anti-racism done by the heritage committee in 2018. Those are very different issues. The heritage committee dealt with the rise of racism and how to deal with that. Many of the recommendations were community-based. The justice committee in 2019 looked at online hate.

This is much different and much more urgent, and it's a threat to Canadians. I think it's incumbent upon us, as the committee that is seized with ensuring that we're looking at urgent issues for Canadians, that we do in fact review this.

Therefore, Mr. Chair, I want to move this motion:

That pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security immediately begin a study no later than May 10th into ideologically motivated violent extremism in Canada; that the study consist of four meetings; that the committee invite representatives from our national security agencies and those who have been impacted by IMVE; that the committee report its findings to the House; and that pursuant to Standing Order 109, the government table a comprehensive response to the report.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1735)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Kristina, is there any debate?

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Damoff, thank you for bringing this motion forward. I totally agree that this is an extremely relevant topic that the committee should study.

However, I can't help but make a comment. As time goes on, this situation is becoming a little frustrating because the committee agreed on several motions early on. These motions were pretty much all adopted unanimously. We agreed on studies that we wanted to undertake, but we did not reach an agreement on the order in which we wanted to do them.

Since the beginning, we haven't made much progress for several reasons. We're still working on the report on systemic racism and the report on the death of Marylène Levesque, in particular because the Conservatives have tabled a few motions that give priority to certain studies. It's the same thing with the Liberals. I find this frustrating for Mr. Harris and me, although I understand that this is how democracy works.

If more members of our party were on the committee, we too would use this part of Standing Order 106(4) to give priority to the motions we put forward earlier.

It's a little annoying to do it that way, because we had agreed to Mr. Lightbound's motion about hate speech on social media, which was pretty much the same. I understand that it's not the same thing and that it has been studied by other committees—an argument that comes up often. When we want to bring forward certain motions, we are told that other committees have already studied the subject.

Despite this, I believe that this motion is important. However, I would like to propose an amendment to the motion. Instead of studying it immediately, I think we could study it as soon as we finished the three reports we're working on right now.

The amendment can be worded any way you want, by mentioning the names of the reports or with the words that this study will be started as soon as the committee finishes its current work. My guess is that this study will take us until the end of May or the beginning of June. I think it would be reasonable to do it that way. If we do it immediately, it will push back the work we're doing right now, which is equally important.

So I would like to propose this friendly amendment.

• (1740)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** First of all, let's find out how friendly the amendment is.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** No, I'm not prepared to amend it like that, Chair. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay, when we come to voting, it will be the amendment first and then the main motion. The debate will continue on the amendment, which will probably slop over into the other....

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** I'm sorry. I have a point of order.

Can I get the specific amendment read out to make sure we're all on the same page?

**The Chair:** Okay.

Kristina, can you be specific? It's really a change in time.

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Yes, Mr. Chair.

We could strike out the word “immediately”. So it would read:

That pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security begin a study no later than May 10 into ideologically motivated extremism...

To summarize, we would change the word “immediately” to “as soon as the committee completes its current work” that we are working on.

Mr. Clerk, I don't know what the best way to word it is, but I'm sure you understand what I'm trying to do.

[English]

**The Chair:** Let me look to the clerk to see if that is sufficient, if the phrasing “immediately” were struck.

[Translation]

**The Clerk:** I'd like some clarification, Ms. Michaud.

Are you talking about work in general or specific reports?

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** I'm referring in particular to the report on systemic racism and the report on the study related to the death of Marylène Levesque. Those are the two main reports we're working on right now.

**The Clerk:** So you're specifically referring to reports that are already being studied or are in progress.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Exactly.

[English]

**The Chair:** For language purposes, the amendment is striking the word “immediately” and adding that this not be dealt with until all of the reports are dealt with.

That's the sense of it. Is that clear to everyone?

Next is Joël, Jack, Shannon, Glen—oh my goodness.

[Translation]

**Mr. Joël Lightbound:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'll try to be relatively brief.

To respond to Ms. Michaud's comments, I agree that there is some overlap between the motion I put forward and this motion. However, unless I'm mistaken, the motion on online hate and extremism that I put forward was passed as a priority after the cases of systemic racism and the death of Ms. Levesque occurred.

However, there's still a difference, in that the motion that is being put forward with respect to Standing Order 106(4) deals specifically with ideologically motivated violent extremism. We just heard the chair of the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians say that this was the most striking aspect of the report tabled by that committee. He said that the dramatic rise of these types of groups in Canada and elsewhere in the west was a surprise to our intelligence agencies and to police forces, both here and elsewhere in the west.

I think this shows the importance of studying the issue. We've seen the events that have occurred throughout the United States and

Europe. Here, in Canada, we've seen the rise of these groups. I believe there's no more pressing issue for the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security than this.

I therefore encourage all my colleagues to support the motion before us. It proposes four meetings over a two-week period. This motion would provide us with relevant information that would inform the government's decisions on this issue and, in the opinion of the chair of the NSICOP, which is responsible for assessing threats to the country's national security, it could hardly be more urgent and pressing.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Jack.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Thank you, Chair.

I have to agree with the urgency of the matter. We have heard, obviously, the recent testimony and we have the report, and [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] brought up the attack on Rideau Hall. He certainly attacked the gate. He didn't get to the Prime Minister to arrest him. Of course, he wasn't there.

Also, in Newfoundland and Labrador during the last election, a gentleman took it upon himself... He had a pickup as well. I don't know if there is any coincidence in that, but he was driving with the intention to “stop the election”, and showed up in front of a campaign headquarters in Deer Lake after being chased. He eluded the police along the way, with 16 hunting rifles and various other things in his vehicle. He was arrested and was subsequently charged.

We do have people who seem to be motivated by ideologies of one sort or another who take it upon themselves to do these things. It is a relatively new phenomenon. It's not the newness of the phenomenon, but the extent of it that appears to give it a sense of urgency.

To me, “urgent” means maybe we should deal with it between now and the end of the session and find a way of doing that. To drop everything to do it and take up four meetings right away doesn't seem to make sense. I'm not prepared to agree to that, but I will agree to undertake the study. Perhaps we can do it in conjunction with the other work we've already committed to, and not necessarily take anything away from what's been put in place already.

● (1745)

**The Chair:** Shannon.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Thank you, Chair.

I think the other edit that will have to be made, in terms of the timing, is striking the reference to May 10. When you look at the agenda circulated from the subcommittee, on Monday, May 10, we will be doing drafting instructions for the Marylène Levesque report.

The Conservatives have no problem with this motion and undertaking this important study. However, we share the same concerns about the timing and completion of the work as it's been scheduled. We certainly do support Kristina's motion regarding timing, but I think an adjustment will have to be made to delete the "no later than May 10th" part, because per the schedule, we will be dealing with the Marylène Levesque report then.

**The Chair:** Colleagues, we started at 3:48. It's now 5:47. Without unanimous consent, I have to adjourn the meeting. In this case, if the meeting is adjourned without debate on the motion, I have to bring it back at the first available opportunity.

I'm open to suggestions.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Can we move to a vote? There's an amendment and then the—

**The Chair:** I don't think we can move to a vote when there are still people wishing to speak.

Unfortunately, I think I have to adjourn unless I get unanimous consent to continue with this meeting.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Chair, are you not suspending because we're in the middle of debate on a motion?

**The Chair:** I suspend the debate on the motion and adjourn the meeting, to be brought up at the first opportunity. Ideally, there would be some conversations prior to the next meeting, which would be Monday.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Okay.

I think we suspend the meeting, though, Chair.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** I have a point of order.

Was there not unanimous consent? I'm okay, personally, with going forward. I didn't actually hear the question get asked, though.

**The Chair:** I didn't see the unanimous consent to extend the time past 5:48.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Chair, can I make a comment, please?

It's in regard to suspending the meeting or adjourning it for a later date. I know we've been here for a long time today, but I think to demonstrate the importance of this particular motion and the whole idea of extremism being looked at and addressed in a timely way, I'm in favour of continuing on.

I don't think it's going to take terribly long to get through this. My hand is still up for Kristina's amendment, which I would like to speak to, but I am certainly in favour of extending this until we get this resolved.

• (1750)

**The Chair:** To get beyond 5:48, I have to have unanimous consent.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Chair, I'm not prepared to stay until we get this done because that could mean God knows when. I am prepared to stay for 10 minutes, if we think that this could be resolved that quickly.

**The Chair:** I still have to have unanimous consent to get past the time. I can see some thumbs, but it's not unanimous.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** There are no thumbs-down.

**Mr. Gary Anandasangaree (Scarborough—Rouge Park, Lib.):** Mr. Chair, maybe you can ask if anybody is opposed to it because I don't see people opposed to extending the meeting.

**The Chair:** That's a better way to ask it.

We'll make it 15 minutes. Is anyone opposed to fifteen minutes? Okay.

Glen, you're up.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Thank you very much, Chair, and I thank Kristina.... First of all, I'll thank Pam for the motion, and add my comments about needing to get at all forms of extremism. We need to deal with that.

I have a couple of things. As far as timing, I'd certainly like to honour the decisions of the subcommittee and would propose a friendly amendment to Kristina's amendment, but I want to bring out a couple of things.

