

Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

**Allegations of Political Interference in the 2020 Nova Scotia Mass Murder
Investigation**

July 25, 2022

Table of contents	
Tab 1 Scenario note	3
Tab 1a Notable statements from members of SECU	5
Tab 2 SECU Committee overview and member biographies	11
Tab 3 Opening remarks	18
Tab 4 Commissioner’s role – political engagement	21
Tab 5 Commissioner’s role – police independence	23
Tab 6 Commissioner’s role – communications	25
Tab 7 Comportment	27
Tab 8 Issues before the MCC and other lessons learned	29
Tab 9 Firearms	30
Tab 10 Chronology	32
Tab 11 Statement – June 21, 2022	34
Tab 12 Media statement – June 29, 2022	35
Tab 13 SECU Transcript – June 23, 2022	36

Tab 1 Scenario note

Appearance

Officials from Public Safety and the RCMP are scheduled to appear before the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU) regarding their study of Allegations of Political Interference in the 2020 Nova Scotia Mass Murder Investigation, on July 25, 2022, from 11:00 to 3:00. Participants will appear on three panels:

Panel 1

- Honourable Bill Blair, Former Minister of Public Safety
- Rob Stewart, Deputy Minister, Public Safety

Panel 2

- Brenda Lucki, Commissioner
- Brian Brennan, Deputy Commissioner, Contract and Indigenous Policing

Panel 3

- Lee Bergerman, Former Assistant Commissioner and Commanding Officer, Nova Scotia RCMP
- Chief Superintendent Chris Leather, Criminal Operations Officer, Nova Scotia RCMP
- Sharon Tessier, Former Director General, National Communication Services

The timing of the three panels are as follows: Panel 1 – 11:00 to 12:00, Panel 2 – 12:00 to 1:00, and Panel 3 – 1:00 to 3:00.

Deputy Commissioner Brennan and you will be appearing virtually, as will Ms. Tessier, while Chief Superintendent Leather and Former Assistant Commissioner Bergerman will appear in-person. Minister Blair and Mr. Stewart will also be appearing in-person.

Background

SECU reviews legislation, policies, programs and expenditure plans of government departments and agencies responsible for public safety and national security, policing and law enforcement, corrections and conditional release of federal offenders, emergency management, crime prevention, and the protection of Canada's borders.

On June 23, 2022, SECU adopted the following motion:

“That the committee study the allegations of political interference in the 2020 Nova Scotia Mass Murder investigation and communications and that the committee hold one four-hour meeting that will include:

- a) A panel to hear from the below officials from the Nova Scotia RCMP:
 - i. Superintendent Darren Campbell, Support Services Officer, Nova Scotia RCMP;
 - ii. Assistant Commissioner Lee Bergerman, Nova Scotia RCMP;
 - iii. Chief Superintendent Chris Leather, Nova Scotia RCMP;
 - iv. Communications Director Lia Scanlan, Nova Scotia RCMP;
 - v. Senior communications manager Sharon Tessier, RCMP.
- b) A panel to hear from:
 - i. Brenda Lucki, Commissioner of the RCMP;
 - ii. Deputy Commissioner, Brian Brennan.

- c) A panel to hear from:
- i. Former Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Bill Blair;
 - ii. Deputy Minister of Public Safety, Robert Stewart.

and that the meeting be held on Monday, July 25, 2022 or the day after the end of the first summer scheduled House of Commons critical maintenance, whichever comes first.”

This issue garnered significant debate during Question Period in the House of Commons during the week of June 20, 2022. There have also been several Order Paper Questions tabled on this topic.

Strategic considerations

In adopting the motion on this subject, several members of SECU have stressed that the purpose of this study is not to examine the RCMP’s response to the Nova Scotia tragedy or the events that took place; but rather, the committee is focused specifically on the allegations of political interference.

RCMP officials are likely to be asked questions on the role of the Prime Minister’s Office (PMO) in this matter. Members of the Conservative Party have been quite vocal in expressing frustration that officials from PMO will not be appearing before the committee.

Two of the witnesses (Chief Superintendent Campbell and Lia Scanlan) included in the motion adopted by SECU will not be appearing before the committee on July 25. Chief Superintendent Campbell is unavailable as he’s scheduled to testify before the Mass Casualty Commission, while Ms. Scanlan is away. It is not presently known how SECU will proceed with respect to hearing from these two officials.

General information

Rounds of questioning:

Members of the Committee are allotted six minutes to both ask questions and receive responses during the first round of questioning. In the second round (time permitting), the allotted time for questions and answers is reduced to five minutes.

- Typical order of questioning for the first round: Liberal, Conservative, Bloc, NDP.
- Typical order of questioning for the second round: Conservative, Liberal, Conservative, Liberal, then 2.5 minutes each for the Bloc and NDP.

Departmental officials present at Committee are responsible for supporting the Minister’s accountability in Parliament. As departmental officials are not primarily responsible for exercising the powers of the Crown, their relationship to Parliament is different from that of Ministers. While Ministers are responsible for political, partisan matters, and for defending public policies before Parliament, deputy heads and officials support Ministers in providing explanations and information on public policies that Ministers could not be expected to provide due to the level of detail or complexity.

Given this role, departmental officials responding to questions in committee are expected to keep their answers factual. They are also expected to avoid taking a position, providing personal opinions or speaking on behalf of others on a given issue. This includes divulging classified information, Cabinet confidences or any information that contradicts privacy laws.

Tab 1a Notable statements from members of SECU

Alistair MacGregor (New Democratic Party (NDP)):

In a media article dated July 6, 2022, MP MacGregor stated, "I think our committee needs to be very respectful of the work" [of the Mass Casualty Commission]. He added, "I use handwritten notes all the time, especially when I'm in committee. When I do refer back to them, I put a lot of stock in their accuracy and truthfulness, so I don't know why Campbell would make a false statement in handwritten notes that he had no idea would be used as evidence in a future inquiry."

It was noted that, per MP MacGregor, SECU will not be looking into the specifics of the RCMP response or the events that took place, and would focus more on the "political aspects" of the issue. MP MacGregor raised concern with, "Those crucial four pages were held back for some reason. So, again, just more questions, but this time involving the Department of Justice."

On June 23, 2022, as SECU debated the motion inviting officials to appear on this matter, MP MacGregor stated, "The mass shooting inquiry is dealing with the events that happened on that terrible day two years ago, but we're dealing with allegations that the commissioner of the RCMP became involved in an investigation because it was to make a point for proposed firearms legislation. That's a very serious allegation. We have many more questions than answers at this point. I think it's possible for this committee to proceed in an orderly way that respects what the inquiry is trying to do, but that also allows us, as members of Parliament, to do our jobs to hold the government to account." He further noted, "I understand the value that might come from hearing the commissioner's testimony during the inquiry, and I understand that's to be a date around mid-July, but this is an issue that the country is seized with right now. Our interest, as a committee, is going to be quite different from what the inquiry is looking at."

During Question Period (QP) on June 23, 2022 MP MacGregor asked, "Mr. Speaker, families who lost loved ones in the worst mass shooting in Canadian history want answers. That a government would compromise this investigation is unacceptable. Nova Scotians have suffered enough. There are very serious allegations of interference in the RCMP's investigation for the Liberals' political gain. Yesterday the minister questioned the accuracy of these allegations, but the integrity of the claims is supported by a former RCMP commissioner. Will the minister be transparent in explaining what role the PMO played in this investigation?"

During QP on June 22, 2022, MP MacGregor asked, "Mr. Speaker, there are very disturbing allegations that the government directed interference in an ongoing police investigation. Nova Scotians have suffered and they deserve answers. The idea that any government would compromise an investigation for its own political gain is insulting for families of the victims. Any interference from the Prime Minister's Office is completely unacceptable and breaks Canadians' trust in our institutions. Will the government launch a full investigation into these disturbing allegations to give Canadians the answers they need?"

Pam Damoff (Liberal Party of Canada (LPC)):

On June 23, 2022, as part of SECU's debate on the motion related to this appearance, MP Damoff stated, "I would remind everyone that there is the Mass Casualty Commission happening right now, where witnesses are under oath, just as they are in a court of law. We need to be mindful that we don't prejudice what's happening at that commission. Commissioner Lucki will be appearing at the commission over the course of July. That's my understanding."

On the issue of timing of the appearance, MP Damoff noted, “I continue to stress that she [Commissioner Lucki] should come following her testimony. Even if we moved it to that first week of July, it would be prior to her testimony. We don't have a date. I know Mr. Lloyd and I were having a sort of off-line conversation on that, but my understanding is that there is not a date for the commissioner to testify. It's also my understanding that, when she testifies, there's no time limit on it. It could be a day. It could be two days. It could be three days. It could be a week. It depends on the commissioner and how many questions they want to ask her. If we're having these officials come, I strongly urge colleagues to do this after she has testified and we have all the facts on the table. That would likely be in August.”

At this June 23 SECU meeting, MP Damoff also noted the sensitivities around those there were being invited to appear before the committee: “The other thing I think we need to be mindful of is that the five individuals who've been asked to testify, and who are now being asked to testify for two hours, are individuals who were deeply traumatized by what happened in Nova Scotia. They have publicly acknowledged that they have had mental health issues following that, and we're asking them to then appear for two hours at our committee. I think we should be mindful of that and give the option of one or two hours in order to be respectful of the mental health challenges they've had.”

