



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 075**

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

---

Chair: Mr. Kelly McCauley





## Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

• (1650)

[*English*]

**The Chair (Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC)):** I call this meeting to order.

Colleagues, welcome to meeting number 75 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates.

Pursuant to the motions adopted by the committee on Wednesday, January 18, 2023, and Monday, April 24, 2023, the committee is meeting on the study of federal government consulting contracts awarded to McKinsey & Company.

Pursuant to Standing Order 111.1(1), the order of reference from the House of Wednesday, June 7, 2023, and the motion adopted by the committee on Monday, June 19, 2023, the committee is also meeting to consider the nomination of Harriet Solloway for the position of Public Sector Integrity Commissioner.

Colleagues and witnesses, please do not put earpieces next to the microphones, as it causes feedback and potential injury. Apparently it is worse in this room than the others, so please be aware.

In accordance with our routine motion, I am informing the committee that all witnesses appearing by video conference have completed the required connection test in advance of the meeting.

We have three opening statements. First will be a short one from our law clerk. Then we will go to Mr. Shea, and then to Mr. Dermarkar.

Mr. Bédard, go ahead.

**Mr. Michel Bédard (Interim Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel, House of Commons):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

You asked me to explain and clarify the right of the House and its committees to send for papers and records.

This right to send for papers and records is one of the parliamentary privileges that the House of Commons and its committees have. This power is constitutional in nature, and it is subject only to the limitation that Parliament, the House or the committees will impose on themselves.

When requesting documents, sometimes a committee may be faced with a confidentiality claim. In such circumstances, the committee may decide to put measures in place to protect sensitive information; it may decide to no longer insist on its production order; or it may decide to insist on its production order and insist on the

production of documents unredacted. Ultimately, it's for the committee to decide what option it wants to choose.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Bédard.

Mr. Shea, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Matthew Shea (Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet, Ministerial Services and Corporate Affairs, Privy Council Office):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good afternoon, members of the committee.

[*English*]

Thank you for inviting the Privy Council Office to return to provide you with further information and respond to your questions about the government's response to the motion for the production of documents concerning contracts awarded to McKinsey & Company.

My name is Matthew Shea, and I am the assistant secretary to the cabinet, ministerial services and corporate affairs at the Privy Council Office.

I would like to keep my opening remarks short to allow greater time for questions. I also delivered opening remarks when I last appeared before this committee, on June 5, 2023, which can be referenced.

The Privy Council Office understands and respects the role of Parliament in holding government to account and is committed to providing information to parliamentarians in a transparent manner. As has been the approach of successive governments, we must balance this commitment to transparency with the need to maintain the confidentiality of certain types of information.

[*Translation*]

We welcome opportunities to work with parliamentary committees to explore ways in which we can balance these two priorities and share information.

[*English*]

The Privy Council Office issued one sole-source, non-competitive contract to McKinsey in 2017, in the amount of \$24,747, during the period for which the records were requested. The Privy Council Office submitted all its documents in both official languages on February 22, 2023. Of the 280 pages submitted, redactions remain in only two paragraphs that relate to cabinet confidence.

[Translation]

Mr. Chair, committee members, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you again today.

I look forward to answering your questions alongside my colleagues.

[English]

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

Mr. Dermarkar, go ahead, please.

**Mr. Fred Dermarkar (President and Chief Executive Officer, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1655)

[Translation]

Good afternoon, everyone.

I am Fred Dermarkar, president and CEO of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, a federal Crown corporation that works to advance Canada's interests through leading-edge nuclear science and technology and environmental protection initiatives.

Our work at the Chalk River Laboratories led to the development of the home-grown CANDU nuclear reactor technology.

Today, we are a lean, flat, commercially-oriented Crown corporation that adapts to the demands of the market and the government and works with the private sector to achieve our mandate.

[English]

The Government of Canada is committed to achieving net-zero emissions by 2050, which requires all solutions, including nuclear technologies. AECL is investing in ways to apply nuclear technologies to help achieve Canada's goals, including CANDU reactor technology, which has proven itself as one of the top-performing reactor technologies in the world today, as well as small modular reactors.

Our recent work with McKinsey analyzed the potential role of nuclear and compared different reactor systems, including our very own CANDU reactors. The report prepared by McKinsey has been used to inform AECL's strategic plan and future work in support of the government's objectives to achieve net zero by 2050. This report underlined the significant potential of nuclear technology, particularly CANDU technology, to address Canada's climate change goals in the context of a focus on energy security, supply chain resilience and economic development.

Nuclear energy not only advances climate goals and provides energy security, but it contributes to Canada's GDP and employment.

[Translation]

The nuclear sector in Canada today accounts for 76,000 jobs across Canada and adds \$17 billion per year to Canada's GDP.

We can leverage decades of investment in CANDU technology and intellectual property, create additional economic and energy security benefits for Canada, position the innovative next-generation CANDU for export, and cement Canada's leadership in an area that is critical to our future prosperity.

I am available to answer any questions that the committee may have.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you, sir.

We'll start our first round with Mr. Barrett for six minutes, please.

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

Thanks to the witnesses for being here.

My first question is for Mr. Bédard.

Is there a limit or a legal restriction as determined by Canadian courts on the power of parliamentary committees to order the production of papers?

**Mr. Michel Bédard:** The courts have recognized the existence of the power to send for records and papers. In parliamentary privilege jurisprudence, they have recognized that the exercise of the privilege itself is not something that is subject to court scrutiny. The manner in which the privilege is exercised is for Parliament alone to decide and, in recognizing the power to send for records and papers, they haven't set any limit to this privilege.

**Mr. Michael Barrett:** How would you characterize a scenario where a committee of Canada's House of Commons ordered the production of papers, and the entity from which the production was requested did not comply? How is that characterized? Is that a breach of the privilege of the House of Commons? Does it rise to being illegal? How is that characterized?

**Mr. Michel Bédard:** When there is a production order from a committee and their concerns are raised with respect to some of the information that is sought, the entity from which the information is requested may try to put in place or suggest some measures to protect the information for which they have concern. The committee may decide to accept those measures, may accept to no longer insist on the production order, or may decide to insist on the production of all the information unredacted. If this is the case, and the order of the committee is not complied with, the committee can report back to the House. Based on the committee's report, this could be raised as a question of privilege in the chamber.

• (1700)

**Mr. Michael Barrett:** That's the appropriate venue for it to be escalated should the committee's request not be satisfied.

**Mr. Michel Bédard:** That's correct. The committee has the power to adopt an order for the production of documents but does not have the power to sanction. That power belongs to the House, and the proper process is for the committee to report to the House, and then a question of privilege can be raised and the Speaker will rule on the matter.

**Mr. Michael Barrett:** Thank you.

Mr. Shea, did PCO direct departments or anyone within PCO to defy the will of this committee?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** PCO did not direct any department nor its own employees to defy the will of the committee. However, PCO has used the same long-standing approach to the redaction of its own documents and would give the same advice to others.

There are long-standing principles used by successive governments, which limit the information that is provided.

**Mr. Michael Barrett:** The committee ordered the production of documents, and PCO did not meet the request. We heard testimony yesterday, or we heard read into the record access to information results, an email from PCO that explained there was no attempt to satisfy the production order of the committee.

Are you familiar with the email that I'm referring to?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I have not seen the email. I do not believe it has been provided to us.

My understanding is that there was an email that was referred to, if it is the one I'm thinking of, that was between Paul MacKinnon and Maia Welbourne. Is that the email you're referring to?

**Mr. Michael Barrett:** Yes.

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** Maia Welbourne left PCO in advance of when this particular parliamentary motion took place. While I have not seen the email, I can say with confidence that it would not relate to this particular motion, as she was not a PCO employee at the time.

**Mr. Michael Barrett:** What it relates to, sir, is the attitude of PCO to defy the obligation of your department to honour the responsibility that you have when an order of a committee of Parliament is made for you to produce documents.

It's not subject to any test that you choose to apply to it, or if you look to past practices of your predecessors or other individuals. That's not the test that needs to apply. The test that needs to apply is that we have the power, as Parliament, to request those documents. Your failure to produce them is a breach of the privileges of Canada's Parliament.

What happens when you do that, as a department, when PCO does that or agents acting on behalf of PCO do that...and they do it during successive governments. They say, "Look, we've been doing this for a long time." I don't think that's an encouraging sign to Canadians. I don't think it's an honourable defence for someone to say, "Well, we've been breaking the law for 10 years. There are lots of different people who held elected office over the course of 10 years and we got away with it, so we're going to continue to do it."

That's the precedent that has been established. There are hundreds of years of precedent that this law has existed under. Parli-

mentary privilege is not subjected to tests applied by PCO or by departments. It is a question that has been settled in law. I have not heard an argument from you that excuses you from your responsibility to furnish this committee with those documents.

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

Mr. Kusmierczyk, go ahead.

**Mr. Irek Kusmierczyk (Windsor—Tecumseh, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have a couple of questions regarding the costs. This is a question for Ms. Bernier and the Public Sector Pension Investment Board.