This is an important study. I want to preface that before I say what I'm going to say. In the last five years, there have been 2,800-plus shootings in Toronto alone. That's not the GTA, but Toronto alone. There have been 361 people injured in that time in those shootings and over 82 people have been killed in that time. As far as emergency debates, there are a lot of things that are emergent that are affecting Canadians immediately. They are no more important or no less important than this particular study.

We also have other studies on our agenda. I would suggest that we can continue on with the agenda we have, which goes until the beginning of June, if I'm correct. At that time, we can move into four meetings or whatever we decide with this particular motion and we are still going to be timely. We're still going to be responsible with a very important issue.

Kristina, if you're amicable to a friendly amendment to your amendment, I'm proposing that we strike the "no later than May 10th" and after where it says "ideologically motivated violent extremism in Canada", we add "following the conclusion of the other work already scheduled by the May 3 subcommittee report".

That will take us to June 2 or 7, or whatever day that is. Everything on the subcommittee report that was decided on Monday goes ahead as planned and then immediately following, we know what our marching orders are for the remainder of June.

If you're amicable to that, those would be my comments on the amendment, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** We had a lot of amendments floating around here.

Kristina, do you perceive that as a friendly amendment to your amendment, which wasn't friendly by virtue of Pam saying it wasn't friendly in the first place?

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Yes, absolutely. That is a very good addition.

[English]

**The Chair:** That part is friendly, but the amendment isn't friendly at this point.

Next is Tako, then Emmanuella and then Jack.

Tako.

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** Thank you. I'll be as quick as I can.

I want to echo what others have said, which is that I think this is a very important study and I'm happy for our committee to undertake it, but I am concerned about the timing for all the reasons that others have stated. We have so many projects on the go right now. A number of them are almost at the finish line. Let's push them over the finish line before we take on another project.

That said, I also want to echo what Glen said about gang violence. He cited some statistics out of Toronto. You know, that's hitting pretty close to home. There have been two shootings in my hometown of Langley just in the last little while, gang-related, gangland-style killings in broad daylight in shopping malls. There was another one in Delta, close by, of a police officer. This is a real and present danger, and Canadians are very concerned.

I've told many people I've spoken to that the public safety committee is going to be studying gang violence very soon and—

• (1755)

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** On a point of order, Chair, are we not debating the amendment on the floor?

**The Chair:** Yes, we are debating the amendment. We're debating the motion, and yes, I let Glen wander off on gang violence and now I'm letting Tako wander off on gang violence.

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** It's about the importance of timing. It's in the timing.

I agree with the motion.

**The Chair:** The motion is subject to an amendment to take it up basically after the subcommittee report, which, I think, finishes around June 2. Is that what we've agreed to at this point?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** It's much longer than that, Chair. It's until the end of June.

**The Chair:** We are at an impasse.

Emmanuella.

**Ms. Emmanuella Lambropoulos:** Essentially what we're saying here with the amendments is that we don't really want to study this. I definitely think it's an important issue that we should study, and I completely understand and agreed with Kristina's original amendment that we should do it after finalizing the reports on the work we've already done. I don't see why we wouldn't finalize the work we've done and table certain things in the House.

It's definitely a really important issue, and I think it would be important to do once those two reports have been tabled in the House and once we finalize them. Having read the subcommittee report

and knowing how long it takes us to actually go through the different reports and to complete them and accept all the recommendations, and judging by the policing study that we just finished, I would say that obviously we won't finish before the end of June all of the things that are listed on that agenda.

If we are actually serious about this being a serious topic that we want to study, I strongly encourage us to find a way forward and a way that makes sense, and not just to say "after the work that's listed in the subcommittee" because that won't allow us time to even begin this study.

**The Chair:** We'll go to Jack and then Damien.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm just looking at the subcommittee report here and thinking about this. I don't think we're prepared to abandon the studies we've already started. I think we do have to finish reports. Even in the amendment there's room for flexibility as we move forward. For the consolidated study we anticipated maybe three meetings. This study contemplates four meetings. We might be able to do it in three, because what we're trying to do is bring the attention of the country to this issue in a greater way than has been done by Mr. McGuinty's appearance today. I think that's a laudable goal.

I think any study of the kind that's referred to as an additional study, as Glen is talking about, certainly can't be done between now and the end of June—a whole new study like that, particularly one of that extensiveness. We don't have to drop everything to do this. If we manage to finish the 15 minutes and have to meet again, maybe we can come up with some agreement between now and Monday to have some flexibility.

By the way, I'm not sure it's going to take two full hours for drafting instructions on the Levesque study. That's something that I wanted to throw in there. It wouldn't hurt to get some briefing for an hour on Monday if we think we can deal with the drafting instructions in an hour.

Maybe I'm being wildly optimistic about that, Chair. You would know better than me, but I think if there's some room for flexibility, we can do what's on this subcommittee agenda, plus have at least three meetings—and they don't have to be all in a row—on the topic presented in the motion. I think it's very valid for us to do what we can to draw attention to this—we'll see whether someone has any way forward—and certainly to ensure the public is well aware of the threat that's been posed.

**The Chair:** Damien.

• (1800)

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

As an observation, I think everybody I've heard speak actually agrees with the intent of the motion. The issue here is timing. In terms of the subject, in reading the NSICOP report and hearing the testimony, and from personal experience both because I'm now an elected official but also from speaking with some academics and others I know who are researching these sorts of things, the proliferation of hate-based extremism and its impact on society is absolutely astounding. Certainly there's a whole range of subjects that will be studied on top of that which won't be the subject of parliamentary review, I'm sure.

My comments are simply this. I agree with the motion, but to suggest that it should pre-empt or be prioritized over all of the other work.... I'd be happy if it could be slotted in to free meetings, or if there's a change in schedule between now and whenever the next opportunity arises. It's very important, but so are some of the other things we're doing.

I would support the amendment for the timing, but I also plan to support the general motion. So far I have not heard any opposition to it. Really, we're just debating the timing. We're not debating the substance of the motion.

**The Chair:** Pam.

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

Thanks to everybody for recognizing how important this is. I would actually argue, though, that this will essentially kill the motion. It took us from February until last week to do the systemic racism report and get it back to the analyst. We haven't even seen the Levesque study yet.

I would suggest we could do one hour on Monday, May 10, after we've done drafting instructions, and then take May 31 and June 2 as two dates we can do on this study, and then go back to the work plan. We can save that fourth meeting until maybe the following Monday or the Monday after. I would not support the amendment that's been put forward because it essentially kills this motion. We will not get time to do it, unless members are prepared to sit through the summer.

It will essentially kill it, so I will absolutely not support the amendment. I think we could do one hour on May 10, two meetings the week of May 31 and June 2, and then go back to committee business. I think that would be a compromise we could make.

**The Chair:** I think Kristina was next.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I wanted to correct what Ms. Lambropoulos said. The amendment doesn't mean that we aren't in favour of the study. I think we've all made it clear how important we think it is.

The importance of each study should not be prioritized. All the work this committee is undertaking is important. I think we need to do one thing at a time. We need to finish what we've started and, as Mr. Harris said, I don't think we need to stop everything we're doing right now to put this study forward.

If I understand the subcommittee report correctly, if we were going to return on May 31 to begin a study of the Correctional Service of

Canada. I don't know how many meetings are scheduled for that. However, as of May 31, there are seven meetings left. That still gives us time to do the study. I don't think this will kill the motion. In any event, I don't see what could come of holding deliberations for an hour on May 10 and beginning the rest in June.

I think we should finish what we started and fully immerse ourselves in this study afterwards. That would be the logical way to do it. In terms of the amendment, it also makes sense to say that we should finish what we have started right now and then continue with the rest.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I think Glen was next.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** I'll never give up my turn to speak, Chair, but I think Jack was ahead of me. I'll defer to my elders.

**The Chair:** Do we want to hear from the left before we go right?

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Yes.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I'm prepared to be flexible here. I don't know if we have to have a showdown on this. The idea of half an hour on May 10 is appealing, because that could get a start to the idea and working on it.

I'm not sure Kristina can say whether it's crucial that item seven be dealt with before May 31. We're not going to write a report on that. It might be something that could be dealt with early in June. I think, if we have the right spirit here, we can accomplish this. To say that this amendment is intended to shut down study I think is wrong. I think it's counterproductive to suggest that.

There seems to be a willingness by the committee to accommodate this study, to fit it in, but I don't think people are prepared to give up what has already been proposed and agreed on. It's just the question of finding the way to do it. I'm prepared to suggest that we only look at three meetings for the corrections study. We have three topics. They're all important. The same goes with the idea of following up on Kristina's motion. We need to do that. That's not time-sensitive in the sense that it has to be done tomorrow or next week, so we can be flexible. We can do all these things with the right will.

Maybe the amendment is a bit too specific by saying after we do all of this. I'm not going to propose an amendment to an amendment, because the chair would rightly rule that out of order. However, I'm suggesting that we should try to find some consensus, if not today, then between now and Monday, and I agree that maybe on Monday, May 10, we can have a witness give us an initial briefing for an hour.