Raquel Dancho (Conservative Party of Canada (CPC)):

During SECU's June 23, 2022 debate of the motion to invite officials to appear on this issue, MP Dancho stated, “More to what Mr. MacGregor has said, I do agree that this is a breaking development. It is shocking and disturbing. It is certainly regrettable that it is happening during a very sober memorial next week. What I would say is that those responsible for the political interference that is mentioned in the testimony, that is on those people. That is on any individual in the Liberal government who put that political interference.... As mentioned in the notes, that is legal testimony in the Mass Casualty Commission. It is deeply regrettable that they have done that, at least as alleged in this testimony. That is why we are here meeting today, so I would agree with Mr. MacGregor.”

Further, during this meeting, MP Dancho argued that officials from the Prime Minister's Office should appear before SECU, “Without having anyone representing the PMO or the other relevant top officials involved in this, we cannot verify or ask questions concerning the testimony that was just released. It is imperative that we have, at minimum, someone from the Prime Minister's Office who was involved at that time to come and testify at committee. Again, the Liberal government would know who those individuals are, obviously. We would be firm on at least one representative from the PMO in order to ensure that this is a fulsome investigation.”

MP Dancho later added, “Obviously we require someone from the Prime Minister's Office to speak because they have been mentioned in two different accounts in the legal witness testimony provided to the Mass Casualty Commission. This investigation at this committee would be incomplete without a representative of the Prime Minister's Office, so that's the second part of my amendment.”

MP Dancho further stated, “Just to be clear, we are now looking at a situation in which this meeting is to follow up on the recent testimony from the Mass Casualty Commission that there was political interference from the Liberal government and pressure put on the RCMP to interfere in a criminal investigation. The Liberal position currently is to wait over four, five, maybe six weeks to hear from those witnesses, to take those 10 witnesses—pardon me, nine witnesses—and put them in a three-hour meeting, five to six weeks from now. That's nine witnesses in three hours. Also, they refuse to allow a member of the Prime Minister's Office to

attend. They're avoiding accountability on this. I'm actually quite shocked that members of the Liberal Party on this committee are so keen to avoid transparency on this. It's very disappointing, Mr. Chair. The amendment as it stands now is completely unacceptable and certainly does not do justice for the victims' families, who are continuing to be shocked and traumatized by this."

In noting the difference between the Mass Casualty Commission's study and that of SECU, MP Dancho noted, "The inquiry is investigating something separate to what we are investigating at the public safety committee. Our responsibility is to hold the government accountable for their actions in all regards and all departments in public safety. This is an urgent matter, a shocking revelation from the Mass Casualty Commission, that we will be further investigating, which is our duty as opposition members and as members of this public safety committee. I would reiterate that the inquiry is investigating matters separate from what we are investigating. We have an obligation to move forward, and to move forward quickly, frankly, given the revelations that were made and how shocking they are."

To the concerns raised by MP Damoff of the mental health of the RCMP officials, MP Dancho stated, "I do appreciate Ms. Damoff's comments about the mental health of the witnesses, certainly. We do know from the testimony that was reported that they also suffered as a result of the meeting with Commissioner Lucki, who, from the testimony, was seen that to be under significant pressure. To quote the testimony as written by Superintendent Campbell, she was very "upset", and that was stressed consistently in the reporting of the Mass Casualty Commission's findings of the written testimony from Mr. Campbell. Again, I think that some of the responsibility for the impact on these individuals would seem to lie with those who were putting the pressure on them to reveal information and to interfere for political purposes in a criminal investigation. That is why we should be meeting urgently to discuss this matter." On July 11, 2022, the Globe and Mail published a story in response to the release of several emails from Commissioner Lucki. The article included comments from CPC MP Raquel Dancho, "If she flagged that releasing this information would jeopardize the investigation ... how would she change her tune five days later... This puts a lot of pressure on Mr. Blair to explain: 'This was flagged for you. What conversations did you have with Commissioner Lucki? What conversations did your staff have? Who was the point person in the Prime Minister's Office?'" Also, on July 11, in response to an article from Global News, MP Dancho remarked, "Clearly someone convinced Lucki in the following 4 days to change her professional opinion that releasing sensitive information would jeopardize the investigation. Is this when the no "undue" pressure from, and the "promise" to, the PMO and Blair happened?"

Dane Lloyd (CPC):

As SECU members, on June 23, 2022, debated a motion to invite officials to appear on this topic, MP Lloyd stated, "...Also, I think the point has been made by some of our colleagues around the table that this issue is separate from what the Mass Casualty Commission is talking about. This is about political interference. It's not about the details the Mass Casualty Commission is focused on. I don't think it should be a prerequisite that we wait until the commissioner has testified before we do that."

During QP on June 23, 2022 MP Lloyd asked, "Mr. Speaker, during the April 28 meeting with the RCMP commissioner and Superintendent Campbell, there were notes handwritten that stated that the commissioner promised to release information about an active criminal investigation to support a pending announcement on gun control. The Minister of Emergency Preparedness has been standing in the House saying that there was no interference, but the Prime Minister just said there was no undue interference. The story is changing. The

commissioner was working with the government to advance its political agenda. Does the minister deny this?"

During QP on June 22, 2022, MP Lloyd asked, "Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly clear why the government wanted to have a secret inquiry on this. In a statement yesterday, RCMP Commissioner Brenda Lucki did not deny that she promised the Minister of Emergency Preparedness that she would release information surrounding the Nova Scotia mass shooting. People are not in the habit of making promises unless they are asked to do so. Did the Minister of Emergency Preparedness or his staff, at any time, ask the commissioner to publicly release information regarding the Nova Scotia mass shooting, yes or no?"

Tako Van Popta (CPC):

During SECU's debate on June 23, 2022, of the motion to invite officials to appear on this topic, MP Van Popta stated, "Without having anyone representing the PMO or the other relevant top officials involved in this, we cannot verify or ask questions concerning the testimony that was just released. It is imperative that we have, at minimum, someone from the Prime Minister's Office who was involved at that time to come and testify at committee. Again, the Liberal government would know who those individuals are, obviously. We would be firm on at least one representative from the PMO in order to ensure that this is a fulsome investigation."

During the SECU meeting of June 23, 2022, MP Van Popta echoed the sentiments from MP Dancho that the Prime Minister's Office should be invited to appear before the committee, "I completely support that motion to have a witness from the Prime Minister's Office attend. The evidence that was given by the superintendent of the RCMP for Nova Scotia, Darren Campbell, indicates that there was pressure from the Prime Minister's Office to disclose certain information at a press conference that Mr. Campbell was not comfortable presenting or making public at that time so as not to jeopardize the ongoing investigation. It's extremely important for this committee, the parliamentary standing committee on public safety, to hear from an appropriate witness from the Prime Minister's Office."

Doug Shipley (CPC):

During SECU's debate on June 23, 2022, of the motion to invite officials to appear on this topic, MP Shipley stated, "I really think this is an extremely important issue for a lot of people, starting with the people who were involved with this incident and the people who lost loved ones in this incident, the residents of Nova Scotia and all Canadians."

There have been several statements issued by some of CPC members of SECU:

- On July 12, 2022, three CPC MPs, including Raquel Dancho and Dane Lloyd, released a statement: "We know that just five days after she wrote this email, the Commissioner directed the Nova Scotia RCMP to do the opposite, telling them she had 'promised' the Minister of Public Safety and the Prime Minister's Office they would publicly release this information to support the government's pending firearm legislation. This revealing evidence suggests that in those few days something swayed the Commissioner to go against her own professional advice. When the Commissioner of the RCMP tells the government that releasing certain information would compromise an active investigation, that should be the end of the conversation. Clearly, that wasn't the end of it and somewhere in those five days, the Commissioner was worn down. It is not believable that the Commissioner suddenly changed her mind without influence. The Prime Minister and Minister Bill Blair said no 'undue' pressure or 'direction' was given to the Commissioner...When the pieces are put together, it appears this Liberal government politically pressured the Commissioner and now they are misleading Canadians and

trying to cover their tracks. The Liberal government needs to come forward and tell Canadians the full story, including what happened in those few days that changed Commissioner Lucki's mind..."