First of all, can you tell us a little bit about the Public Sector Pension Investment Board and what this organization does?

**Ms. Mélanie Bernier (Senior Vice-President and Chief Legal and People Officer, Public Sector Pension Investment Board):** Yes, thank you for your question.

PSP is a Crown corporation that operates at arm's length from the government. Our mandate is part of our constituting act. It is to invest the funds that are transferred to us from the government in the best interests of the beneficiaries and the contributors and to maximize return without undue risk of loss.

We invest globally around the world in different sectors and industries in order to achieve our mandate.

• (1705)

**Mr. Irek Kusmierczyk:** Who are you managing these investments for? Could you repeat that?

**Ms. Mélanie Bernier:** We are managing the amounts that are transferred from the government for the funding of the post-April 1, 2000, liabilities for the pension plans of the federal public service of Canada, the Canadian Forces, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and, since March 1, 2007, the reserve force, as well.

**Mr. Irek Kusmierczyk:** We've heard that translations, although they are necessary, are very costly. The PBO indicated that over \$8.2 million has been spent on translations on this production of documents to this point.

Can you tell us a little bit about how much your organization has spent on translations to this point?

**Ms. Mélanie Bernier:** We have encountered some challenges in the translation of these documents. We had communicated with the translation bureau, who were not able to support us in the translations for this request.

We have also reached out to all of our networks of translators, who have also informed us that they didn't have the ability to deliver in the time frame we had available to us, so we had to find new translation resources. That, unfortunately, did not end up having the quality to meet our expectations or to meet the timing we had. We ended up doing a portion of that translation internally with our own resources.

**Mr. Irek Kusmierczyk:** Is this money that's coming from federal public servants' retirement funds?

**Ms. Mélanie Bernier:** These expenses on translation are part of our operating costs and, yes, they are paid from the money that goes to the pensions.

**Mr. Irek Kusmierczyk:** That is most unfortunate. That money should be staying to support our hard-working federal public servants who have retired.

Thank you very much for that.

Mr. Chair, I would yield my time to my colleague Mr. Housefather.

**The Chair:** Thanks.

You have about two and a half minutes, Mr. Housefather.

**Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Shea, I want to come back to something you just said, which preoccupies me. Did you say that Ms. Welbourne did not work at PCO this year at all?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I can confirm the exact date, but I believe she left at the end of the last calendar year.

**Mr. Anthony Housefather:** At the last meeting, if you look at the blues, Mrs. Kusie stated that this email was from June 6, around the time we had the first group of departments appearing before the committee on McKinsey redactions on June 5, 2023.

Mr. Shea, is it possible that Ms. Welbourne could have sent this email from PCO on June 6, 2023?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** It is not possible.

**Mr. Anthony Housefather:** It's very interesting how this committee may have been misled at the last meeting, given the fact that this email was clearly indicated to the committee as related to this set of documents and came around the time of the first group of departments appearing before the committee.

Mr. Chair, I would again make the request that Mrs. Kusie turn over that document that she referenced to the committee. Can I ask for unanimous consent for her to do that, please?

**Mr. Michael Barrett:** You should ask for PCO to table it and see how long it takes them to get—

**The Chair:** I don't think so, Mr. Housefather. Perhaps you'll return to your questioning.

**Mr. Anthony Housefather:** Certainly.

Mr. Shea, does it disturb you that a member of this committee would attempt to imply that PCO took this attitude towards documents when this email does not seem to have been related to these documents?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I have not seen the reference that you mentioned. I heard that there was an email referred to.

All I can say is that we have looked, and we are confident that Ms. Welbourne did not work at PCO at the time. We would happily provide any email, if we could find it, that was related to that, but we have no such email that we can find.

**Mr. Anthony Housefather:** Thank you very much.

Perhaps my last point is this: Can you just confirm to the committee in writing, then, that Ms. Welbourne did not work there in June 2023?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I can confirm, and I have already confirmed that she left in December 2022.

**Mr. Anthony Housefather:** Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné, it's a pleasure to have you at OGGO with us instead of our usual time together at the public accounts committee.

You have six minutes.

• (1710)

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné (Terrebonne, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and hello to my colleagues.

I want to thank the witnesses for joining us today.

As the chair just mentioned, I am vice-chair of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, so if there's one thing I can do for this committee, despite not having attended the previous meetings, it's add some perspective.

At the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, I introduced a motion that was adopted unanimously, calling on the government to produce, by a certain deadline, the unredacted contracts with pharmaceutical companies from which it had purchased COVID-19 vaccines. Before the deadline, we received all the contracts signed with the six pharmaceutical companies from Public Services and Procurement Canada, and those contracts were unredacted.

Why was the Standing Committee on Public Accounts able to adopt this motion and get Public Services and Procurement Canada to comply with our request for such sensitive contracts, when a similar motion moved at this committee didn't meet with the same response, the same level of satisfaction or, most importantly, the same success rate? When I look at the documents that were produced and I see how much was redacted by the government, whereas McKinsey sent in unredacted documents, I can't help but ask myself some questions. Is it due to bad faith or incompetence? I would rather it was the first and that it could be fixed so that this committee could finally get access to the documents it requested. The law clerk just reiterated that this committee has the right to make such requests.

I'm going to start with you, Mr. Shea. At the last meeting, I gather that you said the documents had been sent over redacted, in accordance with the instructions Mr. Harper had given when he was in office.

Is that right, Mr. Shea?

[English]

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I believe what you're referring to is that, at the last committee, I quoted from "Open and Accountable Government". I'm happy to read that passage again if you would like me to. Ultimately, what I indicated was that it was from 2011 and was approved by the Prime Minister at the time. It was to guide how the public service and ministers should interact with parliamentary committees.

What I indicated was that in 2015, when the current Prime Minister approved "Open and Accountable Government", that exact same passage was there. The message from me was that successive governments have given the exact same edict to members of the public service and to ministers about how to interact with committees, in keeping with what previous governments have done as well.

[Translation]

**Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné:** Okay, thanks.

It's 2023 now. Regardless of what happened in 2011 and 2015, this Parliament has rights that take precedence over whatever edicts may have been given in the past. If this committee requests certain documents, under its parliamentary privilege, it's reasonable for public servants to comply.

Mr. Shea, I'll start with you, if you don't mind.

Can you confirm, or rather explain to me in a few words, because I don't have much time, why you weren't able to produce the unredacted documents requested by this committee by the prescribed deadline?

[English]

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** We respectfully understand the position of the law clerk and what has been explained to this committee, and our approach to the production of documents is sensitive to the powers of the House of Commons and its committees to request production of documents and the role of members of the House of Commons in holding the government to account.

However, the public service's position is animated by other considerations, including respect for other laws enacted by Parliament. Successive governments have taken the view that laws enacted by Parliament itself prohibit the disclosure of certain types of documents.

Going back to my last appearance, we talked about some of the initial redactions from the Privy Council Office documents that were around commercial sensitivities and around privacy. The Privacy Act explicitly prevents us from being able to share that information without the consent of the individual. What we did at PCO is that we actually went to the individual to seek that consent, in keeping with the law—

[Translation]

**Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné:** I apologize for interrupting you, Mr. Shea, but I don't have much time and I just wanted to comment on what you said.

I still say that parliamentary privilege supersedes the things you just mentioned, and that's why the Standing Committee on Public Accounts was able to get access to the highly confidential vaccine

purchasing contracts between the government and the pharmaceutical companies. We were able to get them because at that moment, as Mr. Housefather can also attest, since he was there too, there was trust in our committee.

Do you distrust this particular committee or any particular members?

• (1715)

[English]

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I reflected in the last appearance...and when I read "Open and Accountable Government", the very end of it talks about the importance of "Members of Parliament, in cooperation with Ministers and their offices, to find ways to respond to legitimate requests for information from Members of Parliament, within the limitations placed on them."

A big part, with any of these requests, is the importance of, as a government, our working with the committee to try to find solutions. I think there have been a number of examples in recent history where we have worked as a government with committees to try to find solutions to give access to national security information or other types of information using other methodologies and being creative where possible.

My response to this committee would be that we remain open to finding solutions to make sure that you get the information you need.

I do want to reiterate that, in the case of the PCO—

**The Chair:** That is our time. I gave you a few extra moments, Mr. Shea. We'll have another round, though.

Mr. Johns, we'll go over to you for six minutes.

**Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** I appreciate that line of questioning. I'm going to stay on that, actually.

In terms of ways to work with the committee, what efforts have you made to work with the committee in terms of the concerns the committee has raised around the redactions that are there right now?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I can't speak to the work with this committee, as it's a different part of the Privy Council Office. I was called a couple of weeks ago, and I've come today. I can speak to other examples where we have sought to provide information.

As recently as February 13, 2023, the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs adopted a motion for the production of papers, requesting that VAC provide, and create if necessary, a transcript of recorded telephone conversations from January 25. What was key to that was that, in negotiation with the department, it added to that order, furthermore, that VAC redact from the transcript any personal, identifiable information.