• (1805)

**The Chair:** That may a bit of a challenge, but nevertheless....

Go ahead, Glen.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** I will agree with you, Chair, that it would be a challenge to get witnesses here on Monday, given we usually send the invitation, try to give them time to prepare and and whatever else. Not all of them will be in Ottawa, I'm sure, but because they could be remote it would be....

I agree with Jack. This is an important study that needs to be done. As I said previously, it is no less important or more important than some of the other things we already have on our schedule. I would sooner sit with this study for the three or four times that we are going to meet to do it, and get some meat around what we're trying to uncover, as opposed to piecemealing it over time in between other things.

There are significant issues we have to deal with. We need to get the systemic racism report finished. We need to finish the report in to the death of Marylène Levesque. There's Jack's motion...actively impacting people's lives every day as we speak. Our non-work on these things will impact people's lives every single day, and it's happening in real time.

Again, I agree, Jack. I'd like to be able to find common ground that we could move forward on, but there has to be give on each side, and I would agree with your assessment. To try to paint the fact that we feel these studies should be looked at ahead of this one as meaning we don't support the motion, or we need to withdraw it, is certainly erroneous. We would not support that notion whatsoever.

Rather than spinning our wheels, let's make a decision. Let's move on and try to make a decision. What is in the report that can maybe give us a day so that we can have something before the middle of June? Is there something we need to look at that would make a difference there? I don't know the answer to that question.

Is Bastarache the one that we can just put off until we have the spare time? It's been sitting.... It was written a long time ago. It was proposed and presented to us some time ago. We already have mention of it in the systemic racism report that's coming out. Can we give up a day on it to then move up everything else on systemic racism, on Mr. Harris's motion, so that by the first or second of June we're already into four full meetings or whatever it takes, three to four meetings, of this report on extremism?

That would be reasonable give on both sides.

• (1810)

**The Chair:** I think's it Darren next and then it's either Pam or Damien.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I won't go on for long but I want to congratulate folks for trying to be flexible here and come up with some alternatives and some opportunities to make sure we study this. However, a 106(4) motion by its very nature is an emergency motion. It's one thing to say we all agree that this is important and we should study it, but we don't agree that it's an emergency. We either agree that this is seri-

ous...and we listened to Mr. McGuinty today and we read the report. This is either an emergency for all of us or it isn't, and we'll see that in a vote.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I have a point of order, Chair. This is not an emergency. It's an emergency motion. It's the motion that's urgent to get before the committee. The committee decides the level of emergency. I don't think that was mentioned exactly in the rules.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** That was—

**The Chair:** I'm not sure you are contradicting each other.

I'm going to go to Pam.

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

I think people need to get their calendars out. May 31 is when we start Jack's study. We then have what's proposed with the border study, something that has already been looked at by the Auditor General. In my view, I would hardly make that an emergency. I think you need to look at your calendars. May 31 we start Jack's study. Then we have the border. Then we have the Levesque study to go through. You can't possibly say that by delaying this it will not kill the report—unless everyone on this committee is prepared to sit through the summer—because there is no way we can do the work that's proposed before we get to this study.

Either we feel that this is an important study that we need to do...and actually, the reason the Liberals sent in this letter is that we do feel that this is an emergency. We do feel that this is something that needs to take priority at this committee. It's also something that has never been studied by this committee. This is an emerging issue. I had heard about it, but I was not aware of the severity of it until I read Mr. McGuinty's report. I think every single person on this committee should be seized with studying this right away.

I mean, we can all say that we want to work together, and I'm not trying to be confrontational here, but the fact is that we will never get to this study if we do it after we do all the other work we have. Either we want to look at this pressing issue...which Mr. McGuinty himself said was the most striking thing about the review. All you have to do is look online, at all of the issues that are there, to know that.

I know we're only debating the amendment here, so I'm getting ahead of myself, except to say that if we remove the words that we start "immediately" and start on "May 10th", we will in fact effectively kill this motion, unless we decide right now that we're going to pick some other dates to do it at the end of May and the beginning of June. Otherwise, this will never happen.

Thanks, Chair.

**The Chair:** Damien.

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



With respect, I think that is a false equivalency of epic proportions. This was submitted to Parliament and to this committee before the last subcommittee meeting. To suggest somehow that we're not prioritizing this because we want to continue the good and important work...of which one of the items that we're finishing was in fact an emergency motion brought forward. I could get very political in terms of some of the delays. I won't, out of an effort to ensure that there's a degree of collaboration.

Look, this is an important issue. I think everybody's said that, although I think it's entirely reasonable for the discussion around timing. If there's not a willingness to have that discussion, then I would question the intent [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] when and how this was brought up.

As I've indicated, I plan to support the motion. I think if there was a more collaborative attitude to ensure that we could find some ability to get this done.... Personally, I have no problem sitting through the summer. I did it last summer. I think there are four meeting opportunities in June that are still available. If there's a level of flexibility, if witnesses cancel or evolving situations exist, I think there's a tremendous amount that can be accomplished. It's just a matter of whether or not we can in fact agree that, yes, it's important, which I think we all do, and work together to try to find a way that we can get it done.

Quite frankly, as well, this Parliament adjourns on June 23. There are options for the committee to sit throughout the summer. It's up to this committee to make that call. To suggest that it kills the study is false. Parliament then resumes sometime in September. The false equivalencies on this are troubling to me. It's an important issue. Certainly, I hope we can be collaborative on a path forward.

I would note, Mr. Chair, that we're far beyond the 15 minutes. If there's a willingness, I'd simply call that we go to a vote.

• (1815)

**The Chair:** I still see hands, but I have a note from the clerk saying that we can go to 6:30. If we go beyond 6:30, we have to suspend for a replacement of the support staff.

We seem to be down to a fairly narrow point, and that is some specificity on a date. It may or may not be useful for the committee to know that we have some challenges in getting Minister Blair and Commissioner Lucki on the 12th. We were just informed of that late today, which may possibly free up the 12th for something else.

Whether that is helpful to our deliberations or not, I can't say, but the clerk does yeoman's work in trying to fill our dates with meaningful work. I just point out that the 12th may become available. That's all I can say. It may become available.

Go ahead, Glen.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Thank you, Chair.

I sensed that. That's why I suggested that, on the Bastarache report with Minister Blair and Commissioner Lucki, we can hold off and move up something else that's in the report.

I just want to clarify. This is an in camera meeting—

**The Chair:** No, it's not.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Is it not? Perfect. I want to then suggest what Mr. McGuinty said clearly today and the report clearly says, because it has been mentioned erroneously today that this domestic extremism—if you want to call it that—on Canadian soil is the top priority. If you heard Mr. McGuinty today, he did make it very clear that foreign threats are the top threats for this country and remain the top threats to this country.

That does not diminish the importance of this study and the need for this study. I just want to put that in, in referencing that it's important that we do it. The timing of it is critical. I think that if we are willing to, we can get it done, starting at the beginning of June or thereabouts and being done before Parliament rises June 23—easily—if we have a will to do so. That's the key. We all need to have the will to do so.

**The Chair:** Jack.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I tend to agree. I'm not prepared to go very much longer, Chair. We've been extending and extending, but there needs to be some kind of agreement on dates, not a general agreement. The amendment before the committee doesn't leave that flexibility in an up-and-down vote, so I'm more inclined to let the meeting suspend and see if we can work something out on dates between now and Monday.

**The Chair:** Pam.

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

If we could agree to dates right now—May 10, 12, 31 and June 2—then that would be fine. Mr. McGuinty did say—

• (1820)

**Mr. Jack Harris:** What does that do to Levesque?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** We won't have it back yet. We won't have the Levesque study back yet.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** We'll have Levesque for drafting instructions on Monday, May 10. Is that correct?

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

**Mr. Glen Motz:** We won't have systemic racism back yet—

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** We're doing that on May 26, Glen. That's why I skipped that one.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Is it possible, then, that we can move some of Jack's information further forward—or his study, the consolidated study—and do some of that on the 10th and 12th if we can't get Minister Blair here?

**Mr. Jack Harris:** No, I'm not sure about that, Glen, because we need some documents, too, and those documents are not due until June 2, so there's some flexibility on that end for that study.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I think it's my time right now.

**The Chair:** It is.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** People had indicated there would be a willingness to compromise on this, so this is what I'm saying. We still think that this is something the committee should look at right away, but I would be willing to make some changes so that it is studied by that first week in June. After that, we get the Levesque study back, and the analyst was quite clear that it's going to take quite some time because of translation, so if we can't study it by that week of May 31 and June 2, I don't think we'll have an opportunity to do it.

If we can agree to dates right now, then I would be open to amending it like that, Chair.

**The Chair:** Is it studied in full by that date or initiated by that date?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** It's to have the four meetings by that date. So if—

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Chair, I'm withdrawing my consent to continue this meeting. We have gone beyond the 15 minutes that was agreed to. I don't think we can agree on this today. I think my suggestion of doing this between now and Monday is probably better, because I don't think this study can start on Monday, because we already decided it can't.

**The Chair:** In that circumstance, I believe I don't have any choice but to adjourn the meeting. That means the debate has not been resolved.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I have a point of order, Chair.

Do you not suspend the meeting, though, and then we continue the debate on Monday? Otherwise, my May 10 date is out of date. If we suspend, the meeting continues as May 5, so I think we want to suspend the meeting.