- On July 7, 2022, three CPC MPs, including Raquel Dancho and Dane Lloyd, released a statement: "The last thing Canadians wanted or expected from their government was for it to leverage a national tragedy for political gain and then cover it up. This spring the Liberal government handed over 132 pages of notes from Nova Scotia RCMP Superintendent Darren Campbell, but initially withheld the four pages that implicate the Liberal government in its political interference scandal. These documents were initially subpoenaed by the MCC when the Liberal government was asked to provide all evidence related to the horrific Nova Scotia mass killing nearly a year ago... The possibility of the Liberal government politically interfering in the worst mass murder in Canadian history erodes public trust in our important institutions. Conservatives are calling on the Liberal government to restore public trust and act swiftly on the MCC's latest subpoena, provide all evidence without delay, and waive cabinet confidence of all documents related to this case. We are calling on all who were involved in this scandal...to testify at the Public Safety committee and be held accountable for their actions."
- On June 29, 2022, three CPC MPs, including Raquel Dancho and Dane Lloyd, released a statement: "Given the testimony from four senior RCMP officials, it is clear Commissioner Lucki was under orders to release sensitive information about the Nova Scotia mass killings that could have jeopardized the ongoing investigation. It is also clear that the pressure came right from the top, from the offices of the Prime Minister and Minister Bill Blair. All accounts suggest the Commissioner was angry, emotional, and appeared to be acting out in desperation to appease her political bosses. This was no doubt the reaction of someone who was being placed under immense pressure and may have even feared for her job..."
- On June 24, four CPC MPs, including Raquel Dancho and Dane Lloyd, released a statement: "Canadians were shocked to learn Trudeau's Liberal government may have politically interfered with the ongoing RCMP investigation into the tragic Nova Scotia mass killings to advance their political agenda... Now we are learning that the Liberal government is covering up that evidence to hide the truth. When Minister David Lametti's Department of Justice sent 132 pages of RCMP Superintendent Campbell's written evidence to the inquiry, what was noticeably missing were the 4 crucial pages that implicated the Liberal government. Canadians will find it hard to believe that the Minister's department just happened to miss those 4 critical pages of evidence. This is no coincidence. This was no accident. This is a cover-up...Canadians demand answers. We cannot get to the truth if the government is being dishonest about its role in these allegations. That is why Conservatives have submitted a motion calling on Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, David Lametti, to appear as a witness at the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU) as part of its study on the allegations of political interference in the 2020 Nova Scotia Mass Murder investigation..."
- On June 23, 2022, three CPC MPs, including Raquel Dancho and Dane Lloyd, released a statement: "Instead of being transparent and open with Canadians, Trudeau's Liberal members of the committee are actively and shamefully covering for their boss and blocked the committee from getting answers from the Prime Minister's Office. Sadly, the NDP and Bloc members of the committee chose to abstain from the vote and allowed the Prime Minister and the Liberal government to hide from accountability. When we learned of these serious allegations of political interference in the RCMP's investigation

of the Nova Scotia mass killing, it was clear that the pressure and interference came right from the top. We cannot get to the truth until Canadians hear directly from those in the Prime Minister's office with knowledge or involvement in pressuring the RCMP commissioner to advance the Liberal's political agenda..."

- On June 22, 2022, three CPC MPs, including Raquel Dancho and Dane Lloyd, released a statement: "The separation of political institutions from our law enforcement is crucial. Our police need to be able to do their important work without politicians making attempts to steer or influence them in any way. Not only is this critical to ensuring there is faith and trust in our institutions, but Canadians expect nothing less... These are serious and shocking allegations that deserve answers. That is why we want an immediate investigation in to the matter. We need to hear from the Prime Minister. We need to hear from the former Public Safety Minister. We need to hear from the members of the RCMP who were involved. There must be an investigation to hear the full story..."
 - Appended to the statement was a letter from the CPC members of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU) requesting that the Chair immediately convene a meeting so that SECU "can immediately investigate these troubling allegations by inviting RCMP Commissioner Brenda Lucki, the former Minister of Public Safety Bill Blair, RCMP Deputy Commissioner Brian Brennan, Nova Scotia Superintendent Darren Campbell, Assistant Commander Lee Bergerman, Chief Superintendent Chris Leather, and Nova Scotia Communications director Lia Scanlan, and other relevant individuals to confirm what political pressure was exerted by the Prime Minister, the former Minister Public Safety and their respective offices on the RCMP in Nova Scotia in April and May of 2020."

Tab 2 SECU Committee overview and member biographies

House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU)

The House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security reviews the legislation, policies, programs and expenditure plans of government departments and agencies responsible for public safety and national security, policing and law enforcement, corrections and conditional release of federal offenders, emergency management, crime prevention and the protection of Canada's borders.

Chair	Hon. Jim Carr	Liberal	Winnipeg
Vice Chairs	Raquel Dancho	Conservative	Winnipeg
	Kristina Michaud	Bloc Québécois	Eastern Quebec
Members	Paul Chiang	Liberal	Greater Toronto Area
	Pam Damoff	Liberal	Greater Toronto Area
	Dane Lloyd	Conservative	Edmonton
	Alistair MacGregor	NDP	Vancouver Island
	Ron McKinnon	Liberal	Coquitlam, BC
	Taleeb Noormohamed	Liberal	Vancouver
	Peter Schiefke	Liberal	Western Quebec
	Doug Shipley	Conservative	Barrie, Ontario
	Tako Van Popta	Conservative	Langley, BC

Hon. Jim Carr – Liberal

Winnipeg South Centre, Manitoba

Election

- Elected to the House of Commons in 2015.

Education and background

- Served as the Minister of Natural Resources from 2015 to 2018; he was the Minister of International Trade Diversification from 2018 to 2019; and from January to October 2021, served on Cabinet as the Special Representative for the Prairies.
- From 1988 to 1992, he was a member of the Manitoba Legislature.
- Prior to entering federal politics, he was a journalist and worked as an editorial writer and columnist with the Winnipeg Free Press as well as for CBC Radio.

Points of note

- Chair of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU).

Raquel Dancho – Conservative

Kilonan-St. Paul, Manitoba

Election

- Elected to the House of Commons in 2019

Education and background

- Obtained a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science at McGill University.
- Previously had a career with the Manitoba Government.
- Ms. Dancho served in the senior role of Special Assistant to the Minister of Sport, Culture and Heritage and was instrumental in facilitating critical relationships between the Minister and historic arts and culture institutions across Manitoba.
- Advocate for small business and Canadian farmers.

Points of note

- Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU), Member of the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SSEC). Member of the Special Committee on the Canada-People's Republic of China Relationship (CACN).
- Serves as the Conservative Public Safety Shadow Minister.

Kristina Michaud – Bloc Québécois

Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, Québec

Election

- Elected to the House of Commons in 2019.

Education and background

- Holds a Master's degree in international relations from the Université Laval.
- Worked as a political advisor to interim Parti Québécois leader Pascal Bérubé.

Points of note

- Vice-Chair of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU) and member of its Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure (SSEC).
- Bloc Québécois Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Critic.
- MP Michaud was critical of the RCMP's initial response to the Wet'suwet'en crisis. She supported the RCMP's withdrawal from the Wet'suwet'en area and has expressed support for the creation of Indigenous police services as one way to rebuild trust between Indigenous people and law enforcement.
- Since November 2021, MP Michaud has been particularly interested in illegal firearms smuggling and the presence of firearms on Quebec. Her interest is a result of the ongoing gun violence amongst youth in the Greater Montreal Region.

Paul Chiang – Liberal

Markham—Unionville, Ontario

Election

- Elected to the House of Commons in 2021.

Education and background

- Prior to entering federal politics, he had a career in policing that spanned 28 years. He retired as a sergeant with the York Regional Police Service, but also served with the London Police Service and Durham Regional Police.
- In 2013, he was awarded the Police Exemplary Service Medal.

Points of note

- Member of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU).
- Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Diversity and Inclusion (Diversity and Inclusion).

Pam Damoff – Liberal

Oakville North—Burlington, Ontario

Election

- Elected to the House of Commons in 2015.

Education and background

- Has a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Western Ontario.
- Oakville Town Councillor from 2010 to 2015.
- Worked in financial and investment banking positions for 27 years.

Points of note

- Member of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU) and its Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure (SSEC). Also a member of the House of Commons Special Committee on Afghanistan (AFGH).
- Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety.
- Served previously as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indigenous Services and as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health.
- Recipient of the Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Medal, and a number of other awards for her community service.

- She has expressed concern about the length of time it is taking for the RCMP to review and respond to the CRCC's report related to the death of Colton Boushie.
- She has also advocated for better protection for sexual assault victims.

Dane Lloyd – Conservative

Sturgeon River—Parkland, Alberta

Election

- Elected to the House of Commons in 2017.

Education and background

- Graduated from Trinity Western University with a degree in History and Political Studies.
- Before being elected as a Member of Parliament, he worked as a Parliamentary Advisor to St. Albert-Edmonton MP Michael Cooper, the Honourable Ed Fast who served as the Minister of International Trade, and the Honourable Jason Kenney.
- Serve as a Canadian Army reservist in the Governor General's Foot Guards.

Points of note

- Member of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU).
- Conservative Shadow Minister for Emergency Preparedness.
- Served previously on several committees, including the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology (INDU), the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs (ACVA), the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates (OGGO), and the Standing Committee on Natural Resources (RNNR).
- In June 2021, he introduced Private Member's Bill C-316, *An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act*. The bill sought to amend the *Criminal Code* to add as an aggravating factor for sentencing purposes and as a reason to delay parole the fact that a person who is convicted of certain offences refuses to provide persons in authority with information respecting the location of bodies or remains.

Alistair MacGregor – NDP

Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, British Columbia

Election

- Elected to the House of Commons in 2015.

Education and background

- Graduate of the University of Victoria and Royal Roads University.
- Previously worked in British Columbia's forestry sector.
- Prior to being elected to Parliament, worked as a constituency assistant for an NDP MP in British Columbia.