Our proposal would be that, in any case where it's possible, we would like to work with the committee to suggest potential redactions that would ensure that it gets all of the information it needs while respecting some of the other key limitations we may have in trying to follow other laws that we are governed by as a government.

**Mr. Gord Johns:** The Conservatives brought forward “Accountable Government”. They brought forward this document for the redactions under Stephen Harper and his government. Who was the minister who led that charge in the Conservative government?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I apologize. I do not know which minister led it. However, it would have been the Prime Minister who approved it. It would normally be the Privy Council Office that worked with the Prime Minister's Office to draft it, and it would, ultimately, have been approved by the Prime Minister.

**Mr. Gord Johns:** What were the Conservatives doing? Why were they so afraid of committees and parliamentarians fully getting access to information? Why were they gatekeeping it and road-stopping?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I do not believe that to be the case.

I believe that “Open and Accountable Government” is about being open and accountable but respecting the fact that there are other laws, other policies and other considerations. “Open and Accountable Government” covers far more than just the redaction of documents; it talks about the interaction between the public service and the ministers, which we talked about at the last appearance when I was here. We were asked questions about whether there was political interference with this. The answer was no. That would also go back to “Open and Accountable Government” and the principles—

**Mr. Gord Johns:** Obviously, today we're hearing concerns from the Conservatives about policies they brought in that are now not working in their favour. Would it make sense for this committee to do a study on open and accountable government so that we can have a better depth of understanding of this policy that's been brought forward? Clearly, there needs to be another look at it because no one here is happy about it. Do you think it would be a good idea for this committee to study it?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I would not have an opinion on the work this committee should undertake.

**Mr. Gord Johns:** Okay.

There are 220,000 pages produced so far. Have you ever seen anything like this in your time at the Privy Council Office?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I cannot specifically recall one with this many pages, but it's worth noting that this is 20 different departments. The Privy Council's number of pages is 280—it's not that amount—so this has not been a huge burden for the Privy Council Office, as I mentioned at the last—

**Mr. Gord Johns:** However, for the departments, it has been. Ms. Bernier explained this. Do you think the amount of time we've given to these departments to produce these documents has been reasonable? I mean, it's 220,000 pages. We did an analysis of that. Just scanning it at 30 seconds per page would take a full-time employee 1,832 hours—a year. My team can't do it. So for producing them, we're talking in the millions. We know it's \$8 million, from PSPC, just to translate.

Ms. Bernier, can you give us an idea of how much it costs for your team to translate these?

● (1720)

**Ms. Mélanie Bernier:** With regard to translation, as I mentioned earlier, obviously there is a lot of work that goes into this with the scope of these kinds of requests.

We're still working through a second submission, so those are not included. As mentioned earlier, there's significant effort that's being put into this. For the translation, we are at \$178,745.

**Mr. Gord Johns:** That's going to come out of what would go to pensioners.

This is the problem I have. We did this study to look at highly paid consultants. Now we're way off track from where we were going.

I put forward a motion to expand it and include the other five highly paid consulting firms, which are getting much more money than McKinsey. I didn't ask for every single document, because I was worried about the costs associated with that and the demands. We have a pretty good idea that they're skyrocketing. The government is basically privatizing work that should be in the public service. I have concerns around that.

I have real concerns about the cost of how this is happening for taxpayers. I'm deeply concerned about that. I'm deeply concerned about redaction and how we walk through this. I'm looking for some solutions, some sort of pathway to find a bridge between this committee and government so we can get the answers we need.

Certainly, I'm really concerned about the fact that we've spent 13 meetings now just on McKinsey. We haven't even gotten to Deloitte, PricewaterhouseCoopers and the rest of them. This is 13 meetings. We're at nine studies in this committee. We haven't produced a single report, because we're going down rabbit holes.

I'd like to find a pathway here so we don't spend more time on this and we can get some answers. Do you have any ideas?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** As I mentioned, I think working with departments to try to scope the requests—

**The Chair:** Mr. Shea, I'm afraid that is our time. Perhaps we can get back to it at Mr. Johns' next intervention.

Mrs. Kusie, you have five minutes, please.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC):** Thank you very much.

First of all, Mr. Shea, who is Maia Welbourne?



**Mr. Matthew Shea:** She was previously the assistant secretary to cabinet for legislative and House planning. She has since left PCO, as I mentioned.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** Who took her place?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** Julia Aceti.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** Who does Julia Aceti report to?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** Paul Mackinnon.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** Okay, and what is Paul Mackinnon's role?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** He's the deputy secretary to cabinet for governance, which includes machinery of government, as well as the legislative House planning role.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** Okay, so that would be out of the PCO.

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** That would be out of the PCO.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** I have a document here, which I read in to the record last time. It is out of the PCO. Paul Mackinnon is still at the PCO.

I'm going to ask you, Monsieur Bédard, are we entitled to these documents? It was this opposition that passed the motion to have the documents. Are we entitled to those documents, since we passed a motion that we should have those documents?

**Mr. Michel Bédard:** Provided the document that you're referring to falls within an order that has been adopted by the committee—

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** That's right, an order was adopted.

**Mr. Michel Bédard:** —then the committee is entitled to the document.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** That's right.

An order was adopted that says we are entitled to these documents, yet I have here a note to Mr. Mackinnon from Maia. She was informing Mr. Mackinnon, who is still at the PCO under this branch that is here today. I'll read it again. It says, "The government considers it non-binding if Parliament does. If government doesn't produce documents as ordered by the House, then the matter can be escalated in a number of different ways, including as far as finding the government is in contempt, a minister or official being called to the bar, a non-confidence vote". This is the same kind of scenario as last June with Iain Stewart being called to the bar. As my colleague, Mr. Barrett, pointed out, this was a conversation with someone who is still in the PCO.

Are you on the same page as Paul Mackinnon? Do you have meetings with Mr. Mackinnon in terms of determining where your direction comes from? If you are on the same page as Mr. Mackinnon, then the decisions of this committee are not binding. It's very clear to me from this email where the PCO takes their direction. It's not from this committee. It's not from parliamentarians. It's from the government. It's very clear by this document here.

I think anyone from any party, in particular the government, is obstructing democracy by saying that we would not be entitled to these documents. Yet, it seems that this is what is going on at the PCO. Again, I remind all opposition members that we were the ones, on this side of the House, who made the decision to have

these documents come from the government in a completely unredacted form and in both official languages.

Mr. Chair, I'm going to take this time now to present another motion, if I may.

• (1725)

**The Chair:** Read the motion, please.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** Thank you very much.

The motion reads as follows:

That, further to the evidence received by the committee pursuant to the motion adopted on Monday, April 24, 2023, and in relation to the redactions and improper translation of documents received by the committee pursuant to the order for production of documents adopted by the committee on Wednesday, January 18, 2023, the committee is of the opinion that there is a potential breach of privilege which must be reported to the House, and therefore,

a) The draft report prepared by the analysts on this issue be amended to identify the following departments, agencies and crown corporations that did not comply with the committee's order to produce unredacted documents, or did not adequately translate documents prior to their submission,

Atomic Energy of Canada Limited

Business Development Bank of Canada

Canada Border Services Agency

Canada Development Investment Corporation

Canada Pension Plan Investment Board

Canada Post

Destination Canada

Department of Finance Canada

Employment and Social Development Canada

Export Development Canada

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada

Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada

National Defence

Natural Resources Canada

Office of the Veterans Ombud (Veterans Affairs Canada)

Privy Council Office

That's no surprise.

Public Sector Pension Investment Board

Public Services and Procurement Canada

TransMountain Corporation;

b) The draft report, as amended, be adopted;

c) The report be entitled: Question of Privilege on Providing Documents to the Committee;

d) The Chair, Clerk and analysts be authorized to make such grammatical and editorial changes as may be necessary without changing the substance of the report;

e) Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee request that the government table a comprehensive response to this report;

f) The dissenting or supplementary opinions be in Calibri 12-point font, left aligned, single-spaced, and be submitted electronically, in both official languages, to the clerk of the committee, not later than 4:00 p.m. on Friday, June 23 2023;

g) And that the Chair present this report to the House at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Chair, again, we have requested these documents three times. I would remind my opposition colleagues that we would not have had to spend so much time on this matter had we just received the documents properly translated and in an unredacted form. Alas, we did not. We did not for reasons of the government as well as opposition members. That's why we continue on this. The first time was on January 18. The second time was a March 5 request by the chair. The third time was on March 8.

I will also say that we had such a delay, our poor analysts had to redraft the report a second time, wasting their time as well. If we had just dealt with the matter at hand, which was getting the documents that we were entitled to as parliamentarians, having passed a motion, with all opposition parties at that time in agreement.... I'm not sure why things changed. I guess it's like a relationship; things change sometimes.

We don't have those documents. As such, we unfortunately find ourselves in this position today.