**The Chair:** I will take guidance from the clerk on whether I'm suspending or I'm adjourning. I thought I was suspending the debate and adjourning the meeting.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chair, you can do either, suspend to a future date or adjourn the meeting and resume debate on the motion at a future date.

**The Chair:** Okay, well I—

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Chair, on a point of order, if we adjourn, someone is going to have move this motion again, so I feel really strongly that we need to suspend the debate, suspend the meeting and then continue this meeting on Monday at 3:30 p.m.

**The Chair:** There's a distinction to be made here as to whether the meeting is to be adjourned, but the debate is suspended. If the debate is suspended, and we resume the meeting on Monday, there's nothing to stop you from moving to continue the debate.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** But I would have to move it again, Chair.

**The Chair:** I don't think you have to move it again. All we're doing is suspending the debate as such.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** My motion has a date in it, which will be stale-dated if we start debate anew on Monday. If we suspend, the date remains as May 5. Then we can continue debate on the motion as it is.

**The Chair:** Okay. There's some anxiety as to whether—

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I have a point of order, Chair.

I don't know how we can have a meeting on Monday and call it May 5 so that we can schedule something for May 10 on May 10. It doesn't compute.

I believe the chair's ruling is correct that, if we suspend the debate and adjourn the meeting, then the debate is still on deck on Monday. Am I wrong?

**The Chair:** I don't think you're wrong, because I can do it either way, but there's some anxiety that the motion will be lost if I don't suspend this meeting as well as suspend the debate. I thought I could adjourn the meeting and suspend the debate, and that would be by operation of the rules of procedure, but I'm perfectly happy to suspend the meeting and suspend the debate, since we have run out of unanimous consent to keep this meeting going anyway.

Given that there may be some anxiety as to whether my initial thought is incorrect, I'm perfectly happy to suspend the meeting and suspend the debate.

• (1825)

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I'm sorry, Chair. You're suspending the meeting, not the debate, so we will suspend the meeting, and then it will continue on Monday.

**The Chair:** The debate is by definition suspended, and you will still have to initiate the debate again. It will be the first item on the floor.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** We will suspend the meeting and we will suspend debate. Is that what you're saying? We have run out of time for the meeting, because Jack's getting hungry.

**The Chair:** I know.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** That is the way I read the committee's chapter in the green book, Mr. Chair, that the meeting must be suspended rather than adjourned.

**The Chair:** Okay. As I say, I'm perfectly happy to suspend. I'm not sure I agree. As I initially interpreted it, it was to adjourn the meeting and suspend the debate, but if it's more comfortable for people if I suspend the meeting, I'm perfectly happy to do so, and the motion by definition is suspended.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Mr. Chair, I have a question.

**The Chair:** Good, I hope you get an answer.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Does that mean, as someone has suggested, that the annoying ParlVu music will continue for three days until we come back on Monday, because the meeting is only suspended and not cancelled or adjourned?

**The Chair:** You're going to have to work out your own headphones on that, Glen.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** No, I'm talking about the poor people who have been monitoring this on ParlVu, and that music will keep playing now for the next three days.

**The Chair:** I see those people. I feel badly for them already. In order to provide a comfort level for all of us, the meeting is suspended.

*[The meeting was suspended at 6:27 p.m., Wednesday, May 5]*

*[The meeting resumed at 3:35 p.m., Monday, May 10]*

**The Chair:** Good afternoon, colleagues.

We are resuming the debate that was suspended last Wednesday. We were discussing the Damoff motion, which had a subamendment put forward by Ms. Michaud, then a subsequent subamendment put forward by Mr. Motz. Technically, I think we are to be discussing the subamendments.

I want to clarify, between Mr. Motz and Ms. Michaud, whether we still have two subamendments or we are talking about one.

Kristina.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** I think it would be wise to adopt the wording proposed by Mr. Motz because I hadn't made it clear what I wanted. It was a time management issue. After talking to the Liberals, I think Ms. Damoff wanted to suggest something else, so I'll let her speak before we see what we are going to do with that amendment.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Unless it is formally withdrawn, we are still dealing with two subamendments.

I saw Pam's hand first, then Jack's and then Shannon's.

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

Thanks, Kristina.

In the spirit of co-operation, which we were trying to get at the last meeting, there were comments made by all parties that if we just work together.... I know there have been conversations about how we can make this work so that we can get everything done, being respectful of timing for translations and everything else.

With regard to the amendment, I would propose changing my motion to three meetings that would be held this Wednesday, May 12, May 31 and June 9. If everyone has a pen, I could go through a suggested schedule.

Would that be okay, Chair? It might make it easier for conversation.

**The Chair:** Technically, that's not in order. I think it's useful information that there have been discussions, which I was encouraging last Wednesday, but we are bound by the order in which the motions and the—

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I have a point of order.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Chair, part of the motion before us is following all the work in front of us, so perhaps I could just go through the order of work in front of us under that part.

That was Glen's part of the amendment. Isn't that right?

**The Chair:** I have to respect Mr. Harris's request for a point of order first.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** My point of order is that we have a motion that we can discuss. Pam is right that we can talk about dates and things like that, but if we have a motion on the floor, to get into that level of detail, perhaps we can have a more general discussion about what it is we want to accomplish.

We have 10 meetings left between now and when we rise. Some of them may disappear. Some of them we know we're committed

to. The actual schedule as to what happens on what day probably should be filled in once we've agreed to what we hope to accomplish between now and the end of June.

**The Chair:** Shannon.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Chair, are we discussing the point of order? Am I finished now? Can I not talk about the work that we want to do?

**The Chair:** Okay. We're back to Pam, and then to Shannon.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I won't get into the dates because that's...according to Jack.

The work would be the ideologically motivated violent extremism study. It would be finalizing the racism study. We would have Minister Blair and Commissioner Lucki come to deal with Bas-tarache. We would review the Levesque study. We would do the border study, and we would do the CSC study.

I have a potential schedule to do that. As I said, we would shorten the IMVE study to three meetings.

Thanks, Chair.

**The Chair:** Shannon.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Thanks, Chair.

I think I'm sort of out of turn here, but before we completely dis-pense with our discussion on the motion, I just wanted to add that, after we've dealt with the timing issue, I want to make what I hope will be taken as a friendly amendment to expand the scope of the motion, so that we can get the most meaningful work out of it possible.

**The Chair:** I'm holding on by my fingernails to the proper order here, but what is on the—

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** I'll just give you a heads-up that I want to sneak in. Between the timing issue and the final vote, I'll want to sneak in there.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Jack.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Thank you, Chair.

I was looking in detail at what it is we're trying to accomplish here, and I think it's very unlikely that we can get a report done on the IMVE, or on the CSC, both of which we've agreed that we want to do.

Pam has made a very strong case, which I think we all agreed with last week, that the IMVE study should be looked at as quickly as possible. Looking at the fact that we have 10 meetings left after today, realistically, the sensible thing in my view is to devote two of them, guaranteed, to IMVE and two of them to CSC. We've already committed to one on racism, and hopefully, we'll finish that. If we don't, we might need part of another meeting.

We've committed to one on the border study. We are certainly committed to one on the Bastarache, i.e., the Lucki and Blair meeting, and drafting instructions, potentially. We also appear to be committed to at least two meetings on Levesque, and I hope we get a report out of that. If we do that, that's nine meetings, leaving one floating meeting that we could use for something else.

In the fall, if there is a fall, we can either complete the CSC study and do a report, complete the IMVE study and do a report, or if we don't get the Levesque study finished, we could do a report. However, we could commit to finishing the racism study and the Bastarache study, and to trying to do the Levesque study if we can.

If there's a meeting left over, we can have either IMVE or CSC as that third meeting. That would be a compromise of everybody saying, well, we're not really going to finish three reports. We'd be lucky if we finished racism, Bastarache and Levesque, and that might be difficult.

Otherwise, we're not going to be able to accomplish what we've agreed we want to touch on between now and June 23. That's my proposal. As to when those meetings will take place, I have ideas about that too, but that's just a detail. If we can get an agreement that we'll have two for sure on IMVE, two for sure on CSC, one border, one racism, two Levesque and one Bastarache, that takes nine meetings with one up in the air.

**The Chair:** Before I recognize Pam, I want to bring us back to some sort of order. The Damoff motion is on the floor. Michaud had an amendment, which I am now assuming is subsumed into the subamendment of Motz, and we haven't dealt with the Motz amendment.

I would like to know from the committee which way to proceed here. Do you want to bring the Motz amendment to a vote, or is it a withdrawal on Glen's part and an amendment to the Damoff motion to be put forward? Is it in Pam's fashion or Jack's fashion? It's one or the other. I'm open as to how to proceed with this because I don't want to lose the procedural niceties of the committee.

I see Pam's hand up, and then Jack's hand up.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I was going to say, Chair, it's hard to get into.... In essence, I agree with Jack. I think we're both on the same page on this. It's just a matter of order, but in essence, I don't want to remove that we report to the House for CSC or IMVE. The assumption is that we're coming back in September and that we can finish reports on these if need be, but I think we want to get this done. Unless we deal with Jack and Kristina's motions, it's hard to move forward with this.