Points of note

- Currently serving as Critic for Public Safety, Agriculture and Food, and as Deputy Critic for Justice. He has previously served as the NDP's Critic for Senior and Justice and Human Rights.
- Member of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU) and the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food (AGRI).

- Has served previously on several Standing Committees including the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights (JUST) and was the Vice-Chair of the Special Joint Committee on Medical Assistance in Dying (AMAD).
- In November 2021, called for RCMP reform and offered to form an alliance with the LPC to do so.
- Introduced a Private Member's Bill seeking to prohibit investments of Canada Pension Plan in entities that produce weapons or commissioned of human, labour or environmental rights violations. The bill was defeated by both the CP and LPC.
- Commented on the SECU Committee Report on "Systemic Racism in Policing in Canada." Stated that the following recommendations should be implemented: Legislative overhaul of the *RCMP Act*; Better and more robust civilian oversight; A better review and complaints process; The transition away from a para-military force; and, Better Indigenous consultation, inclusion, and partnership in policing services, especially in Indigenous communities.
 - During JUST's 2018 study on Human Trafficking in Canada, he sought to understand if the *Criminal Code* is working for successful prosecution of those accused of human trafficking. He asked a witness, "what are front-line officers and CBSA or our police doing themselves to meet them halfway? Are any strategies being employed to try to actively form those relationships with people who are affected to encourage them to come forward? I think there's a role for agencies to meet them halfway..."

Ron McKinnon – Liberal

Coquitlam-Port Coquitlam, British Columbia

Election

- Elected to the House of Commons in 2015.

Education and background

- Earned a Bachelor of Science from the University of Alberta and an honours diploma in Computer Technology from the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology.
- Prior to entering federal politics, he was a business owner and a computer systems analyst.

Points of note

- Member of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU).
- Previously served as Chair of the Standing Committee on Health (HESA), Chair of the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure of the Standing Committee on Health (SHES), Member of Liaison Committee (LIAI), and Member of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights (JUST).
- In the 42nd Parliament, 1st Session, he sponsored Bill C-224, *An Act to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act* (assistance – drug overdose), which received Royal Assent in 2017.

Taleeb Noormohamed – Liberal

Vancouver Granville, British Columbia

Election

- Elected to the House of Commons in 2021.

Education and background

- Graduated from Princeton University with BA, attended the University of Oxford for Graduate/Doctoral Studies, and completed his Master's at Harvard University.
- Prior to entering federal politics, he served as a senior official in the federal government from 2002 to 2007. During his time with the federal government, he was involved with establishing the Cross-Cultural Roundtable on Security. He also served as Director of the Air India Review Secretariat and Special Advisor to the Hon. Bob Rae.
- He was an executive in the technology sector and was a member of the Board of Directors for the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority (CATSA).

Points of note

- Member of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security.

Peter Schiefke – Liberal

Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Québec

Election

- Elected to the House of Commons in 2015.

Education and background

- Holds a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from Concordia University as well as a Master of Science in Renewable Resources from McGill University.
- Prior to entering into politics, worked in numerous capacities in sustainable development for domestic and international causes.

Points of note

- Member of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU), Chair of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities (TRAN) and its Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure, and Communities (STRA).
- Has held several Parliamentary Secretary positions: served as a Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Youth) from 2015 to 2019; served as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction from 2018 to 2019; served as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change from 2019 to 2021; finally, served as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship from March 2021 to August 2021.
- In February 2022, MP Schiefke delivered a speech in the House of Commons where he argued in favour of the government invoking the *Emergencies Act*. He noted, "What we are doing is giving the RCMP the power to enforce local laws and work quickly and efficiently with local law enforcement. We are not putting the RCMP or any other police force under the direct control of the government. Policing operational decisions remain independent under this act, as they should and must in any strong democracy."

Doug Shipley – Conservative

Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, Ontario

Election

- Elected to the House of Commons in 2019.

Education and background

- City Councillor in Barrie from 2010 to 2019.
- Small business owner.
- Former Vice-Chair of the Barrie Police Services Board.

Points of note

- Member of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU). Was a previous member of SECU in 2020. Also previously served on the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities (TRAN).
- When SECU was studying Systemic Racism in Policing Services in Canada, he expressed interest in strategies that could be easily and quickly put in place by the RCMP to recruit more members, specifically women, from first nations communities.

Tako Van Popta – Conservative

Langley—Aldergrove, British Columbia

Election

- Elected to the House of Commons in 2019.

Education and background

- Holds an undergraduate degree from Trinity Western University and a law degree from the University of British Columbia.
- Had a 30 plus-year law career with McQuarrie Hunter LLP.
- Former director at the Surrey Board of Trade and the Downtown Surrey Business Improvement Association.

Points of note

- Member of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU).
- Recently completed the Firearms Safety Course in an effort to better understand his constituents' concerns about the assault-style firearms ban. He noted that "the real problem [is] illegal guns and gang violence", including cross-border firearms smuggling.
- Voiced concern in the House of Commons about the economic effects of the Indigenous rail blockades in support of the Wet'suwet'en.
- On the Merlo-Davidson Settlement Agreement, he asked the Commissioner whether she was confident the progress the RCMP is making to address Justice Bastarache's findings "will be effective in restoring the public's confidence" in the RCMP. Additionally, he asked Justice Bastarache whether "the RCMP even be fixed, or does it have to be dismantled? Do we have to have another model of policing altogether?"

Tab 3 Opening remarks

Good afternoon.

I can't imagine what Nova Scotians went through during that 12-hour rampage and recognize the healing that is required to move forward.

Each and every day, my employees do the best they can with the circumstances they are faced with, but of course we can always do better and that is why the Mass Casualty Committee was created... "to provide meaningful recommendations to keep communities safe in the future."

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to some of the important issues raised by this incident.

Let me be clear - I did not interfere in the investigation around this tragedy.

Nor did I experience political interference. Specifically, I was not directed to publicly release information about the weapons used by the perpetrator to help advance pending gun control legislation.

Was there pressure for information from the federal government about this incident? Yes.

This wasn't surprising as we were dealing with the biggest mass shooting incident in our country.

It was my responsibility to keep relevant officials apprised of the evolving situation while maintaining the integrity of the operation.

Were the requests for information and updates political interference? No.

And in my dealings with Minister Blair, he was very conscious of this and has never sought to interfere in the investigation.

I understand that some RCMP employees may have a different perspective based on the meeting of April 28th.

However, I was the only RCMP official dealing with the Minister, other senior government officials, and occasionally with the Prime Minister. And I am the only one who can speak to the nature of the requests, exchanges of information and my intentions during that meeting.

The integrity of a police investigation is critical – as someone with over 35 years of policing, that's something that I would never seek to influence or jeopardize.

Nor would I allow RCMP investigations to be dictated or influenced by government officials.

I am accountable to the Minister from an administrative perspective, but the RCMP is operationally independent.

The basis for this principle is to prevent direct and specific political control of police operational activity, with the sole responsibility for operational decision-making resting in the hands of police officers.

Keeping the government informed through timely and accurate information sharing is not interference. It's standard procedure and these situational updates are provided without compromising the operational integrity of an investigation.

I did provide information on April 23rd about the types of weapons found in the perpetrator's possession - information that was to be shared with the Minister and the Prime Minister – noting that it wasn't to be disseminated any further as there was an active investigation.

Additional information was shared as well, but government officials were advised that any information received couldn't be shared with the media until first released by RCMP. This included such information as the number and names of the deceased, replica police uniforms and vehicle information, the incident at the fire hall, the background of the perpetrator and the weapons used and seized.

In the lead up to the Nova Scotia press conference scheduled for April 28th, I provided information to the government on what would be released, at which time I was asked if the information about the weapons would be included.

When my communications team told me it would be, I relayed this information back to Minister Blair's Chief of Staff and the Deputy Minister of Public Safety.

Regarding my use of the word 'promise' during the meeting I had with my team following that press conference - at that time and in that context, I was trying to convey that I had confirmed to the Minister that the information about the weapons would be released during the press conference – a confirmation made based on information I had been provided.

Due to a miscommunication, this was not the case, and I felt I had misinformed the Minister and, by extension, the Prime Minister.

These were difficult and demanding circumstances. Everyone was doing their best to provide information to the government, to the public and to the media about this appalling event.

And this all took place just over a month after COVID-19 was declared a global pandemic. The pandemic fundamentally changed how we managed the incident.

The unfortunate reality is that the information flow from Nova Scotia colleagues into my office in the hours and days following the shooting wasn't what it should have been. It was for this reason I called the meeting - to express my disappointment and frustration and to outline expectations.

Once I was informed during the meeting of the miscommunication, and that releasing the information would jeopardize the ongoing investigation, I considered the matter closed and did not pursue it further.

This was clearly articulated to the Minister's office, and in fact, to support my assertion on non-interference, this information was not released until several months later.

On the matter of the April 28th meeting itself, it needed to happen. It was essential that I had more timely and accurate information and it was important that my team understood expectations going forward.

It was not helped by the fact that it was a teleconference – I had no visual cues for how my words affected those on the call. In the early days of the pandemic we didn't yet have access to the on-screen platforms we do now.

But the timing of the meeting itself was not ideal and I should have been more sensitive to those in attendance - people who had been operating in a high stress and emotionally charged environment and had just come off of significant press conference.