[Translation]

I know that Ms. Vignola has also pointed out several times that we unfortunately didn't get the documents in both official languages. She also said that the quality of the translated French wasn't as good as the English.

[English]

That is a shame as well.

Mr. Chair, I'm putting this forward today. This is despite the government not wanting us to see these documents. It is evident that this is happening. It is evident that this is happening at the highest level of government with the PCO here today. Despite that, and despite opposition members who were once on board with transparency in the fight against a company that is corrupt, a company that has fuelled the opioid crisis, something that I thought the member on this side of the table was committed to getting to the bottom of and solving, here we are—

**Mr. Gord Johns:** [Inaudible—Editor]

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** Yes, that's all there is to do at this point—laugh—because of the place we're at now. All we can do is laugh.

But I'm not going to sit here and laugh, Mr. Chair. I'm going to, once again, through this motion, ask the committee to pass this motion to get the documents. I have some clues as to what will go on, but I think Canadians will see, again, the obstruction of information that is occurring at the highest levels in coordination with the coalition.

I'll leave it there, Mr. Chair. Thank you very much.

• (1730)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

The motion is in order.

I've started a speaking list. We have Mr. Barrett, Mr. Johns, Mr. Housefather and then Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné.

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

Thanks to my colleague Mrs. Kusie for this motion.

We've been dealing with this for some time. There was a lot of discussion about the volume of documents requested and the amount of time it has taken, but it was an order of the committee that the documents be produced.

There are a lot of great things parliamentary committees can do, and there are matters still under review by the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates that can be completed over this term of Parliament. However, the situation we're faced with is this: If we undertake a study on diversity in procurement or on shipbuilding, or one that expands to Deloitte, KPMG and Price-waterhouseCoopers.... If we want to review the criteria used by government to award contracts, and whether these should be awarded to companies that have been involved in supercharging opioid sales in other countries and attempting to do so in this country; that have engaged in fraudulent practices in other countries; that have been involved in election interference; that are so morally bankrupt as to hold a corporate retreat adjacent to concentration camps—specifically in an area where Canada's Parliament is said to have been—where a genocide is occurring.... If we want to look at any of those things....

If the committee wants to ask for any documents but is content with the entities from which we ask for documents just saying, "Well, it's private information, so we don't want to share it with you", so it's case closed and Parliament doesn't need to look at it, if that's what we're content with, we can dispose of this motion, move on to those other things and not get to see anything the people we are studying or investigating don't want us to see. We're going to be pretty ineffective.

That will survive not just in this Parliament and government but also in governments into the future. Witnesses today have talked about departmental plans and government position papers from more than a decade ago. If we want to use and rely on those—the current government claimed they would do better than that, because they didn't like the conditions as they existed, but then they did the exact same thing—we're going to keep getting the same results.

It would be astonishing—and I'm frightened at the thought—to find ourselves with a single party in government forever in this country. If we don't want to improve on what happened a decade ago under a previous government, or on what's happening with this government, how could Canadians possibly expect there will be an improvement on that with future governments, particularly if the opposition sees its document production requests not being met? They will say, "We want to continue to look into things, but the government is obviously obstructing information from Parliament." That's what's going to happen with a future government.

If we don't have the opportunity to fix it and demonstrate to departments that they're not allowed to continue to do what they claim they've always done.... "That person doesn't work here anymore, so we're not responsible for them saying our department doesn't believe the committee actually has the juice to get these documents from us. What are you going to do?" That was the gist of the email Mrs. Kusie read. I guess they're about to find out what we're going to do.

The dollars or time spent on the document production is not the issue that was raised in the failure to produce the information in the form it was ordered in by this committee. It's their refusal to give us the information. Please, I stand to be corrected by you, Chair, by the analysts, by the witnesses or anyone who is listed here that the only impediment to their meeting the request of this committee is time and money. That's not what we're hearing.

● (1735)

If they're saying that they need a little more time and that they're prepared to give us the documents as they become available, then we should remove those entities one by one from the list, but that's not what we're hearing. They have a different set of rules they are looking to operate by from those that Canada's Parliament operates by.

I don't work at PCO. I work for Canadians, and we have laws that allow us to order these documents. We're seeing that the servants are becoming the masters of Parliament. That's not the position we want to find ourselves in. I don't like to be there as an opposition member; I wouldn't want to be there on the government side, either. That's not how this place is supposed to work.

We had this discussion at committee. We had this discussion amongst this group several months ago—about more time. First, write them a letter and tell them we're about to take the next step. That was the request from Mr. Kusmierczyk. That was his request. I protested. I said they'd had enough time. However, just because you get your say, that doesn't mean you get your way, so we gave them more time.

Mr. Johns said he wanted to see them here and wanted to ask them questions. I protested. I thought it was sufficient that the powers are established that we're able to order these documents, but here we are and we have asked for them all to come. I haven't heard anything different from what they've said to this point.

Those were the concerns raised by the fourth party and by the government: They wanted to give them more time and give them a chance, and they wanted to hear from them. Perhaps they would say something compelling.

I find myself not compelled by what they've said. In fact, I find myself distressed because this is going to be the state of play going forward—not just for the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates, but for all parliamentary committees. If they don't feel like giving us the information, they won't. That's what we're choosing to accept or not.

Mr. Housefather and Mr. Kusmierczyk, at our previous meeting this week, said there was concern that referring this to the House was an attempt to delay the business of the House. The relevance

and the importance of Parliament only exist if we actually protect the powers we have as legislators.

I undertook on Monday—having spoken to the House leader for His Majesty's loyal opposition—that this would not be raised before adjournment at the end of this week for the planned recess, if it was referred to the House. That wasn't to the satisfaction of government members, so I question their sincerity in raising that as their objection.

We have, Chair, checked all the boxes. We checked the box of giving the departments a lot more time. We checked the box of giving them the opportunity to come here individually to offer statements or remarks, expanding on their opportunity to correspond in writing with this committee.

● (1740)

The majority of the representatives from these organizations declined to even speak to the issue. They were given the opportunity to come, and they were given the time to produce the documents. We've had the legal opinion from the House, which is crystal clear, that we as a committee are, without restriction, entitled to these documents. Cost, time, care and control of the documents are not the issue. The issue is that these entities do not recognize the right of Parliament to require the production of these documents. That's what it comes down to. Either we're effective and we have the powers that have been given to us as a parliamentary standing committee, or we give them away.

Often in the House, when the opposition asks the government about what's going on at committee, the response is that committees are independent and masters of their own domain. There's no party line. There's no supply and confidence agreement that would weigh into this. It's strictly the opinion of the regular members of this committee—or the associate members, who are appropriately substituted onto the committee—that this does rise to affect our privileges as a committee.

This is the foundation on which all of the work that we do is built—our ability to actually get people to come and talk to us and give us the papers to read so that we can understand the issues.

I'm not a lawyer. We brought one today. He doesn't work for the opposition; he works for Canada's Parliament. We heard, in response to my questions of some of these same witnesses last week, that they're not lawyers, but they disagree with the one of Canada's Parliament. I'm going to err on the side of Canada's Parliament in this case. My understanding is supported by what we've heard from his testimony, and that's that the privileges of this committee have been violated, and the only way for us to redress this is for the matter to be referred to the House.

That's why I support this motion. I'm very concerned about our ability to meaningfully do any work for the remainder of this Parliament if we don't refer this matter to the House—but also in future Parliaments. I think that's the question we should be concerned with. That's the question, certainly, that I'm concerned with.

**The Chair:** Thanks, Mr. Barrett.

Mr. Johns, go ahead.

**Mr. Gord Johns:** The idea was to get witnesses to come here so we could ask them questions and get answers to try to find a pathway to a solution. Instead of doing that, we're debating this motion.

The Conservatives brought in the rules in 2010, and today they're kicking and screaming because the rules that they brought in don't work for them today. You can't make this stuff up. They're yelling and screaming at public servants because of the rules they brought in.

I don't like the rules, and it's interesting because Mr. Barrett talked about the history of government after government with these bad policies, and I agree. That's why the NDP wants their turn in government. We're working on that. As I'm getting heckled by the Conservatives, I will say this. There is some difference, but not a big difference, between Conservatives and Liberals. We just saw them work together on whistle-blowing to defeat a bunch of motions by the Bloc and the NDP to make sure that whistle-blowers have a better structure in terms of support and protection. We saw them gang up on that.

I will say this. Yes, I supported this motion, but I am embarrassed about the cost this has taken on the public servants, the delay in other work that they could be doing, the \$8 million just for translation from PSPC, the \$172,000 taken from pensioners when two paragraphs were missing out of 800-plus pages. This is not okay.

We're doing nine studies. We haven't completed one, not one. I'm embarrassed; I had a part in this. We had a part in this, but I would never, ever, go down this rabbit hole again. I'll tell you that right now.

We should be studying accountable government. If the Conservatives are so upset about the rules that they brought in, then let's look at them, but let's do it right. We can't do anything right here. We can't even do McKinsey and say here's a dissenting report, or here's a report that can include this concern as part of our main report. Even on the Governor General, motions start dropping in here ahead of the report. On McKinsey, more motions start, like, let's ban McKinsey.