**The Chair:** Do you mean with Glen's and Kristina's?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** With what Jack, Kristina and I have all been talking about in terms of trying to get all of this work done...but it does require us to deal with the motions that are on the floor before we can actually have a fulsome discussion on where we're going.

**The Chair:** I'll look to Glen. Can you see your way clear to withdraw your subamendment?

**Mr. Glen Motz:** I'm looking for the document that lays out the new proposed schedule.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** We can't deal with that until we deal with the motions.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** I'm not prepared to withdraw my amendment until I have an understanding of what the proposed dates are, what that looks like and what we are going to set aside and when. I need to know what that all looks like, so I can't.

I feel very strongly that we need to get at the stuff that we wanted, but Pam, if you're amicable to consider a friendly amendment on the main motion, I'm certainly prepared to withdraw my amendment to Kristina's, and move with the timeline that I thought I heard you propose at some point in time.

**The Chair:** Let me just look to the clerk to maintain some procedural regularity.

The Motz amendment is still alive. Pam is proposing a subamendment that we would deal with first. Then we would deal with the Motz amendment, and the main motion as amended or not. Can Pam amend the motion as it is presently on the floor?

**The Clerk:** Technically, you're supposed to dispose of the subamendment, and if it's to get more information before there's a request for withdrawal, then you could proceed that way. The subamendment is still, technically, before the committee, or the amendment, I should say, is still before the committee.

**The Chair:** Yes, I agree, but can a second subamendment be put forward?

**The Clerk:** No, they have to be dealt with successively, because otherwise they can overlap and contradict.

**The Chair:** What if they were put forward by someone other than Pam?

**The Clerk:** The same would apply.

**The Chair:** One way or another, we have to deal with Glen's subamendment before we can deal with the main motion.

Go ahead, Glen.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Thank you, Chair. I'm just looking at the proposed changes. My issue, last time, was about whether we were prepared to have the extremism study starting today. We weren't. We aren't. Are we prepared to have it starting on Wednesday? I would hope so. I hope we would be prepared if that's what's being proposed, and if Kristina is.... The 10th was my hang-up, that we weren't ready for it.

As I said before, Pam, I wanted to withdraw my amendment to Kristina's motion. If we want to expand this study, as Shannon briefly articulated.... I think it's such an important issue that we probably should, so we're not limited in our scope. We'll get to that when we get to it.

I'm prepared, Mr. Chair, to withdraw my amendment to Kristina's motion, given there is some movement on the flexibility of the schedule, and we can get at some of the things that we need to get at. That's what our purpose was last time, to make sure we get at the things that we really have on our plate.

(Amendment withdrawn [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** I'll take that as a withdrawal.

Mr. Fisher, please go ahead.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** I don't know if I need to speak now. Glen just opened up a real window of clarity there that added to Jack's window of clarity, so I have a good idea now that we are actually trying to get to the point of the discussion that we had at the last meeting or the previous day.

I don't think I need to make any more comments, but I want to thank Glen for that, because that really did help with the clarity of the process.

**The Chair:** Can either Pam or Jack arrive at some reconciliation as to what is being proposed?

Maybe I should go to Pam first, and then we'll try to find where the differences are between what Pam is proposing and what Jack is proposing.

Go ahead, Pam.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I think the only difference is the number of meetings for Levesque. I'm agreeable to what Jack was saying in terms of the number of meetings. What I'd propose is that on May 12 we have officials for IMVE. We don't have anything planned at the moment. They are people who can be readily available: the RCMP, CSIS and CSE.

On May 26, I think all of us want to finalize the racism study and get it tabled in the House. That certainly should be doable in a day if we all put our minds to it. Then I'm proposing that on May 31 we do IMVE, and bring back Blair and Lucki on June 2.

At that point, the Levesque study should be written and translated, because we know that it takes time to translate. Therefore, on June 7 we would start reviewing the Levesque study. On June 9, we would do IMVE; on June 14, the one-day border study we'd agreed on; and then—

**The Chair:** Hang on. You're going a little too quickly for me.

On June 9, we'd do what?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** We'd do IMVE. On June 14, we'd do the border study, and then the next three meetings—June 16, 21 and 23—would be on CSC.

Based on what Jack was saying, I think we could have some flexibility there in terms of the order. I'd love to hear from Jack in terms of moving it around.

I do think, though, we need to hear from Blair and Lucki, and we should try to get a couple of meetings in on IMVE by the end of May. We all listened to David McGuinty. I think there's agreement on the committee as to how urgent this study is. We need to get a couple of meetings done by the end of the month. I've backed off

quite a bit from where we started, so I'm hoping that committee members will agree with this.

**The Chair:** Before I go to Jack, does everybody now understand what Pam is proposing, before we get any further confused than we already are?

Tako, are you wiggling your finger or are you confused?

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** I was scribbling down notes as quickly as I could, but I didn't get when the second Levesque day will be.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Chair, is it okay if I respond?

**The Chair:** Yes. The first Levesque day is today. I think the second Levesque day is the seventh, is it not?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** It is.

I had only put down one meeting on that. Part of the reason is that I think we want to try to get it back to the analyst as quickly as we can. I recognize that there are a lot of recommendations in that, but I also think, if we put our minds to it, we can go through that report and determine what we all agree on. There might be a fair amount we don't agree on, which is fine, and those would be supplementary or dissenting reports.

We could try to do in a day the sections that we agree on. Jack has suggested two days, and that may be necessary and that's fine. We could do June 7 and 9 on Levesque, but the risk we all run is that the longer it takes for us to do Levesque, the less chance we have that it gets tabled in the House, because of translation and analyst writing time. Bear that in mind, but I think we could be flexible and do June 7 and 9 on Levesque if we needed to.

Tako, does that make sense?

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** That makes sense.

I'm just thinking that it is going to be two days. If I go by experience on how many days we spent on the racism report, I'm not optimistic that we'd get the review of the Levesque report done in one day.

**The Chair:** I think we all understand the proposal in front of the committee and we're all singing from the same song sheet.

First up in the choir is Mr. Harris.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Thank you, Chair.

I'm in general agreement with the approach that Pam has taken. However, I think it's unrealistic, and frankly impossible, to have a Levesque report done in that time frame. First of all, we're going to be reviewing something that's drafted for June 7. It is not going to be passed that day. I haven't seen them, but I'm told we have 50 recommendations, plus there's a whole raft of them in the recommendations from witnesses. That's an impossible task. We'd be very lucky to get a report, if we did nothing else, to ensure that we had the Levesque study—

**The Chair:** We're having Lucki on June 2.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** June 2 is committed already. That is clear. We agreed with that.

Having May 12 for IMVE is agreeable. May 26 is clear, and hopefully we'll finish that day, but there's no actual guarantee on that. I'm satisfied with leaving IMVE for May 31 if it is available, but not if the racism study is not finished.

For Blair, Lucki and Bastarache, I think that will hopefully take one day. If we can get drafting instructions on that day, then we can have a report on Bastarache by the end of June.

June 7 is for Levesque.

On June 9, I would want to start the CSC study. I want to start the CSC study early. The border study may be flexible to go on the 16th, and we can use June 9 for the Levesque study to hopefully get somewhere with that and do the CSC study on either June 9 or 14. Then there are three days left. We may need time to do Bastarache. We'll still have a second day for the CSC study and then we'll have the one flexible day.

That's the way I would see it shaking down. If we finish Levesque, that would be wonderful. If not, the fall could be a time when we would finish off the CSC, finish off the IMVE report if we don't get time to do it, and then finish Levesque. I think we could have two IMVE meetings in May and then one that could follow in June if there is a place outside of the dates that I've outlined.

**The Chair:** What I'm hearing is agreement all the way to and including June 7.

Glen.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you for that, Jack, as well.

Pam mentioned something a few minutes ago, and I think, Mr. Chair, you reinforced it. Some of these studies will not get to the House, even though we want them there. They won't get there before we rise at the end of June. The CSC study will not be done, as Jack has indicated, before the end of June. The extremism study will not be done before the end of June. With those things in mind, while it's important that we at least start both of them, we're putting ourselves under the gun to get the studies done that need to be presented to the House before we rise. We're putting them off.

Quite honestly, the Levesque study is not that long. I believe that it should be easily drafted by the 31st because it's not that long of a study. We can get at it, then, as soon as we can. The House voted unanimously to bring it to committee to get this done, so it would be remiss of us to not get it back to the House for the House to receive it before we rise.

The racism study, certainly, has been longer, and we have a timeline for it. I would hope that.... If we have a meeting on the 31st, then let's move the Levesque study back to the 31st. We can start our extremism study on Wednesday. We have some witnesses that we're prepared to bring forward, I believe—and I'm sure everyone does—for that day. Let's bring the Levesque study and get a good handle on it for the 31st. We can have Blair and Lucki on the second. The Levesque study can come back on the seventh, and we can finish it off. Then we can get to Jack's CSC study, I agree, earli-

er. We're going to have a day.... Let's get another extremism study date in there before the end of June as well. At least we can get at the things there. We can get the reports back to the House that we've committed to before Christmas. We want them to get back to the House. We've not had that opportunity yet. I would think that this would be wise of us to do.