Given this context, I regret the timing and how I framed the conversation, but the discussion was necessary.

It wasn't brought to my attention until a year later that there were concerns of political interference stemming from that meeting and that my approach and interactions with my team were in question. Had I known my words and approach had such an affect I would have definitely made things right sooner...this is who I am.

Let me be clear: I did not interfere in the investigation. I did not receive direction. And I was not influenced by government officials regarding the public release of information and, more importantly, on the direction of the investigation.

I ensured that operational independence was maintained in all my interactions with government, as I do today.

In closing, I'll note that the RCMP is committed to supporting the important work of the Mass Casualty Commission.

Any time we have a mechanism to review and, importantly, improve how we operate is critical.

Thank you.

Tab 4 Commissioner's role – political engagement

RCMP speaking points:

- I am accountable to the Minister from an administrative perspective, but the RCMP is operationally independent.
- The basis for this principle is to prevent direct and specific political control of police operational activity, with the responsibility for operational decision making resting solely in the hands of police officers.
- Keeping the government informed through timely and accurate information sharing on such activities is not interference. It's standard procedure and one of my many responsibilities as the Commissioner of the RCMP.
- This operational independence is critical to maintaining the trust of communities we serve and has been front and centre in all of my interactions with the federal government in my role as Commissioner.

If pressed on political engagement in April 2020:

- At no time did I receive direction, nor was I influenced by government officials regarding the public release of information and, more importantly, on the direction of the investigation.
- It was my responsibility to keep relevant officials apprised of the evolving situation while maintaining the integrity of the operation.
- While there were constant requests for information from the federal government, these requests for information and updates were not political interference.
- In my dealings with Minister Blair, he was very conscious of this, and has never sought to interfere in the RCMP's investigation.

If pressed on political engagement generally:

- To reiterate, the integrity of a police investigation is critical – as someone with over 35 years in policing, this is something that I would never seek to influence or jeopardize.
- As outlined in the *RCMP Act*, as Commissioner, I have the control and management of the organization, under the direction of the Minister. In all interactions, the principle of police independence is respected.
- We provide information and respond to questions on a range of issues and files without impacting criminal investigations.

Questions and answers:

What information did you share with the Minister?

- I shared situational updates with the Minister, his office and other senior officials, but government officials were advised that any information received couldn't be shared with the media until first released by RCMP.
- This included such information as the number and names of the deceased, replica police uniforms and vehicle information, the incident at the fire hall, the background of the perpetrator and the weapons used and seized.

Is the RCMP free of political influence from the Federal Government?

- Yes, absolutely. Section 5 of the *RCMP Act* specifically states that as Commissioner I have "the control and management of the Force and all matters connected with the Force". I take this very seriously to ensure that the RCMP conducts all investigations in a

manner that is free of political influence.

What do you do when you are asked for information that may interfere with an ongoing investigation?

- I am always clear with the government about what I can and cannot share, and what information needs to be protected because it is part of an ongoing investigation.
- As stated, I routinely provide operational updates to the Minister, his office and the Government during an event or incident, but I do not take operational direction.

Do you have any suggestions for safeguards that can be put in place to protect against political interference?

- I believe that colleagues from Public Safety may be better placed to answer this question, but I would note that there have been a number of reports on how police and government interact, with a range of recommendations. For example, in 2007 there was the Task Force on Governance and Cultural Change in the RCMP – the Brown Report.
- I am not an expert on the various models, but we are working with Public Safety on a number of important measures such as strengthening our Management Advisory Board as part of our modernization efforts.
- The RCMP would be happy to support Public Safety and the Department of Justice in exploring guidance and safeguards to further protect the integrity of police investigations.

Tab 5 Commissioner's role – police independence

RCMP speaking points:

- I did not interfere in the investigation around this tragedy.
- It was my responsibility to keep relevant officials apprised of the evolving situation while maintaining the integrity of the operation.
- The integrity of a police investigation is critical – as someone with over 35 years in policing, this is something that I would never seek to influence or jeopardize.
- This operational independence is critical to maintaining the trust of communities we serve and has been front and centre in all of my interactions with the federal government in my role as Commissioner.

Questions and answers:

Q. If police operations are independent, why would the Commissioner request information related to the firearm be released publicly? Did the Minister ask the RCMP to release that information?

- I was not asked or directed to ensure the public release of information about the weapons used by the perpetrator.
- As I noted in my opening remarks, in the lead up to the Nova Scotia press conference scheduled for April 28th, I was asked if the information about the weapons would be included.
- When my communications team told me it would be, I relayed this information back to Minister Blair's Chief of Staff and the Deputy Minister of Public Safety.

Q. Why then, did you tell your team you had 'promised' this information would be released?

- Regarding my use of the word 'promise' during the meeting with my team that followed that press conference - at that time and in that context, I was trying to convey that I had confirmed to the Minister that the information about the weapons would be released during the press conference – a confirmation made based on information I had been provided.
- Once I was informed during this meeting that releasing the information would jeopardize the ongoing investigation, I considered the matter closed and did not pursue it further.
- This clarification was provided to the Minister's office.

Background / Current status:

Under the various statutes establishing the agencies, the Minister has the authority to provide "direction" to the Agency Heads, who are responsible for the "control and management" of the agency, "under the direction of the Minister". Direction is sometimes provided through formal instruments known as "Ministerial Directives".

The Principle of Police Independence

The two principles above apply even more strongly in the case of the RCMP, due to the principle of police independence. The principle of police independence requires that police, in exercising their police powers and making decisions related to law enforcement and the investigation of individual cases of alleged criminal activity, must be free of direction or influence from the executive. This principle was endorsed by the Supreme Court of Canada in 1999 in the case of Campbell and Shirose, which explained that the RCMP Commissioner "is not to be

considered a servant or agent of the government while engaged in a criminal investigation. The Commissioner is not subject to political direction". This includes political direction by the Minister of Public Safety, to whom the Commissioner ultimately reports. Any Directive to the RCMP must be provided to the Commissioner only and falls outside the law enforcement function so as to not infringe on police independence. They should not interfere with a specific law enforcement function, often referred to as "core policing decisions", as expertise, tactical and implementation decisions should be left to the RCMP.

Police Independence and Information Sharing

It is appropriate for government and police to exchange information. The government has a legitimate authority and often a significant interest in receiving information from the police about ongoing police operations. This authority is justified by the principle of ministerial accountability. Likewise, the government has the responsibility to keep the police updated on relevant policy decisions if it can be reasonably foreseen that they will affect police operations or public safety. However, safeguards must be put in place to protect the police from inappropriate government direction or interference. In exchanging information, RCMP and Government must respect proper chain of command and communication lines.

Police Independence and Contract Policing

As the representative of "Canada" for the purposes of the Provincial Police Service Agreements, the Minister continues to have a role and responsibilities in relation to the RCMP; the Commissioner continues to be under his direction. However, a distribution of responsibilities has been agreed upon in the Agreements. There is a danger that directives could be issued concurrently on matters of the same or overlapping subjects. To avoid being placed in a difficult position in relation to the delivery of policing services, the RCMP may thus, to the extent that it can and that it may be aware of an incoming directive, wish to encourage consultations between the governments of Canada and the province prior to a direction being issued.

Tab 6 Commissioner's role – communications

RCMP speaking points:

On communications in April 2020 specifically

- The 2020 mass shooting was a significant and dynamic event. As the situation unfolded, regular updates were provided to the public.
- Communication efforts were as timely as possible in an effort to provide Canadians with the information we could confirm at the time - without compromising an active, ongoing investigation.
- RCMP personnel, including communication and public affairs teams, are prepared to handle various crisis situations. As always, we continuously review our policies and procedures with a view to improving and applying lessons learned.
- The Mass Casualty Commission will continue its review of our actions in April 2020. The RCMP is committed to supporting the important work of the Mass Casualty Commission. Any time we have a mechanism to review and importantly improve how we operate is critical.

Background / Current status:

Roles and Responsibilities - RCMP Communications Staff

The RCMP's communications team is made up of representatives at the national, divisional, and detachment levels. The Director General (DG), National Communication Services (NCS) is the head of communications for the RCMP. The RCMP communications staff's activities, at National Headquarters and in Divisional offices, must adhere to the requirements set out by the Communications Policy of the Government of Canada, regardless of reporting relationships or placement within organizational structures.

At National Headquarters, NCS employees provide valuable advice and assistance in the development of policies and programs that enhance and promote RCMP services to the public, the RCMP's roles and responsibilities, and the RCMP's commitment to strengthening partnerships. This is key in safeguarding trust and confidence with the public and RCMP partners and stakeholders.

Divisional Communication Advisors provide advice and assistance in the development of policies, programs, and projects that enhance and promote RCMP services to the public, its roles and responsibilities and its commitment to strengthening partnerships. They provide many of the same services and products available from NCS, for example, web-based publishing, media-oriented products, project management for print products.