Let's include it in the report. Let's actually do a report, something we can bring to the House, recommendations we could make to the government and then hold them to account. We can't do that, because no one wants to do it. Why even do studies if we're just going to play games here? This is out of control.

This idea around McKinsey and the toxic drug crisis, and even an attempt to shame me—

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** You should be ashamed.

**Mr. Gord Johns:** No, I am not ashamed, actually. I'm not ashamed by listening to experts—

● (1745)

**The Chair:** Let me interrupt, Mr. Johns.

Let me just say, colleagues, that Mr. Johns has the floor. I would ask everyone to allow him the floor.

**Mr. Gord Johns:** Thank you.

Mr. Chair, if we're going to ban McKinsey for their role in the toxic drug crisis, which might be a good recommendation for the report at this committee, then we should also, when we're doing the bigger report, look at some of those other highly paid consulting firms and look at their roles in some of the scandals that have happened in this country.

We have to make sure that we have some standards that are legitimate and that are across the whole spectrum, and that we have credibility. I'm not afraid of that, but to try to insinuate, first, that McKinsey is responsible for all of the toxic drug crisis is completely ludicrous. Bad drug policy is responsible for the toxic drug crisis that's killing people. Fentanyl entering the drugs that are on the street, the toxic drug crisis that's killing people, is clearly a result of failed drug policy.

What we've tried to do is bring forward policies that are recommended by experts, including the police chiefs' association, chief medical health officers across the country, the expert task force on substance use and experts across the country, but the Conservatives don't want to listen to them. They just want to say, "Let's put it all on McKinsey." They don't want to come back with a robust, comprehensive response to a complex issue.

It's not so simplistic. These issues are not simplistic.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** Without the documents—

**Mr. Gord Johns:** I'm sorry. I am getting heckled again by the Conservatives on this issue we are talking about today. This is policy and rules that the Conservatives brought in, and they are yelling at public servants, which is completely unacceptable—to yell at people. This is a committee. We are parliamentarians. Leadership means we have to work together through difficult times.

I think we should be getting back to the witnesses so we can ask them questions and then include the concerns, and what we hear, in the report. If most of this needs to go in the report, I'm fine with that, but to have this in the motion—to have dissenting opinions reported to the House 48 hours from now—is completely unreasonable. We have to get to reasonable.

I actually want to work with my colleagues here, who think that I don't. I actually do want to work with them. In my municipal government, in my little town of Tofino, we didn't even act like this. We asked staff to come back with a report. We looked at the report.

● (1750)

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** We did that—twice.

**Mr. Gord Johns:** We made decisions. I sat in local government. That's how it was.

We're Parliament. We're running a country. This is not okay.

That's all I have to say.

**The Chair:** Thanks, Mr. Johns.

Mr. Housefather, go ahead.

**Mr. Anthony Housefather:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I will try to be succinct. I have a few things I want to say, but I also want to get back to the witnesses who were called here today. We have many of them, and I think we should be using our time with the witnesses.

Mr. Chair, coming back to the question of... Something really important was raised by my colleague, Madame Sinclair-Desgagné: Why, in the public accounts committee, was it okay to obtain unredacted copies of the vaccine contracts? Why did I work with her and with you, sir, to get those? It's because it was something that was reasonable. It was something that was tailored and targeted, and there was a mechanism put in place that everybody agreed with and that ensured everything was kept confidential. It wasn't a fishing expedition of thousands and thousands of documents at huge cost and huge effort that kept the bureaucracy tied up for months and cost millions of dollars for translation. There were very specific contracts.

I agree with the principle that committees should be able to get the documents they ask for and that they should be able to work out a way to get them in an unredacted way. I believe that very strongly. I think we should be looking into the current procedures being used by the Privy Council Office and the departments and rethink them and make suggestions, but I don't think that what we did here was well thought through at all. If I could go back, I wouldn't vote for the motion the way it was, because it was clearly much more wide-ranging than I think any of us really understood at the time—certainly me.

The second thing, Mr. Chair, is that we've had a lot of outrage about documents being shared with certain redactions. This motion was raised by once again referring back to an email that I now have asked for copies of twice and both times have been refused, an email that at the previous meeting was used to clearly suggest that this was written in June of this year and tied to the McKinsey documents. It was again raised in the questioning to the Privy Council Office as a precursor for this motion. As opposed to receiving it redacted or unredacted, this committee has not received it at all. It hasn't been shared, even though it's being relied upon as the reason why the motion was brought forward.

I find it outrageous that in the last meeting I was clearly misled to believe that this document was written as an email about McKinsey, when the person who allegedly wrote it has not been with the Privy Council Office this year, and that email that we keep talking about has not been shared with the rest of us.

Mr. Chairman, given that, I move that the debate on the motion be adjourned so that we can return to the witnesses.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thanks, Mr. Housefather.

That is a dilatory motion, so we will go to an immediate vote.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 6; nays 4)

**The Chair:** Colleagues, we will get back to the debate.

We're finishing at 6:55 today, so if we wish to have time with our nominee, we will end this round with the witnesses at about 6:20.

Mr. Bains, you are up for five minutes.

• (1755)

**Mr. Parm Bains (Steveston—Richmond East, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'll be sharing some of my time with my colleague Mr. Kusmierczyk.

Thank you, witnesses, for waiting patiently for us to get back to our questions here.

At issue is that a significant portion of the documents are being provided with redactions. Can you explain what the redactions are for, Mr. Shea, and whether these redactions impact the documents in such a way as to interfere with this committee's study on McKinsey & Company?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I have not seen all the documents. I can speak for the Privy Council Office. We have two paragraphs that are redacted for cabinet confidence; they relate to a meeting in which there was a reference to a cabinet confidence. They do not materially impact the documents in any way. We have fully provided translated and unredacted documents as they relate to all McKinsey contracts.

**Mr. Parm Bains:** McKinsey provided all of their documentation unredacted. Have any attempts been made to reconcile this with your own production of papers?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I believe what you're asking is why we redacted it and they did not. We are bound by privacy policies and other policies. As I mentioned earlier, we cannot release commercially sensitive information without the permission of the company. We cannot release private information without the consent of the individual. We as a government rely on the trust of companies, of citizens and of individuals to provide us with their private information, and we safeguard that and follow the laws.

In the case of the Privy Council Office, once we learned that McKinsey was willing to have theirs unredacted, we of course unredacted their information with their consent.

As for the other two pieces of personal information we had redacted, we redacted two signatures related to the contract by public servants, but not the names. It was very transparent who had signed the contract, but the actual signature.... You can appreciate, in light of identity theft and other reasons, why someone would want to protect their signature. Nevertheless, we asked those public servants whether they would be willing to allow us to unredact that to be fully transparent to the committee. They, of course, would have had the ability to say no. Both absolutely said yes right away, and we have unredacted those as well.

So we are left with just those two paragraphs, which we do not believe in any way change the interpretation of the documents or the clarity of the documents.

**Mr. Parm Bains:** I'll go to Mr. Dermarkar with the same questions, and then I'll go to my colleague here.

**Mr. Fred Dermarkar:** I'd like to say that AECL's original submissions contained very few redactions to begin with. After the committee's request, we submitted an updated package that removed virtually all the remaining redactions. Only a very small percentage of the documentation is redacted—approximately one page out of more than 150 pages of documents. The small number of remaining redactions protect third party information not originating from McKinsey that is commercially sensitive and that relates to federal-provincial relations.

The other previously redacted information that was subsequently provided includes personal information and banking information. We highlighted this information in yellow so you could see it and we identified that we would want the committee to redact this information should they choose to share it more broadly outside of the committee's membership.

**Mr. Parm Bains:** Okay.

I have one final question for Mr. Shea. Can we please ask PCO officials to undertake to find the email mentioned by our colleague Mrs. Kusie and to then submit it to the committee?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** It is difficult for me to commit to doing that without knowledge of the information. I don't know the date of the email. I don't have any information that would allow us to find it. We have attempted to find it based on what we heard at a previous meeting. We have found no such email and certainly not in the June time frame, as I mentioned.

Ms. Welbourne did not work at PCO at the time. We would happily work with the committee to try to provide the email if we had more information from the member who has, apparently, this email through an ATIP.

**Mr. Parm Bains:** Go ahead, Mr. Kusmierczyk.

**The Chair:** You have about a minute and 45 seconds.

**Mr. Irek Kusmierczyk:** I was just going to say that we've had 13 meetings now on McKinsey and 45 witnesses. The Conservative colleagues have now led us on what is an expensive fishing expedition, and it's netted not a single minnow of evidence at all that there was anything untoward—

• (1800)

**Mr. Michael Barrett:** Let us see the documents.

**Mr. Irek Kusmierczyk:**—happening here.

Obviously, we've heard about the tremendous costs to organizations like the Public Sector Pension Investment Board in terms of actual money. Ms. Bernier, can you speak, as well, to opportunity cost in terms of resources that have been directed away from the day-to-day work you conduct on behalf of your members?