Both the CSC study and the extremism study will be things that might take us down longer paths. I'd hate to start them because we know we're going to have to finish them in September. They will not be done at any time before we rise.

Why are we cramping our style to not get other things done in time before the House rises so that they can be presented? That was the essence of my motion last time, Mr. Chair, my friendly amendment to Kristina's suggested amendment on the dates. That's why.

I think that if we can come to a compromise that we make the 31st a Levesque study meeting, that we then have Blair and Lucki, and that we take the seventh for the Levesque study, we honour Jack because he's had this CSC study on the radar for us for a significant period of time. We certainly think that there are some things there that we need to consider as a committee. That still leaves us with an extremism date sometime following that, be it the 14th, 16th, 21st or 23rd. One of those four remaining days, we can get another extremism study meeting in there before we rise.

Those would be my suggestions, Mr. Chair. We can try to make that work.

**The Chair:** The big elephant in the room, though, is translation. We don't even have the recommendations translated at this point for the Levesque study. It's just a challenge. It's a challenge for every committee. For us, it's a unique challenge.

I take your overall point. We have to give ourselves a real chance to be able to table both the racism study and the Levesque study. I think that, in principle, everyone agrees with that.

I think Pam was up first and then Jack.

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

If I'm not mistaken, other than Glen we had agreed until June 7. Then I think Jack wanted to do CSC or Levesque on June 9, I'm not sure which. We'd be agreeable to that.

I just want to go back, though, to the CSC. This was an issue that we'd studied in the last Parliament a number of times. No one on the committee is more committed to looking at what's going on in corrections, but let's go back to the fact that the Liberal members brought this motion as an emergency motion to the public safety committee, because we have concerns, based on what CSIS has said and what NSICOP has said. Just today, the leader of the NDP was talking about his concerns around IMVE.

There was an arrest made in Edmonton on April 29, where the RCMP said the following:

An ever-increasing concern and challenge faced by law enforcement is the use of the internet and social media as a platform to inspire, radicalize or espouse extremist messaging or calls for violence....

This was in relation to an arrest made there:

The accused was interacting online with like-minded individuals in posting extreme views that ultimately escalated towards him engaging in criminal activity that posed a considerable risk to public and police safety, ultimately resulting in his arrest.

I want to draw us back to the fact that we, as Liberals, felt that this issue required immediate attention, so I'm glad everybody agrees with that. I think it's just timing. I think we've gotten down to probably June 9 at least, and June 14 to do the border study. On June 9 we could either look at CSC or continue Levesque, depending on what Jack is suggesting.

On the schedule, I did keep in mind the lengthy time that's required for translation. This wasn't an attempt to put off Levesque at all. It was more a reflection of the amount of time the House is requiring right now to get things translated. We have to be cognizant of that.

The longer we take to finalize the Levesque study, the less likely it is to get tabled in the House. I think all of us working towards getting that done, if we could, in a day...and I recognize that this is extremely optimistic.

I'll leave it at that for now, Chair.

**The Chair:** Okay.

I think the big question is whether Mr. Fisher is eating an Annapolis Valley apple right now.

So we—

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Chair, do you want me to put a motion for us to discuss to amend my motion, or...?

**The Chair:** I think we're jogging along somewhat close to consensus. Before we get to the motion stage....

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Okay.

**The Chair:** We have basically agreed to June 7. We could leave it at June 9—

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Hold on, Chair. On a point of order, I didn't agree to June 7.

**The Chair:** I said we were jogging along and were mostly agreed. I didn't—

**Mr. Glen Motz:** We still have Kristina's amendment, which takes precedent before we move any further. I just want to make sure that—

**The Chair:** No. Her amendment was taken over by your amendment. Your amendment is the only one that's formally still through. The way I heard it two comments ago, you were withdrawing it, as commented by Darren, and we were working out this schedule. The schedule, except for your concerns about May 31, was essentially looking like it was agreed to until June 7.

I was going to suggest that we then leave June 9 to be one of IMVE, the border or CSC, depending on—

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Damien.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, but it was my understanding that Glen withdrew his subamendment to Kristina's amendment. Wouldn't we procedurally be currently in discussions on Kristina's amendment, which replaced, I believe—this is going from memory—the May 10 deadline, which was the subject of some controversy at the conclusion of the last meeting, in order to ensure that it wouldn't be made out of order for the deliberations taking place now?

All the scheduling is fair discussion, and I think it lends towards the larger debate, but my understanding is that there is currently an amendment on the floor that needs to be dealt with before any further decisions can be made.

**The Chair:** I could stand corrected, and it wouldn't be the first time, and it won't be the last time.

The way I understood it was that the Damoff motion is the main motion. There was a proposed amendment by Michaud and proposed subamendment by Motz. Michaud withdrew in favour of Motz, and then Motz's in turn, I've interpreted, was withdrawn while having a conversation about the various dates. Then Pam and Jack put a proposal forward that got us to June 7 with one objection by Glen. I hope I have that sort of right.

Jack, you're up.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I'm working my way through this as well, because we all have to. We're all working our way through this. We have the study of racism on May 26. On May 31, I think at the moment, that's also possibly the study on racism for now.

We also have to remember, if we're looking at scheduling all the time, that we might end up losing time, because this is the crazy season, as anyone who's been around this Parliament for any length of time knows. There are votes galore and God knows what to interfere with our work.

I think we ought to have some flexibility built into this, which is why I made the original proposal. I'm not sure May 31 is totally agreed upon, because the study on racism might have to be given priority. I've been thinking about priority. To me, the priority is the study on racism and getting the Bastarache report done—because it's doable—which means hearing from them on June 2, so that we have lots of time to get a report out on that. If we don't do it on the day, we might have it bleed into something else.

The third priority for a report is the Levesque study, if we can possibly do it. As for the IMVE and the CSC, I don't think we're going to get reports on those unless someone wants to move a particular motion that would be in the form of a report.

I would see us into the Levesque report on June 7. As you said, sir, June 9 is open for IMVE, border or CSC. The same would be said for June 14: IMVE, border or CSC. One of those has to be the border, and we'll use the other one to finish the Levesque report, if we're going to do it. We then have room left for the last three days, if they're available, to finish the Levesque study with a third meeting on the IMVE, if it hasn't already taken place, and to do a second meeting on CSC, if it hasn't already taken place. We still have one floater.

I'm not worried so much about what's on June 16, 21 and 23 as such, as long as we're all going to be here on June 23. Whether the House is here or not, we can still be here and I'm happy to do that.

**The Chair:** I want to caution folks.

I was hoping to get some instructions to the folks on the Levesque report today. To be realistic about it, we can basically plan a month in advance, and even that is going to be subject to the vagaries of parliamentary procedure. We need to focus our minds so that we can get a coherent path forward. Otherwise, the Levesque report won't be dealt with today either.

I think it's Glen next, then Kristina and then Pam.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Kristina had her hand up before me. I'll go after her, please.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Kristina, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I wanted to say that I had the same understanding as you, Mr. Chair, that my amendment had become Mr. Motz's and we had withdrawn it. I think it would be simpler for everybody if Ms. Damoff, as she suggested, amended her own motion with the dates she mentioned to us.

If anyone disagrees with any of the dates, they may propose a subamendment. Personally, I would feel reassured to have the dates we talked about included in the motion. That way, we'll know they won't be changed four or five times, as we've been doing all along.

This would organize the end of the session nicely. We would know where we are going, bearing in mind that we have enough meetings to finish the report on the study on the circumstances surrounding Ms. Levesque's death. I think everybody would be happy

with the way it seems to be shaping up. Having it in writing might be better.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Glen.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, Kristina. That's my thinking as well.

As I mentioned before, Chair and team, my concern is the 31st. I think we can live with some adjustments. We haven't heard from the analysts whether the 31st is a possibility to get at Levesque after today—we can get at it again today—and whether we are going to be in a position to start looking at it differently, and then on the seventh as well. We have some flexibility with the ninth, 14th, 16th, 21st and 23rd, as Jack indicated, on extremism, the border and CSC, but our priorities remain racism and the Levesque study. I don't think we can continue to put those ones off for any other reason.

I don't know where we're at with the racism one. Are they going to be ready for us on the 26th? I don't know. I certainly hope so.

Let's put the dates in here. If there's a date [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] I'm proposing. As I said, let's shore up something different for the 31st, and I'm good with it personally. We need to get at the things we've committed to tabling in the House. Those are racism and Levesque, with no exceptions.

**The Chair:** There's no question.

Pam.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Chair, I'll give you an amendment to my motion. It's that “the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security immediately begin a study of three meetings to be held on Wednesday, May 12, 2021 with departmental officials, Monday, May 31, 2021 and June 23, 2021, into ideologically motivated violent extremism in Canada” and remove the words “no later than May 10th”. We remove the words “that the study consist of four meetings” because that has already been dealt with.

I would add at the end, Chair, that the following schedule be suggested for the committee: May 26, racism study; May 31, IMVE; June 2, Minister Blair and Commissioner Lucki on Bastarache; June 7, review Levesque study; June 9, 16 and 21, Levesque or CSC, timing dependent; and June 14, the border study.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I would amend it that way, recognizing we might have to revisit this after.