RCMP Reference Guide and Standard Operating Procedures for Crisis Communications (SOPs)

The RCMP Reference Guide and Standard Operating Procedures for Crisis Communications (SOPs) were developed by an internal working group of National Communications Services (NCS) staff in consultation with divisional communications units. The document offers detailed tactical guidance within a best practice framework of definitions, objectives and principles from three primary sources¹:

¹ (i) *Public Safety Canada's Emergency Communications Protocol 2021 – Version 3.0*

(ii) *Crisis and Emergency Risk Communications*, US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

(iii) *Crisis Communications in Canada*, by John E.C. Cooper

The goal of this document is to equip RCMP Communications teams “to respond quickly and appropriately to events ... to ensure a well-coordinated and effective communications response...”² that maintains public confidence in the organization.

The SOPs spell out key objectives, core stakeholder groups, evidence-based principles for an overall strategic approach, proven practices, roles and responsibilities for the on-site communications team and counterparts at National RCMP Headquarters, as well as evaluation and monitoring mechanisms. The document is updated on a yearly basis as to ensure relevancy and accuracy of the information contained.

² Public Safety Canada’s Emergency Communications Protocol 2021 – Version 3.0

Tab 7 Comportment

RCMP speaking points:

On the April 28, 2020 Meeting with H Division

- As police officers, we are relied upon to stay calm when faced with high pressure and emotional situations.
- I have expressed regret for the way I approached the meeting with my Nova Scotia RCMP colleagues.
- The timing of the meeting was not ideal. I should have been more sensitive to those in attendance - people who had been operating in a high stress and emotionally charged environment and had just come off of a significant press conference.
- But, the April 28th meeting needed to happen. It was essential that I had more timely and accurate information and it was important that my team understood my expectations going forward.
- We – our regular and civilian members, public service employees and those who work alongside us – are a team, and in that moment, I did not effectively lead them the way I would have liked.
- We are striving as an organization to gain the trust and confidence of the public and to build a safe and healthy workplace, and I know this starts with me.

If pressed on comportment during April 28, 2020 meeting

- Hindsight has offered me an opportunity to learn from this experience and do better. I've acknowledged my actions, expressed regret, and am committed to self-improvement.

If pressed on leadership and cultural change

- We have been focused in recent years on understanding RCMP culture and what we need to do to create meaningful and lasting change.
- We have learned that we need to focus on the ways we support each other professionally and personally, create safe spaces to share perspectives without fear of reprisal, and prioritize open communication.
- As leaders, our individual behaviours must model the RCMP core values that we just renewed—acting with integrity; showing respect; demonstrating compassion; taking responsibility and serving with excellence.
- These values are at the centre of becoming the healthy, inclusive and modern RCMP that we strive to be. I remain committed to reflecting, learning and leading by example.

Questions and answers:

Q. What are you doing to ensure those members feel support now?

- Learning is an ongoing process. Through important inquiries and reports such as MacNeil and Bastarache, combined with our RCMP 150 initiatives, we have come a long way, but there's always more to be done, as we will learn from the MCC.
- For example, one initiative taken by the RCMP was the establishment of a Support for Operational Stress Injury Program known as SOSI. SOSI consists of confidential one-on-one meetings with coordinators and group sessions. SOSI Coordinators are individuals who have a lived experience with operational stress injury, either personally or through living with someone or having worked in an environment supporting persons who have experienced trauma.

- The RCMP also provides all employees with access to internal peer-to-peer coordinators. Whether it's a work-related or personal issue, our coordinators can provide information on services offered through Health Canada's Employee Assistance Services, as well as referrals to resources within the RCMP.

Q. How can you ensure those members and future members do not face retribution from reporting similar situations?

- Employee Assistance Services, which include psychological counseling, are available to all RCMP employees and their families through Health Canada.
- Progress has been made in implementing many of the recommendations in the Bastarache report, as part of a holistic, long-term approach to a modern, healthy and inclusive RCMP, most notably:
 - We launched last year the Independent Centre for Harassment Resolution (ICHR) to address harassment prevention and resolution, and provide support for employees. Options are currently being explored to further externalize the ICHR to ensure there are no conflicts of interest.

Q. What services are available for the officers and their families after this tragic event?

- The RCMP has implemented a Family Liaison Program that provides support and guidance to families of serving and former RCMP members. The program is responsible for providing outreach presentations to detachments/units, managers, employees, veterans and family. The Family Liaison Program's mandate is to inform and educate peers of resources and benefits both internal/external to the RCMP. They maintain strong relationships with Canadian Armed Forces Family Wellness Centers, Veterans Affairs Canada, RCMP Warrant Officer Group, RCMP wellness and SOSI teams.

Tab 8 Issues before the MCC and other lessons learned

RCMP speaking points:

- As I noted in my opening remarks, I can't imagine what Nova Scotians went through during that 12-hour rampage and recognize the healing that is required to move forward.
- Each and every day, my employees do the best they can with the circumstances they are faced with, but of course we can always do better and that is why the Mass Casualty Committee was created... "to provide meaningful recommendations to keep communities safe in the future."
- The RCMP is committed to supporting the important work of the MCC. Any time we have a mechanism to review and importantly improve how we operate is critical.

If pressed:

- I will be providing testimony in the coming weeks at the MCC.
- I will continue to respect the process underway and abstain from any further comments. The RCMP supports this important work.
- I look forward to the Commission's findings and recommendations.

Tab 9 Firearms

RCMP speaking points:

- Since 2017, I have served as the Commissioner of Firearms, the chief executive of the Canadian Firearms Program.
- As per the *Firearms Act*, the role of the Commissioner is to support the lawful ownership and use of firearms in Canada by regulating firearms licensing and registration. In my role, I engage stakeholders in reviewing and developing policies, provide advice and support implementation.
- Reducing gun violence is a priority for the RCMP in the communities and areas that we serve, and also more broadly across the country.
- Beginning this fiscal year, the RCMP received \$40.3M over five years and \$5.5M ongoing to address firearms smuggling, including investments to support the Canadian Intelligence Service Canada's new Canadian Criminal Intelligence System, which will help all law enforcement in Canada to target and disrupt criminal activity.

Questions and answers:

What are your thoughts on the SECU's study on Gun and Gang Violence and the report that was tabled prior to the House adjourning?

- The RCMP is supporting the government in preparing its response to this very important study.
- The RCMP continues to examine areas that may require possible action, whether from a training, policy, procedural, resourcing or equipment perspective.
- I take the the issue of gun violence very seriously and strive to ensure that our policy, procedures and resourcing adequately reflect that.
- The RCMP is committed to ongoing collaboration and participation with our partners – to address issues of joint concern and responsibility highlighted in the SECU report.

Background / Current status:

The Commissioner of the RCMP is also the Commissioner of Firearms and reports annually to Parliament via the Minister of Public Safety on the operation of the Canadian Firearms Program.

Each province and territory has a Chief Firearms Officer who is responsible for: licensing individuals and businesses within their jurisdiction; issuing authorizations to transport and/or carry restricted and prohibited firearms; and, inspecting and approving shooting ranges. The provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have provincially designated Chief Firearms Officers. All other provinces and territories have federally designated Chief Firearms Officers.

Budget 2018 and 2021 Funding

From Budget 2018 and beginning in 2018-19, the RCMP received \$34.5M over five years from the Initiative to Take Action Against Gun and Gang Violence (ITAAGGV) to expand the services available to law enforcement by enhancing several capabilities to better combat the use of illegal firearms and improve the national collection, analysis and sharing of firearms-related intelligence and information. Further, the RCMP is providing specialized training to law enforcement agencies on firearms identification, regulatory requirements, as well as new technologies and emerging trends in firearms trafficking and illicit manufacturing.

From Budget 2021 and beginning this fiscal year, the RCMP received \$40.3M over five years and \$5.5M ongoing to address firearms smuggling, including investments to the Canadian Intelligence Service Canada (CISC) for its new Canadian Criminal Intelligence System that will help all law enforcement in Canada to target and disrupt criminal activity.

As well, the RCMP received an investment from Budget 2021 beginning this fiscal year of \$15M over five years and \$3.3M ongoing to increase capacity to trace firearms and identify the movement of illegal firearms into and within Canada.