**The Chair:** You have about 20 seconds, Ms. Bernier. Please be brief.

**Ms. Mélanie Bernier:** I don't have the number of employees specifically who have been on this, but significant resources have been dedicated to complying with the requests of the committee to make sure we also proceed diligently. So, of course, this is time and attention that is taken away from our normal investment activities that are dedicated to achieving our mandate.

**Mr. Irek Kusmierczyk:** I have the same question for Mr. Ledwell from Veterans Affairs—

**The Chair:** Thank you very much. That is your time.

You're welcome to respond in writing to the committee if you wish.

Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné, you have two and a half minutes, please.

[*Translation*]

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

I'm surprised by the absurd arguments I'm hearing today, and that's coming from someone who sits on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, where things aren't always rosy either.

The last argument I heard was about the past....

The member opposite who just asked some questions, but who is now looking at his phone, could he just stop and think for two seconds about the amount of resources needed to redact documents rather than submit them as is? Is he taking into account all the time it takes for someone to go through a document and decide which parts should or should not be redacted? It's completely absurd. It's my first time sitting on this committee, and I'm flabbergasted.

Now I'm going to respond to Mr. Housefather's comments.

I agree with you, Mr. Housefather, that our request was certainly more concise. The root of the problem may indeed lie in the sheer number of contracts awarded to firms like McKinsey, PricewaterhouseCoopers and Deloitte. In the interest of being constructive, maybe the committee should just start somewhere. For instance, it could ask the departments to send it the McKinsey documents from a certain year, and it could set a deadline for the other years. Two months later, they could submit the documents from another year, and so on and so on. Maybe that would give the committee and its members a break.

If everyone were acting in good faith, that's probably what would happen immediately. But that's not at all what we're seeing. We're seeing people coming out with absurd arguments about how much time all this is taking, even though they've spent more time debating these motions than actually reading the documents and doing their job.

The committee members should have looked at the documents and tried to answer one fundamental question: Why has spending on consulting firms skyrocketed since 2016? Spending is in the billions of dollars. All governments, including the Conservatives, have hired consulting firms. I think everyone here would agree that it's normal to hire them. However, spending on consulting firms has soared since 2016.

We have to wonder why this committee, which is the committee that should be doing this, still hasn't answered these questions. Why hasn't the committee received the unredacted documents it was requesting? I refuse to believe that it's due to incompetence.

I know that you're competent, so please show your good faith.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

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

**Mr. Gord Johns:** Let me get this straight. The Conservatives create this policy through open and accountable government. Now, obviously, documents are coming back. A couple of paragraphs are redacted just here today, which we're talking about.

Do you believe they would have known that this would happen—that there would be redactions coming back—given they designed the policy that is creating the redactions in the first place?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I think it would be well understood in the advice from the Privy Council Office that the reason to have this is to be clear what can be redacted, what cannot be redacted and what must be redacted. The goal, of course, is to minimize redactions to what is absolutely necessary. That is the advice the PCO provides to departments.

**Mr. Gord Johns:** You would think that the designers of this policy that has created the redactions would have a full understanding that there would be redactions because they designed the policy that would make sure there are redactions on things you have highlighted here around national security or privacy.

• (1805)

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** Yes. I believe those who drafted it and approved it would have not only anticipated it, but expected that those key things, like cabinet confidence and national security, would be protected.

**Mr. Gord Johns:** That we would be right here today, ending up in this very conversation, potentially.... This could be a strategy.

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I won't speak to strategy and how this would play out at a parliamentary committee.

**Mr. Gord Johns:** How do we move forward? I'm going to go back to that, Mr. Shea. How do we get a pathway through this?

Obviously, I think we need to study this terrible policy that was created by the Conservatives, which protects Liberals and Conser-

vatives when they are in government from getting information to the committee, to MPs and to the public.

How do we move forward in terms of the stalemate we're in right now at this committee in trying to get access to the information without tearing down government by requesting 220,000 pages to get to the bottom of what's going on here?

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I would not seek to give advice to the committee on how to move forward, but I would reiterate what I have said before.

We are happy to work with parliamentary committees. In fact, "Open and Accountable Government" encourages departments and ministers to work with parliamentary committees to find consensus and to find compromise.

As I reflected on my last appearance, I did look at previous rulings from the Speaker of the House. I know that was raised last time. I would note that in 2010, Speaker Milliken did give a ruling that talked about safeguarding this. He referred to *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, second edition, and quoted pages 1,068 and 1,069, which talked about how "[p]articular attention is paid to the questioning of public servants—

**The Chair:** That is our time, Mr. Shea.

Thanks very much.

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I'd be pleased to read that into the record later.

**The Chair:** Put it in writing and send it to us, please.

Mrs. Block, you have five minutes, please.

**Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Perhaps this is a good segue to the request I have of Mr. Shea. I would ask that Mr. Shea please provide us with the policy document that he's referencing and attributing to the Conservative Party.

If you wouldn't mind, could you send that to this committee so that we can take a look at it? It's the historical document that you've attributed to the Conservative Party of Canada.

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** If I could add clarity, it is not related to a party. It is related to the Government of Canada. It would have been the Conservative government, approved by the Prime Minister. It is not about the Conservative Party or the Liberal Party.

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** Fine. If you could send the document you've referenced that was created by the Government of Canada when the Conservatives were in government, I would appreciate that.

**Mr. Matthew Shea:** I would be pleased to do so.

**The Chair:** Thanks, Mrs. Block.

Mrs. Block yields her time.

Mr. Jowhari, go ahead.

**Mr. Majid Jowhari (Richmond Hill, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have a quick question for Ms. Wademan, and then a request for Mr. Shea.

Ms. Wademan, I understand that you are the CEO of the Canada Development Investment Corporation. Can you briefly tell us what your mandate is and why you felt that those redactions were needed because it may be impacting your mandate?

**Ms. Elizabeth Wademan (President and Chief Executive Officer, Canada Development Investment Corporation):** CDEV is a federal Crown corporation that provides specialized financial advice to the Department of Finance. We're also responsible for a number of large subsidiaries, including their oversight, and standing up and incubating new entities.

In regard to the redactions of the McKinsey document, CDEV went out of its way to redact as little as possible. We did undertake certain redactions, and they pertained to information in the report that identified confidential business information of third parties. We also redacted information that could harm the economic interests of Canada.

**Mr. Majid Jowhari:** Thank you.

My request to Mr. Shea is this: Can you, sir, kindly undertake a search through completed ATIPs to find the emails that Mrs. Kusie read into the record between Paul Mackinnon and Maia Welbourne on June 6? We requested that, I believe, last time as well. If you could undertake that and submit it to the committee in writing, it would be really appreciated.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I yield the rest of my time.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Jowhari.

Before we dismiss our witnesses, Ms. Bernier, if you don't mind, could you clarify something for the committee, please? In your remarks, it sounded as if you were intimating that the costs of operations or the costs of the translation would possibly result in reduced pension payouts. I'm wondering if you'd like to clarify that response. I think it's very clear what your response was, but I'd like to give you the opportunity to clarify that response, please, especially in light of paragraph 5.6 of the funding policy for the public sector pension plans, which clearly shows that costs are borne by the government.

• (1810)

**Ms. Mélanie Bernier:** What I mean is that our operating costs are netted against our returns, and what is then—

**The Chair:** But the pensions are guaranteed. It's a defined plan. They're guaranteed. These operating costs would not result in reduced pensions in any way.

I wanted to give you a chance to clarify that, because your comments—I'll be blunt—were extremely misleading. I'm surprised that a person in your position would make such blatantly misleading comments. I'm glad you had an opportunity to clarify that public service pensions would not be reduced. PSPIB has hundreds of millions in operating expenses, and many millions are spent on

bonuses, so I find it shocking that \$100,000 in translation costs would possibly affect pensions. I'm glad we had an opportunity to clear that up.

Witnesses, you are dismissed.

We will suspend for a very brief moment to welcome our nominee in the next round.

• (1810)

(Pause)

• (1820)

**The Chair:** Members, we are back.

We welcome Ms. Solloway to our committee for a short period.

We'll have a five-minute opening statement, and then we'll have a round of one six-minute intervention from each party.

Ms. Solloway, welcome to the operations and estimates committee, which I call "the mighty OGGO".

You have five minutes.

**Ms. Harriet Solloway (As an Individual):** Thank you.

Mr. Chair and members of the committee, thank you so much for providing me the opportunity to be here today and for your consideration of my nomination. I am very grateful.

As a long-serving international public servant, I have consistently demonstrated my commitment to the rule of law, including due process and access to justice. In a public service context, that requires a safe space in which personnel can come forward and be heard when there are concerns that, if left unaddressed, could shake public confidence and cause serious threat to the integrity of the public service, casting a pall over the work environment for dedicated personnel and impeding the ability to deliver quality service that is owed to the public.