I hope that gives some flexibility to the other dates. If we need more time for Levesque, we can take more time for Levesque. It still leaves in the border study, which was Kristina's motion. Minister Blair, Commissioner Lucki and Bastarache were extremely important.

That's how I would amend it. Ideally, I would have preferred to have the third meeting on our IMVE study sooner, but we can live with the 23rd, Chair.

**The Chair:** Everyone has heard the proposal.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I didn't hear the whole proposal.

**The Chair:** Okay. We can do it again.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I missed the ninth.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Jack, the ninth, 16th and 21st would be Levesque or CSC, depending on how much time we need.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I'm not prepared to agree with that. That leaves one meeting for the CSC, presumably.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I moved IMVE down to the 23rd, Jack.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Yes, I understand that, but then there's no specific date for the CSC, so it can't be planned.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I was just trying to give flexibility. If we want to do two on Levesque and then two on CSC, I'd be fine with that too.

I'm just trying to get some flexibility for the chair, not knowing how long some of this stuff is going to take to do.

**The Chair:** Joël.

[Translation]

**Mr. Joël Lightbound:** Mr. Chair, in this case, I was wondering if we could set a definite date of June 9 for the study on the Correctional Service of Canada that Mr. Harris has suggested. Then, we would have—

[English]

**The Chair:** We're getting no translation. I'm sorry.

**Mr. Joël Lightbound:** I was just about to suggest that we could set in stone the ninth for the CSC study.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** On a point of order, Chair, there is no translation at all.

**The Chair:** He is speaking English.

[Translation]

**Mr. Joël Lightbound:** Regardless of the language.

[English]

**The Chair:** Do some *franglais*.

**Mr. Joël Lightbound:** Yes. Just *comme je* was saying. I'm trying. It's not easy.

Do I get translation now?

[Translation]

I would propose that the study on the Correctional Service of Canada that Mr. Harris has proposed be definitely scheduled to begin on June 9. On June 7, we would review the report on the circumstances surrounding the death of Ms. Levesque, and then we

could complete the report on Ms. Levesque's death on June 16 and 21, if necessary.

So there would be the border study, which Ms. Michaud wants, the Correctional Service of Canada study, which Mr. Harris wants, and the rest, I think Ms. Damoff has really covered. If we can get this over with as quickly as possible, we could begin the review of the report on the death of Ms. Levesque.

[English]

**The Chair:** Pam.

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

I would see that as a friendly amendment. It would change June 9 to CSC and then it would only leave the 16th and the 21st to be CSC or Levesque, depending on the timing. I would see that as a friendly amendment to what I put forward.

**The Chair:** Dare I ask for a vote?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Sure.

**The Chair:** I'm a little afraid here, but I don't see any hands going up.

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** Chair, I do have my hand up.

I'm just not clear on what happens next Wednesday, the 12th of May, and for the rest of this month—the 12th, the 17th and the 19th of May.

**The Chair:** May 12 I can speak to. We would start the IMVE study. CSIS, CSE and the RCMP can make themselves available on that day.

Then we would go to.... What's the date after that? It's the 20th—

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** It's the 17th.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** No, the House isn't sitting, Tako.

**The Chair:** No. May 26 will go to the racism study. Okay?

**Mr. Tako Van Popta:** Got it. I'm clear.

**The Chair:** I knew that I should have gone for the vote immediately. Now I have more hands.

Glen.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** If we proceed with the dates as Pam has proposed, we will not get the Levesque study tabled in the House. That is the concern that I brought up before. I withdrew my motion because of the timing and because it appeared as if there was some willingness to make some adjustments to the extremism study and to make sure we focused on things that needed to get done.

We're still focused on the 31st for a second extremism study day when Levesque could be prepared at the same time. There is no reason that I can see that we can't have Levesque looked at then. If we're looking at the 16th or 21st and we're still in committee on Levesque, there is no possible way that it's going to be before the House.

Let's not kid ourselves. Let's focus on things that we can get done now. Let's start the studies that are important and that we know won't be done until the fall. It baffles me that we continue to push off and push off and put ourselves in a spot where we're again not going to get anything done. I don't understand why we can't finish something that has been before the committee for how long now...? Is it a year or two years on Levesque?

**The Chair:** Jack, apparently your headset is off, according to a note I have here that says your headset is not working.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Am I back now?

**The Chair:** Yes, you're back.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I think what Glen is saying does make some sense. If, at the end of June, we're going to be looking back and forth between CSC and Levesque, even if we've finished it, we won't get it to the House. That doesn't make real sense. If we're serious about trying to finish Levesque, we would have to start it a little earlier or change CSC from the ninth to the 14th and leave the border one for a little later.

**The Chair:** Pam.

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

I only added to do Levesque on the 16th and the 21st because colleagues said we couldn't get it done in a day. I have to say that if we really want to table it in the House, we need to get it done in a day. I think there's going to be a fair amount of differences of opinion in terms of where the Levesque study goes, and it's incumbent on us to get that done that day, or quite frankly, I don't think it will get tabled in the House. As Glen expressed concerns about getting it done, I think it's incumbent on us to do it and get it back to the analyst.

Everybody seems to have agreed, except for the Conservative Party, that we need to do these two meetings on IMVE. It's later in the month. Mr. Chair, we're trying to come to consensus here, but maybe we do just need to go to a vote and see where this goes.

**The Chair:** I see Glen's hand next.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Pam is probably right that we need to vote on this and then go back and fix it, because I think we will have to go back and fix it.

On the 26th we already have the racism study ongoing. The 31st can be for finishing racism and Levesque. We can combine those. We have Blair and Lucki. We finish the Levesque on the seventh and we go from there with the things that are left. We should have it done by the second, then, or we could be done by the second if we really put our minds to it. Then it gets to the House.

**The Chair:** The irony on Levesque, Glen, is that there's probably no agreement among the parties, so it's actually potentially going to be three separate reports. There's likely little consensus among the parties. Ironically, it actually may go faster, because in the racism study we made some considerable effort to get a meeting of minds.

Pam.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** If Robin is still on here, I wonder if she could give us a sense of how long translation is taking. With this whole talk of being able to do something on May 31, we need to wrap this

up quickly so that we can give her drafting instructions today if we really want to get moving on that study.

As we move later into June, I suspect the timing is going to get longer. I'm recognizing you can't give us a definitive answer right now, Robin, because you don't know what other committees are doing. I wonder if she could give us a sense, Mr. Chair—if that's okay—of translation time.

**Ms. Robin Whitehead (Committee Researcher):** I can't give a definitive answer, but I have been told that translation has been experiencing a lot of delays because a lot of committees are working to finalize reports.

I think it is wise to expect that it will take at least a couple of weeks to translate any significantly sized document. I think the guidelines they usually say is 1,600 words, but I don't know to what extent that is applicable at this time of year, and I won't know until I have the meeting with translation.

I'll have to get the instructions on drafting first so that I get a sense of what you're looking for in the report in order to have a sense of the length and to be able to give them a heads-up about what we're looking for.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Mr. Chair, could we perhaps—

**The Chair:** We'll just call a vote.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Yes. Could we get a recorded vote, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** We certainly can. Anyone can ask for it, so we're asking for a recorded vote on the motion, as amended. Since the mover and the person amending were one and the same, it's one motion.

Mr. Clerk, could you call the roll?

**The Clerk:** Yes, Mr. Chair. The vote is on the amendment by Pam Damoff. I will call the roll now.

Ms. Damoff.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I'm sorry. On a point of order, since I amended my own motion, is it not on the motion as amended?

**The Chair:** I would have thought so, but I will defer to my clerk.

**The Clerk:** It should be on the amendment, and then the main motion as amended or as unamended.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Okay, so in favour—

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** On a point of order, as just a technicality, is someone allowed to amend their own motion without unanimous consent of the committee? I'm just curious as to what the rules of committee procedure are on that.

**The Chair:** Mr. Clerk.

**The Clerk:** It has been done. Usually it's another member moving the motion, but we probably have examples of it being done this way in the past.

Typically, generally speaking, it's another member moving it, but it's how the committee wishes to proceed.

**The Chair:** Technically, I can't recognize points of order in the middle of a vote. We are in the middle of a vote.

Mr. Clerk, please continue.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Colleagues, we want to move now to the Levesque conversation. That should be in camera. We are prepared to—

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Chair, on a point of order, we only voted on our amendment.

**The Chair:** You're right. I apologize for that.

We will call the roll again.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** No, Chair, I'm sorry. I had my hand up.

First of all, Conservatives want to thank the Liberals for bringing forward this motion. We share your belief in its importance and we certainly have seen the same information from NSICOP and CSIS.

To that end, Pam, would you accept a friendly amendment, or see it as friendly, if we expanded it and added to the scope of your motion rather than leaving it narrow in the way it is now, just given the fact that both CSIS and NSICOP, for example, say that religiously motivated violent extremism continues to be a top threat? In fact, Jewish people in Canada are the top people who are threatened the most in Canada.

By this phenomenon of violent extremism, through which there is often an online component, as you had said earlier, I wonder if, to make it more inclusive, rather than limiting and prescriptive, you would be open to adding the words “politically motivated violent extremism and religiously motivated violent extremism” immediately following the words “ideologically motivated violent extremism” so that this study would encompass the diversity and the variety of threats to individual and public safety that, Conservatives agree with you, exist and are growing.