Tab 10 Chronology

Sunday, April 19, 2020

- (PM Event) Outward Media – 12:15pm Conference with statementⁱ
- (H Division Event) Outward Media – 6:00pm News conferenceⁱⁱ
- (Ministerial/RCMP Event) Outward Media – Commissioner interviews with CBC, CTV and other outlets (based on MCC Report)
- (Ministerial/RCMP Event) Outward Media – Minister Blair Statementⁱⁱⁱ

Monday, April 20, 2020

- (PM Event) Outward Media – 12:15pm Conference with remarks on NS^{iv}
- (H Division Event) Outward Media – 2:00pm News conference
- (Ministerial/RCMP Event) Outward Media – 2:30 pm Ministers Blair & Fortier and Commissioner Lucki press conference^v

Tuesday, April 21, 2020

- (PM Event) Outward Media – 12:15pm News conference with remarks on NS^{vi}
- (NS Government Event) Outward Media – 3:30pm Provincial press conference^{vii}
- (RCMP NHQ Event) Outward Media – NHQ statement with updated death toll^{viii}
- (H Division Event) Outward Media – 8:26pm H Division statement on Facebook (posted online next day)

Wednesday, April 22, 2020

- (NS Government Event) Outward Media – Provincial press conference^{ix}
- (H Division Event) Outward Media – News conference and statement^{x, xi}

Thursday, April 23, 2020

- Outward Media – No media or statements
- Internal Communications (Unless otherwise specified, all messages sent by Commissioner Lucki) – One email outlining weapon inventory^{xii}
- Internal Communications (Unless otherwise specified, all messages sent by Commissioner Lucki) – List of weapons and request for a map^{xiii}

Friday, April 24, 2020

- (H Division Event) Outward Media – H Division news conference^{xiv}

Saturday, April 25, 2020

- Outward Media – No media or statements

Sunday, April 26, 2020

- Outward Media – No media or statements

Monday, April 27, 2020

- Outward Media – No media or statements

Tuesday, April 28, 2020

- (H Division Event) Outward Media – 4:00pm news conference^{xv}

- Internal Communications (Unless otherwise specified, all messages sent by Commissioner Lucki) – Internal meeting with Commissioner Lucki and H Division regarding communications
- Internal Communications (Unless otherwise specified, all messages sent by Commissioner Lucki) One email with reaction to press conference^{xvi}

Wednesday, April 29, 2020

- Outward Media – No media or statements

Thursday, April 30, 2020

- Outward Media – No media or statements

Friday, May 1, 2020

- (PM Event) PM Announcement of Ban of assault-style firearms^{xvii}

ⁱ <https://pm.gc.ca/en/videos/2020/04/19/remarks-situation-portapique-nova-scotia-and-updates-covid-19>

ⁱⁱ <https://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/en/news/2020/statement-nova-scotia-rcmp-commanding-officer-assistant-commissioner-lee-bergerman>

ⁱⁱⁱ <https://www.canada.ca/en/public-safety-canada/news/2020/04/minister-blair-responds-to-the-shooting-in-nova-scotia.html>

^{iv} <https://pm.gc.ca/en/news/speeches/2020/04/20/prime-ministers-remarks-shooting-portapique-nova-scotia>

^v https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MB-oc72c1_4

^{vi} <https://pm.gc.ca/en/news/speeches/2020/04/21/prime-ministers-announcement-emergency-community-support-fund>

^{vii} [Portail de la GRC/RCMP Web Gateway \(youtube.com\)](#), [COMM0057762 \(2\).pdf](#)

^{viii} [Update on Investigation into the incidents on April 18 and 19 | Royal Canadian Mounted Police \(rcmp-grc.gc.ca\)](#)

^{ix} [Portail de la GRC/RCMP Web Gateway \(youtube.com\)](#)

^x [Statement by RCMP Criminal Operations Officer, Chief Superintendent Chris Leather | Royal Canadian Mounted Police \(rcmp-grc.gc.ca\)](#)

^{xi} [Portail de la GRC/RCMP Web Gateway \(youtube.com\)](#)

^{xii} Recipients: Chris Leather, Lee Bergerman, Brian Brennan

^{xiii} Recipients: Rob Stewart, Zita Astravas, Vincent Rigby, Ken Moreau, Rob O'Reilly, Radey Barrack

^{xiv} <https://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/en/news/2020/maps-speaking-notes-supt-darren-campbell>

^{xv} <https://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/en/news/2020/speaking-remarks-supt-darren-campbell-april-28>

^{xvi} Recipients: Rob Stewart, Zita Astravas

^{xvii} <https://pm.gc.ca/en/news/speeches/2020/05/01/prime-ministers-remarks-announcing-ban-assault-style-firearms-canada>

Tab 11 Statement – June 21, 2022

Statement by Commissioner Brenda Lucki

June 21, 2022 Ottawa, Ontario

I want to acknowledge and address information included in the foundational document issued by the Mass Casualty Commission (MCC). As a police officer, and the RCMP Commissioner, I would never take actions or decisions that could jeopardize an investigation. I did not interfere in the ongoing investigations into the largest mass shooting in Canadian history. It is important to note that the sharing of information and briefings with the Minister of Public Safety are necessary, particularly during a mass shooting on Canadian soil. This is standard procedure, and does not impact the integrity of ongoing investigations or interfere with the independence of the RCMP. I take the principle of police independence extremely seriously, and it has been and will continue to be fully respected in all interactions.

The horrific events of April 2020, in Nova Scotia have forever changed the lives of victims' families, community members and RCMP employees across Nova Scotia and beyond. Several days after the mass shooting, I met with Nova Scotia RCMP colleagues to discuss a number of things. This included the flow of information to RCMP national headquarters on the investigation and the public release of information. It was a tense discussion, and I regret the way I approached the meeting and the impact it had on those in attendance. My need for information should have been better weighed against the seriousness of the circumstances they were experiencing. I should have been more sensitive in my approach. Had I led the meeting differently, these employees would have felt more supported during what I know was an extremely difficult time.

The RCMP continues to be an active participant in the MCC. I will be providing testimony in the coming weeks and the RCMP will continue to support the Commission's important work.

Tab 12 Media statement – June 29, 2022

Statement by Commissioner Brenda Lucki

I can confirm I received the letter from an RCMP employee about a meeting I had on April 28, 2020, with members of my team.

It was an extremely difficult time and I did express frustration with the flow of information. I regret the effects my words had on those involved in that meeting.

I know there are questions about political interference. There was certainly a need for an exchange of timely and accurate information with the Government of Canada and I endeavoured to do that. However, I want to re-emphasize that I did in no way seek to interfere in the ongoing investigation, nor did I feel any political pressure to do so.

I will be providing sworn testimony to the Mass Casualty Commission in the coming weeks and appearing before a Parliamentary Committee on these matters.

I won't be commenting any further as my thoughts and attention are on honouring Cst. Heidi Stevenson as we gather to celebrate her life at tomorrow's memorial.

Tab 13 SECU Transcript – June 23, 2022

The Chair (Hon. Jim Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.)):

Welcome back, everybody.

Ms. Dancho, you have a hand up. Let me introduce the subject, and then we'll proceed at pace. Pursuant to Standing Order 106(4), the committee is meeting to consider a request received by the clerk and submitted by more than four members of the committee regarding allegations of involvement of the offices of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Safety of politically interfering with the criminal investigation of the 2020 Nova Scotia mass murders.

Members have all received the letter. I will open the floor for debate.

Who would like to speak first?

(17910)

Ms. Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC):

Mr. Chair, my hand is up.

The Chair:

Yes, Ms. Dancho. I recognize you.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to move that the committee study the allegations of political interference in the 2020 Nova Scotia mass murder investigation and communications; that the committee (a) hold a two-hour meeting to hear from RCMP officials, including (i) Superintendent Darren Campbell, support service officer, Nova Scotia RCMP; (ii) Assistant Commissioner Lee Bergerman, Nova Scotia RCMP; (iii) Chief Superintendent Chris Leather, Nova Scotia RCMP; (iv) communications director Lia Scanlan, Nova Scotia RCMP; and (v) senior communications manager Sharon Tessier, RCMP; (b) hold a two-hour meeting to hear from, (i) Brenda Lucki, commissioner of the RCMP; (ii) former minister of public safety and emergency preparedness Bill Blair; (iii) deputy minister of public safety Robert Stewart; (iv) Minister Blair's former press secretary, Mary-Liz Power; and, (v) any other department officials involved in the 2020 Nova Scotia mass murder investigation and communications; and (c) that these meetings be held no later than June 30, 2022.

Mr. Chair, we are providing this motion to the clerk in both languages. He can distribute it immediately.

The Chair:

Do we have comments on the motion?

Mr. MacGregor, the floor is yours.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP):

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Actually, do you know what? I will give up my spot. I need to develop a few more thoughts on this.

Let me pass on this, Mr. Chair.

The Chair:

I'll go to you, Ms. Damoff.

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

Chair, could we suspend for a minute until we get the actual motion? It was read into the record, but we don't have a copy of it yet.

The Chair:

Is there agreement from members of the committee that we suspend sufficiently so that members have a chance to look at the motion?

Some hon. members:

Agreed.

The Chair:

Okay.

Clerk, let me know when the motion has been distributed and I can resume the meeting.

(17910)

(17920)

The Chair:

I call the meeting back to order.

Let's continue with the speakers list.

Ms. Damoff, I believe you have the floor.

Ms. Pam Damoff:

Thank you very much, Chair.

I have a couple of comments. Thank you to my colleague for bringing this motion forward and to all the colleagues for calling our meeting together today. These are important issues that this committee should be looking at.

I would remind everyone that there is the Mass Casualty Commission happening right now, where witnesses are under oath, just as they are in a court of law. We need to be mindful that we don't prejudice what's happening at that commission.

Commissioner Lucki will be appearing at the commission over the course of July. That's my understanding. That's a comment that will preface where I'm going with this.

The other thing is that next week—I believe it's on Wednesday—there's a memorial for Constable Stevenson, one of the....

Chair, I guess we need unanimous consent to continue.

The Chair:

Are the bells ringing?

Ms. Pam Damoff:

They are.

The Chair:

Do we have unanimous consent to continue this discussion while the bells are ringing?

Some hon. members:

Agreed.

The Chair:

Let's resume the discussion, Ms. Damoff.

Ms. Pam Damoff:

Thank you, Chair.