The Public Sector Integrity Commissioner is the guardian of procedural fairness in the investigation of wrongdoing, including due process for whistle-blowers, for the subjects of our allegations of wrongdoing and for other participants in the process, with overarching objectives of promoting an ethical public service culture in the federal government.

This is a critical juncture for the office of the PSIC, with active consideration of Bill C-290, as well as the work of the external task force appointed to explore revisions to the act. I look forward to co-operating with the task force and to the faithful implementation of the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act, including any amendments that may emerge.



[Translation]

My career includes experience in labour relations, law, and management both domestically and internationally, including more than 22 years at the senior executive level in the international public sector at the International Criminal Court, the United Nations, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and others.

As a pioneer of programs to rebuild and transform justice systems in challenging circumstances, I have successfully led multiple strategic and change management efforts. In several positions, most notably as a legal adviser in conflict zones, such as Kosovo and the Central African Republic, and the Director of Rule of Law in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, I oversaw human rights reports ensuring the accuracy of evidence-based allegations, while considering other factors such as witness and informant protection.

I have extensive global experience in the development and implementation of investigation and policy strategies to address serious crimes and human rights abuses. As the Legal Adviser for Sex Crimes at the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, I guided the investigation that led to the first conviction for sex crimes in an international tribunal, the Akayesu case.

• (1825)

[English]

During the course of my career, I've investigated crimes, defended accused and built cases for the prosecution in criminal proceedings. I have worked for the protection of witnesses and engaged in capacity building for judges and investigators, all of which provides me with the perspective to be truly neutral, unbiased and fair to all. This, along with my laser focus on due process protections for all parties, will provide the foundation for the approach I will take as commissioner.

Lastly, our dedicated civil servants deserve a workplace where they feel safe and proud of the work they do. I commit to the unwavering objective of exposing wrongdoing and fostering trust in an ethical public sector for our personnel in the 134 government institutions subject to the act, and for the Canadian people.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

We'll start with Mrs. Kusie for six minutes, please.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** Thank you very much, Ms. Solloway.

Welcome to the government operations committee, "the mighty OGGO", as our chair refers to it.

Can you tell us, please, when you were informed that you had the nomination?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** I'm not sure, but I'm guessing it was shortly before it was announced. There were discussions leading up to it, but in my mind, anyway, it was not assured until very shortly, like a day or two, before the formal announcement was made. I can't tell you the exact date; I'm sorry.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** Remind me when the announcement was made.

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** I would have to verify that. I'm going to say approximately a month ago, but I'm not sure.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** Can you tell me about the final conversation you had with the President of the Treasury Board prior to receiving the nomination, please?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** That followed a process that was very similar to the process in other organizations, like the UN.

I had already taken a test. I assume I was short-listed for a panel interview. I went through that interview. A period of time after that—I could not be exact as to the period—I was contacted and told that the minister would like a few words with me. We had a few words. Even at that time, she did not, at all, commit to the nomination. It was just, "Okay, thank you very much." It was probably about 10 minutes in length.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** You mentioned that you wanted to foster trust among public servants. What are some ideas you have to do that, please?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** Until I get into the job, I don't really know the mechanics of how I will do it. I also, of course, await the outcomes of Bill C-290, as well as the review. I do have some notions of how it's been done elsewhere.

I think, first and foremost, people have to have trust in the office. They have to know about the office, and then have trust in it. One thing I would do is reach out to those in other parts of the system who may have positive contact with staff members who may find themselves in difficult situations, such as ombudspersons who may exist in different organizations or human resource persons who may have knowledge of trends. I would receive information from them, or consult with them, as to how they think we should approach raising the profile of the office and making it most effective.

It's hard for me to be more specific at this stage, other than to say that I would faithfully implement the mandate. In terms of the details beyond that, I'm unable to give you many more specifics, as I really haven't been in the system.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** Sure. Thank you.

You mentioned the cases where you felt you were able to listen to two sides and—pardon me if I'm poorly paraphrasing—determine a fair outcome, or what you believe was the right outcome. Can you give us an example of a case that stands out in your mind? Perhaps there's a difficult one, or one where you were particularly proud of the outcome in terms of having navigated a complicated situation. Is there something from your background or experience that you can draw upon, or a specific time that you feel was particularly pertinent to the work that you'll be doing here?

• (1830)

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** I'm struggling to find a case. I didn't have an adjudicative role in any of my functions, so that's a little bit tricky. I have been the chair of several boards of inquiry. During the boards of inquiry, I sought information as the chair—the whole board of inquiry sought information from relevant parties, from witnesses to various incidents.

There was one case—actually the first case of sexual exploitation and abuse—that was in the DRC when I was there. There was a colonel of a particular contingent, which I prefer not to name, against whom certain allegations were made. It turned out to be true, so some of the witnesses were traumatized. One has to know how to approach that. I had been a legal adviser for sex crimes at the Rwanda tribunal, so I was already, I think, quite experienced in being able to interact with people who had been traumatized and to elicit from them the information needed to get a better picture of the circumstances.

Notwithstanding that, although I had this information or these testimonies, having been a defence lawyer, I never took for granted that everything was complete, or that one perspective was the only perspective. Of course I listened, as part of the panel, to the person who was accused of these wrongdoings. Together with the panel, we came to a recommendation for our hierarchy.

I'm not sure if that answers the question, Mr. Chair.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie:** Thank you.

Thank you, Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Ms. Thompson, you have six minutes, please.

**Ms. Joanne Thompson (St. John's East, Lib.):** Thank you.

Welcome to the committee.

I want to circle back to the previous question about the nomination panel. Could you provide more detail on how you attested and interviewed in that nomination process, and what skills specifically were evaluated?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** I don't remember, but it was a competency-based interview, very much like other interviews that I had been a part of in the UN, both as an applicant and as a panel member. They went along the lines of “Can you give us an example when you would have demonstrated this competency or that competency?”

I must say I don't specifically recall what the competencies were. Having been familiar with that type of interview, I was able to draw on examples from my past to illustrate my capability for the different competencies. That, of course, came after the test. I do not remember the questions on the test. I'm very sorry. That is what I recall.

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** Thank you.

Based on your international experience, what types of measures work, in your opinion, to address retaliatory responses in the workplace?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** I think there are certain measures that... I'm speaking generically here, because every organization is different and is structured differently, so I can't speak to the Government of Canada.

In an ideal situation, one tries to avoid a situation where there might be retaliation. I don't know what measures are permitted under the human resource rules of the Canadian civil service, so I'm unable to provide specifics as to what the options would be. In other organizations, for example, it could mean changing reporting lines pending the outcome of a complaint or an issue, or permanently. It could be asking whether the individual who has made the complaint wishes to move to another area temporarily, but not to be forced. The same option might be given in some circumstances to the person who is accused of wrongdoing. The person accused of wrongdoing, depending on the strength of the prima facie evidence, might be put on administrative leave with or without pay—usually with pay, but not necessarily.

There are a number of measures that one can take to keep the staff member in a protected environment so that they don't feel threatened for having blown the whistle.

• (1835)

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** Thank you.

We've heard certainly in this committee a number of public servants who expressed their skepticism with whistle-blowing protection. How could you help improve that trust in your role as commissioner?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** How could I improve that? It is vitally important for the word to get around that if one engages with the office, they will be protected. For word to get around, the office has to perform as it should perform. I must say that it can't be one office alone. The safety that a person might feel has to also emanate from other parts of the organization. There is often stigma attached to being the person who raises an issue even when everybody else knows the issue is there. Human nature is human nature. It's a whole-of-organization responsibility. I think that is something that, together with relevant stakeholders and counterparts, we could discuss to see how people can be made to feel safe anywhere in the system. It cannot emanate from the office alone.

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** Thank you.

I'm going to see if I can get in one more question.

Are you comfortable to work in both official languages?

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** Yes, I'm used to working in French. In the Democratic Republic of Congo and in the Central Africa Republic, I worked exclusively in French.

I haven't had to do so for some time now because I have been working in English in New York for about seven years. As a result, my French is a bit rusty and I apologize for that, but I'm not at all concerned about my ability to work in French.

[English]

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** Yesterday, we completed the study on Bill C-290. How would your experience in change management help with its implementation, should this receive royal ascent?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** I think my experience would be very valuable. One of the first things to do is make staff members feel comfortable, because, typically, when there is a change, staff members are very concerned about what that means for their roles and positions—what might be expected of them. As a leader, one has to reassure people that they will have a place and that we will figure it all out together and involve them in any change management that occurs. That's critical. Involving stakeholders is also critical, but, particularly for changes that affect an office, one must involve the people in the office so they don't feel things are being done to them, but rather with them.

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** Thank you.

Could you explain to Canadians why whistle-blowing is important, and why we need to protect a whistle-blower?

**The Chair:** Give a very brief answer, please.

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** I think that, if we expect integrity in the public service, we necessarily rely on people who have access to that kind of information coming forward. It may not be the only way, but it's certainly one of the main ways. It can often be the linchpin in achieving integrity in a federal public service.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Mr. Savard-Tremblay, welcome to OGGO. Go ahead for six minutes, please.