Just to account for that, the second reference right now in the motion that says people “who have been impacted by IMVE” would then just say “who have been impacted by violent extremism”.

Does that capture it?

Chair, do you want me to make a formal motion?

**The Chair:** Let me just find out whether Pam considers that friendly.

Just so I understand it, this would add the words “political” and “religious” to “ideological”.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Right, it would add both of those. Then the motion would capture all forms of violent extremism in Canada.

It would capture ideologically motivated, religiously motivated, hate-based extremism, extremist travellers, including neo-Nazis and ISIS, and then also politically motivated ones.

**The Chair:** Okay, but the motion is amended to add “religious—

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** It is to add, “politically motivated and religiously motivated violent extremism” to “ideologically”. It's not taking anything away, but adding to it.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Then it is removing that last part, as you indicated, Shannon, so it says, “impacted by...”?

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** It's “by violent extremism”.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** First of all, let me find out whether that's perceived to be a friendly amendment.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Mr. Chair, I appreciate Shannon's trying to expand.

Right now, we have two meetings on this subject.

If you look at the CSIS report, it states the following:

Since 2014, Canadians motivated in whole or in part by their extremist ideological views have killed 21 people and wounded 40 others on Canadian soil—more than religiously motivated violent extremism...or politically motivated violent extremism”.

While I'm not trying to play down the importance of those two, I think it's clear from the CSIS report, from the information that Mr. McGuinty shared with us, that ideologically motivated violent extremism is worthy of a study on its own.

I would suggest that, if Ms. Stubbs wanted to suggest... We all hope we're back in September. If we want to do another study on those, we could look at that, but I think that right now, with only two meetings scheduled, it would be impossible to expand it, so I would say no. I don't treat it as a friendly amendment. I think we need to deal with the one that is killing 21 people and wounding 40 others on Canadian soil and treat it as the urgent matter that it is.

**The Chair:** I would perceive, though, that there is now an amendment on the floor, so the debate is on the amendment.

Go ahead, Mr. Harris.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I didn't really have my hand up to debate the amendment, but I do have another issue to raise. Maybe I'll have to wait until the amendment is dealt with.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Does everybody understand the amendment? Is there any debate on the amendment?

Seeing none, I'm assuming we'll want a roll call.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Mr. Chair.

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

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Thank you very much.

I think it's unfortunate that there's not a willingness on behalf of the members of the government on this committee to expand the study in what I think is an inherently reasonable manner. I read the NSICOP report and have been following closely some of the other work, and it's stated very clearly, in fact—I'm paraphrasing from memory—that religiously motivated extremism is the greatest threat to Canadians.

I think it's incumbent upon all of us to ensure that, when we undertake these studies, the committee is not prejudging a conclusion. What I think is a very reasonable amendment put forward by Ms. Stubbs would ensure that the committee is addressing the issues facing Canadians in a manner that allows the committee to really get to the bottom of what is undoubtedly...

I think there is universal agreement on this committee that there are concerns that need to be addressed; however, with a narrow scope, I think we limit the work that the committee can do that would more effectively ensure what we can address what I think, and certainly hope, is at the heart of this motion.

I plan to support the amendment. I think it adds to the study proposed by the government, and it would ensure that it accomplishes, as I said, what I hope the objective is here.

For the committee to limit itself and prejudge its outcomes would be an unfortunate restriction. Again, I think it's unfortunate that it wasn't accepted as a friendly amendment, but because of the fact that we could do good work as a result, I hope members would consider supporting that.

**The Chair:** We'll go to Glen, and then Pam and Jack. I'm not sure which one was up first.

Glen.

**Mr. Glen Motz:** Thank you, Chair.

What I will add is that, as Damien said, we don't want to prejudge what is ideologically motivated or religiously motivated. In many cases, quite honestly, what I might consider to be religiously motivated hate crime extremism might actually be ideologically motivated. The challenge that we are going to be facing is trying to differentiate the issue, so let's avoid the issue of any grey area and have it all-encompassing because the overarching theme for all of these is violence. It's the violence.

It doesn't matter whether I'm ideologically or politically or religiously motivated, it is the violence that puts Canadians at risk in this country. As Damien said, let's not limit ourselves to.... Again, we're going to have witnesses who are going to have varying views. We're going to have witnesses who will talk about extremism in all of its forms, not just ideologically motivated, as I said, because some may consider religiously motivated extremism to be an ideology. Why would we put ourselves already in a grey area where we're going to be having dual motives being debated as opposed to the issue of violence because of extremism?

I will be supporting the amendment as a result.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Jack, and then Pam.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I hadn't had my hand raised initially to wade in on this, but since I have listened to the discussion I decided I have a view that would support the motion as it is, and it's not be-

cause Glen hasn't made a very good point or the points are there. We're only talking about two meetings and the possibility of a third, which is doubtful. It's kind of focused. If we go into the fall, then I'd be amenable to amending it or expanding it if the will is there.

I agree that sometimes it's hard to tell. Is anti-Semitism religious-based or is it something else? It's extremism. It's terrible and awful and, as pointed out, one of the worst most common forms of discrimination, and can be violent as well. I think this study, and the intention of the mover from the very beginning, was to deal with the specifics of ideologically motivated—politically motivated, I guess you'd call it—extremism as a new phenomenon that we need to look at.

If we only have two meetings, let's stick to that. That's not say anything about the concerns of other equally important types of extremism, but given the nature of the recommendation from the beginning and all the debate so far, I don't think we should change it for now.

**The Chair:** We're down to 45 minutes for drafting instructions on Levesque. I'm just taking note.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** I had my other comment though as well.

**The Chair:** With that, I think we'll go to Pam, and then Kristina.

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

I agree with Jack on a short study.

I also want to remind people that there have been no Canadians killed in 2020 due to religiously motivated violent extremism or politically motivated violent extremism, but there have been.... We heard very clearly from Mr. McGuinty when he appeared—and I'm sure we will hear from CSIS when they appear and they can give us some clarification on this—that this is a new phenomenon. It is rapidly increasing during the pandemic and I think it's important that we look at this in our two short meetings, possibly three.

It's something that Canadians need to.... We're the public safety committee, and this is something that is new and it's a threat. I remember Mr. McGuinty saying that the number of people, Canadians, involved in ideologically motivated violent extremism was higher than in the U.S. and the U.K., and had risen during the pandemic.

I'm going to leave it there, Chair, because I think we need to vote on this and then deal with our drafting instructions before 5:30.

**The Chair:** Kristina.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Mr. Chair, I just want to reiterate the fact that we don't have much time left to work on the report on the circumstances surrounding the death of Ms. Levesque.

We're having a hard time agreeing on motions, and it's taking a long time. We have so much to do that I think it's unrealistic to expand the scope of the study, especially since we only have two meetings to do it. If we had plenty of meetings, I would have agreed, but given the situation, we don't really have the time or opportunity to do that.

So I would suggest that we focus on the current motion so we can vote on it, then continue our work on the report on the death of Ms. Levesque because there isn't much time left in the meeting.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Jack, is your hand still up?

**Mr. Jack Harris:** Yes it is, sir.

I don't know if I was misreading, or had a note here that ended up.... The motion that we passed actually has a provision for three meetings in June, potentially, of the CSC or Levesque study, going to June 21, when there's no possibility of anything being translated to get the report to the House. If June 9 is reserved for the CSC study, then I would be okay, but if I'm wrong, then we have three meetings in June, after the seventh, which are for either the CSC or Levesque. That means that CSC is only tentative. I would like to ensure that at least one meeting be guaranteed, particularly since we are not going to get a report from the Levesque study back to the House.

Now that we're on the main motion, I'd like to amend the main motion by suggesting that one of these meetings be reserved specifically for CSC. I'd prefer the ninth, but I'd accept the 16th.

**The Chair:** Your amendment wouldn't be quite in order just yet—

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Chair, I think if we check with the clerk, I said that June 9 would be the CSC.

**The Chair:** That's what I was just going to say. That's what my notes say as well. I want to confirm.

**Mr. Jack Harris:** If that's correct, then I don't need a motion.

**The Chair:** Mr. Clerk.

**The Clerk:** Those were my notes as well, although I could always double-check with the blues, once they're published.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Does that satisfy you?

**Mr. Jack Harris:** It satisfied me.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Pam, are you calling for the vote, or do you want to speak?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I'm sorry. I forgot to put my hand down, Chair.

We're going to vote.

**The Chair:** Okay. Do we need a recorded vote?

(Amendment negated)

**The Chair:** We're now on the main motion, as proposed.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Can we get a recorded vote, Chair?

**The Chair:** We can, indeed.

(Motion as amended agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** That was a painful path to unanimity, but here we are.

As I was about to go into in camera, can you give us instructions on that, Mr. Clerk?

**The Clerk:** Yes, Mr. Chair.

You will need to suspend the meeting while we set up the in camera Zoom. I will now send out the connection information to all members about connecting to the Zoom meeting. It's a different Zoom, and it has the in camera protections afforded to it.

**The Chair:** With that, we are suspended. See you shortly.

[*Proceedings continue in camera*]





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

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

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

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

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

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

---

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