[Translation]

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Ms. Solloway.

I will help you to practise your French by asking you questions in French. Of course, you can answer in the language of your choice since there are interpretation services available, but it might be good practice for you since you want to get used to speaking French again. There is nothing wrong with your French, by the way. I commend you for that.

I want to follow up on my colleague's question. You spoke about how you are in favour of protecting whistleblowers. Could you elaborate on that?

• (1840)

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** I'm sorry, but I'm not sure I understood your question.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** You answered a question about how you experienced situations involving whistleblowers. What do you think about providing them with additional legal protection?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** It couldn't hurt. However, since I am not familiar with all of the details of such a situation, I can't make recommendations regarding what laws should be in place.

That being said, I don't think additional legal protection could hurt. It could even help the commissioner's office to do what it has to do, knowing that there is a law to strengthen its measures.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** We know that you have experience in investigations since it seems to be one of the main focuses of your resume.

What are some of the key factors in ensuring proper investigative capacity since that is the main duty in the job you are applying for today?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** I can't really say at this point because I do not have enough information about how the commissioner's office is run. However, what I have noticed is that the ability to complete investigations in less than a year seems to pose a challenge for this office. I don't know yet why that is the case. I would have to look at that to see what improvements could be made. It is also possible that the situation can't be helped given the circumstances.

For now, I don't know, but I hope that the commissioner's office already has the necessary resources.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** That's fine. Thank you.

We know that you will be learning about this position. There will be a sort of listening and learning process. If the situation requires it, who will you consult first? What would be your first reflex, so to speak?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** The first people I would consult would be the staff of the commissioner's office because I think that they are in the best position to know what is going on. Next, with their support, I would identify the stakeholders or those who are somehow involved in the office's mandate to get their perspective. As I mentioned earlier, I would consult the ombudsmen. I'm sorry. I don't know what the word is in French.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** The term “ombudsman” can be used in French and English.

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** Thank you.

I would consult the ombudsmen and perhaps those who work in human resources just to get an idea of the trends so that I know how to better meet the needs of the public sector.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** You said that you would consult the ombudsmen and employees. However, this committee has heard from whistleblowers, whistleblowing experts, and representatives of whistleblowing non-governmental organizations or NGOs. Would you also consult them?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** Of course. I thought you were asking who I would consult first. Obviously, I would consult the experts and look at the best practices of other organizations. I think we can always learn from each other. Obviously, I would not limit my consultations to the two groups I mentioned first.

• (1845)

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** That is good. Other than experts, would you consult with the NGOs and the whistleblowers themselves?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** Absolutely.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Okay.

How much time do I have left, Mr. Chair?

Forty seconds? That will be all for this round.

Thank you.

[English]

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

**Mr. Gord Johns:** Thank you for being here.

Before I get started, I want to acknowledge that it's Indigenous Peoples Day. I'm not able to be home with the people in the community where I live, the Hupacasath and Tseshaht people, but I do want to acknowledge that we are doing business on the land of the Anishinabe and Algonquin peoples. I want to wish a happy Indigenous Peoples Day to all indigenous people across Canada from coast to coast to coast.

Ms. Solloway, you have quite an esteemed career. I want to thank you for your service in serving on the international criminal tribunal, the International Criminal Court, the United Nations. The work that you've done around this is extensive in terms of human rights.

There are concerns that this office, I think you know.... Have you been following Bill C-290?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** I've been following it as best I can, yes.

**Mr. Gord Johns:** I think you can sense, from the concerns from the whistle-blowers and the public servants who have come forward, that there is a lack of trust; they don't feel the office has been safe, confidential and independent. This is an independent agent of Parliament who reports to Parliament.

What are you going to do to ensure that this changes so that whistle-blowers feel confident that they can come forward when there's wrongdoing?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** Over the course of my career.... I think you could probably say many things about me, but one of them is that I'm very due process-oriented and very fairness-oriented. Whether one likes or doesn't like the outcome, to me it's very important that everybody's rights be protected. That will never waiver. I think the way we gain trust is to demonstrate that we are worthy of the trust, making sure that people know what they can expect if they engage with the office, making sure that they know they can trust us to not put them in harm's way.

Whether it is the whistle-blower or the person who is accused, at the end of the day, it would be important to me that they feel that they were respected, that their rights were respected and that they were heard. It's clear that, at the end of any process such as this, some people may be happier than others. Usually nobody is quite happy. If they are happy that they got what they could have expected from the office—which is fairness, due process, and respect—

then I'm confident that we will gain the confidence of the public sector.

**Mr. Gord Johns:** Are you aware of the results so far of the previous office, before you entered into it?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** I've read different briefs. I've read reports. I was, unfortunately, not able to listen to all of the debate on Bill C-290. I regret that—

**Mr. Gord Johns:** Bill C-290 aside, in terms of whistle-blowers coming forward, the results are dismal. The outcomes are really clear. If I were working in the public service, would I dare to come forward, given the results and the outcomes so far? I wouldn't. I wouldn't even think about it.

How are you going to change the confidence of the public servants so that there are real results and so that they see there's someone in their corner?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** It's my understanding that this office is meant to be a neutral party in the process, and it's my understanding—I mean this with all due respect—that the office shouldn't be in anybody's corner. The office needs to protect everybody's rights.

As a former defence lawyer, I'm well aware that sometimes people are not guilty. I'm also aware that sometimes they're guilty and they are not found guilty. I understand that, but as a neutral entity, I regret that I don't think it would be the role of the commissioner to be in anybody's corner.

• (1850)

**Mr. Gord Johns:** That's the right answer.

Whom will you consult with in terms of...? Will you be consulting with some of the stakeholders who came forward who didn't feel that was the case and who felt that, maybe, there was a tilt of the hand of the previous commissioner? How are you going to embrace them and listen to their concerns, because they have a lot to offer?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** If anybody who has anything to offer by way of insight is willing to speak to me, I would be delighted to hear from them to gain a better understanding as to how all parties to the process are reacting to the process and what they perceive the process to be, including its weaknesses. Absolutely, I welcome any whistle-blower or any person who was involved in prior cases coming forward, so that I can learn from their experience.

**Mr. Gord Johns:** What will be the key factors to ensure that there's a proper investigation that happens under your office?

**Ms. Harriet Solloway:** A proper investigation is a complete investigation. That's why I alluded before to the fact that I don't know yet whether or not one year is a reasonable time period to be able to do that. It's because I don't know all the challenges of the mechanics of the investigations.

I think a complete investigation is the best way to do that.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Johns.

Ms. Solloway, that is our time.

Before you go, to follow up on Mr. Savard-Tremblay's questions about what you're going to do, I would urge you, as someone who's been on this committee and was a large part of the 2017 report—I'm going to plug that—to read the entire report and all of the testimony, and the testimony from Bill C-290, before you spend one second with the internal folks.

To follow up on Mr. Johns' comments on your comments about not being in anyone's corner, I would just urge you, again, to listen to the testimony of some of the victims of the retribution from the government. We realize you have to follow the rules, but one whistle-blower against the entire strength of the government that's coming down on them.... I realize there's a certain neutrality that's required, but there's also a realization of one person against the unlimited resources of the government to go after someone. I would just urge you on that.

I thank you for your time.

Colleagues, that is it for us—

**Mr. Majid Jowhari:** I have a procedural question.

Do we have to confirm her?

**The Chair:** No, one of the rules is to “do nothing”. There is a vote tonight.

I would require a motion from the floor, but it's not required.

**Mr. Majid Jowhari:** I'd like to move a motion so we can confirm her.

**The Chair:** Just give me a moment.

Just to be nice, I'm going to provide you with some wording and perhaps you would wish to read it into the record.

**Mr. Majid Jowhari:** Thank you.

I'd like to move:

That the committee report the following to the House:

Your committee has considered the Certificate of Nomination of Harriet Solloway, nominee for the position of Public Sector Integrity Commissioner, referred on Wednesday, June 7, 2023, pursuant to Standing Order 111.1(1).

Your committee has considered the proposed appointment of Harriet Solloway as Public Sector Integrity Commissioner and reports its recommendation that she be confirmed by the House of Commons as Canada's Public Sector Integrity Commissioner.

Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for your support.

● (1855)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

(Motion agreed to on division)

**The Chair:** Wonderful.

Now, before we break for the summer, I just want to thank all of you for your patience with me in this relatively new role.

I want to thank our clerk for all of her outstanding work on a lot of difficult files.

Also, of course, thank you to Ryan, who's been with us for quite a while.

Diana is moving off to the Senate after today, so this will be her final analyst role with us. Thank you, Diana. I'm sorry that we won't see you back right away, but maybe in the future.

Also, thank you to all the support staff who have been helping us get through so much work this year.

With that, unless there's something else, colleagues, we are adjourned.





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

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

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

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

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

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

---

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