Next week there is a memorial for the RCMP officer who was killed during the horrible mass casualty in Nova Scotia. It would be absolutely insensitive and disrespectful for us to call all of these RCMP officers, as well as Commissioner Lucki, to appear before a committee at the same time as this memorial is being held in Halifax.

I am going to suggest that we hold a three-hour meeting—just one—and that we remove Minister Blair's press secretary, Mary-Liz Power, and any other department officials involved in the 2020 Nova Scotia mass murder investigation and communications from the list. They're numbers (iv) and (v) under point (b). I would further amend the motion that the meeting be held immediately following the commissioner's appearance at the Mass Casualty Commission. We would be able to ask these people questions following the commissioner's appearance. We would have more information at that time.

The other issue that we are running into, quite frankly, is that House resources are down from July 4 to 22. It would probably be in early August, but we would leave it to the chair to call the meeting immediately following the commissioner's appearance. I think we all have faith in our chair to do that.

Those are the changes I would propose to this motion.

(17925)

The Chair:

Ms. Dancho, I see your hand up.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. Perhaps the clerk—

The Chair:

I'm sorry, Mr. Clerk. Did you see other hands?

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Wassim Bouanani):

Yes. Madame Michaud was next and then Mr. MacGregor.

Ms. Pam Damoff:

Mr. Chair, to be clear, I moved the amendment to change the motion.

The Clerk:

Mr. Chair, the debate is now on the amendment moved by Ms. Damoff.

The Chair:

Ms. Michaud, you now have the floor.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Mr. Chair, I thought I was next.

The Chair:

I believe the clerk had a different interpretation of when hands were up. As you know, I can't see the whole room.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

I have a quick point of order, then.

I believe the Liberal member needs to move an official amendment. She has proposed it verbally, but she did not move it.

The Chair:

Ms. Damoff, do you have the intention of moving this amendment?

Ms. Pam Damoff:

Yes. The motion would be amended to say, under point (a), "hold a three-hour meeting to hear from RCMP officials, including"; remove point (b) completely; points (i), (ii) and (iii) under (b) would remain; and that those meetings be held following the commissioner's appearance at the Mass Casualty Commission.

To be clear, the panels would be (i) to (v) under point (a) as one panel, Commissioner Lucki as one panel, and Minister Blair as one panel. That would fill out the one hour. If you want me to clarify that in the motion, I can.

The Chair:

Are members clear on Ms. Damoff's motion as articulated?

Mr. Tako Van Popta (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC):

Mr. Chair, I am not clear on Ms. Damoff's motion. Please clarify it once more.

Ms. Pam Damoff:

Maybe this would be clearer. I would move that the committee hold a one-hour meeting to hear from RCMP officials, including those five named officials; hold a one-hour meeting to hear from Brenda Lucki, commissioner of the RCMP; hold a one-hour meeting to hear from the former minister of public safety and emergency preparedness Bill Blair, and deputy minister of public safety Robert Stewart; and that the three meetings be held on the same day, following the commissioner's appearance at the Mass Casualty Commission.

It would just be a—

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I'm not sure if the amendment is in order. Maybe the clerk can clarify that and we can move forward.

My understanding is that 106(4) requires that the meeting happens within five days. Can the clerk clarify?

The Chair:

The meeting within five days is the meeting we're having right now, Ms. Dancho.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor:

I have a point of order.

The second vote we had was specifically to move into public to discuss the 106(4) request. We have already approved the fact that this meeting is now dealing with the 106(4).

The Chair:

Yes. That's my understanding. We're debating it right now.

I have a list.

Madame Michaud, I believe you're next.

[Translation]

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ):

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

First of all, I would like to thank my colleagues from the NDP and the Conservative Party for proposing this emergency meeting pursuant to Standing Order 106(4).

I understand that we are debating Ms. Damoff's amendment. Indeed, I thank her for it and agree with her on the whole.

The reason I support the changes that Ms. Damoff has proposed is mainly because of timing. We do this kind of thing in order to get answers for our citizens and for the public. Now, let's face it, during the week between Quebec's National Holiday and Canada Day, people follow the news a little less—it's summer, the holidays are coming up. So if we really want to get answers and make sure that they reach the public, for the public's sake, we should hold this meeting at a slightly better time. Also, with the memorial service that Ms. Damoff was talking about, the timing seems even less appropriate.

So we have had a rather busy session. I think, out of respect for the human resources of the House, which are stretched, we should postpone this meeting. To have it as early as next week would be rushed. Personally, I would have postponed it until the resumption of regular business

in September, but I understand that it may be appropriate to hold it after Ms. Lucki's appearance before the inquiry in July. Perhaps that would be a better time.

Also, I have some questions about the French wording. I feel that the translation is not very accurate. The text talks about “meurtres collectifs,” but this is not really something that is said in French. It should be called the « tuerie de 2020 ». Secondly, I'm not sure I understand why it is proposed to study the allegations and communications. Perhaps it should be worded differently. Apart from these details, I am in favour of the changes proposed by Ms. Damoff.

(17930)

[English]

The Chair:

Thank you, Madame Michaud.

Now I have Mr. MacGregor on the list.

Sir, go ahead.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I agree with what Ms. Damoff is proposing in terms of putting this together in a three-hour meeting.

The one part I don't agree with is the timing. I know that we, as a committee, want to be respectful of the inquiry's work, and I still think we can do that. However, the revelations that have come out from media, from Wednesday onwards, deal with an issue that Parliament needs to be seized with.

The mass shooting inquiry is dealing with the events that happened on that terrible day two years ago, but we're dealing with allegations that the commissioner of the RCMP became involved in an investigation because it was to make a point for proposed firearms legislation. That's a very serious allegation. We have many more questions than answers at this point. I think it's possible for this committee to proceed in an orderly way that respects what the inquiry is trying to do, but that also allows us, as members of Parliament, to do our jobs to hold the government to account.

The one thing, though—and I know this might be a subamendment to the amendment—is that I think we also need to include the RCMP deputy commissioner, Brian Brennan. He is not listed here. It is mentioned that he was on the call with Commissioner Lucki. In fact, the handwritten notes from Superintendent Campbell noted that Deputy Commissioner Brennan tried to calm things down during what was a very heated call. He might add an interesting perspective. I would suggest that the deputy commissioner appear alongside the commissioner during her particular hour.

The one part I have an issue with in Ms. Damoff's amendment is the timing. I understand the value that might come from hearing the commissioner's testimony during the inquiry, and I understand that's to be a date around mid-July, but this is an issue that the country is seized

with right now. Our interest, as a committee, is going to be quite different from what the inquiry is looking at.

I would support having the meeting next week and trying to find a way to be respectful of the fact that the members of the RCMP we have listed here are going to be attending a memorial for a fallen comrade. I'm sure there is a way that we can work around that. We have Canada Day at the end, but there is a way for us to find some time so that they can both attend a fallen comrade's memorial and be present for our important inquiry.

I have an issue with the date. Everything else is fine. I would suggest that we also add Deputy Commissioner Brennan to the list.

(17935)

The Chair:

Is this in the form of a subamendment to Ms. Damoff's amendment? Are you formally putting forth the subamendment now?

Mr. Alistair MacGregor:

Yes.

My only subamendment would be to add Deputy Commissioner Brian Brennan to the hour that Commissioner Brenda Lucki is appearing.

The Chair:

Okay.

Ms. Dancho, I see your hand up.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

More to what Mr. MacGregor has said, I do agree that this is a breaking development. It is shocking and disturbing. It is certainly regrettable that it is happening during a very sober memorial next week. What I would say is that those responsible for the political interference that is mentioned in the testimony, that is on those people. That is on any individual in the Liberal government who put that political interference.... As mentioned in the notes, that is legal testimony in the Mass Casualty Commission. It is deeply regrettable that they have done that, at least as alleged in this testimony.

That is why we are here meeting today, so I would agree with Mr. MacGregor. I would also agree with Mr. MacGregor that we add Deputy Commissioner Brian Brennan. Certainly, he should be part of that. I agree on the timing and his addition there.

I would say, however, that we are concerned about Ms. Damoff's amendment to remove, in part (b), "(v), any other department officials involved in the 2020 Nova Scotia mass murder investigation and communications". We have no representative yet from the PMO on this. That is supposed to be encapsulated in this. It is specifically mentioned in two separate legal testimonies in the MCC that the Prime Minister or the Prime Minister's Office directed or pressured Commissioner Lucki, but there's no specific name mentioned. In order to do a fulsome investigation, we require a representative from the PMO who was involved in this, who

was in those discussions with the minister and Commissioner Lucki, so that they can come forward and answer questions.

Without having anyone representing the PMO or the other relevant top officials involved in this, we cannot verify or ask questions concerning the testimony that was just released. It is imperative that we have, at minimum, someone from the Prime Minister's Office who was involved at that time to come and testify at committee.

Again, the Liberal government would know who those individuals are, obviously. We would be firm on at least one representative from the PMO in order to ensure that this is a fulsome investigation.

The Chair:

Do other members want to add commentary on the subamendment?

Mr. Lloyd, go ahead.

Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC):

Thank you.

The Chair:

We're keeping an eye on the clock. I don't know how much time we have.

Mr. Dane Lloyd:

Yes. I'll try to be brief, Mr. Chair.

I agree with Mr. MacGregor's subamendment to add Brian Brennan, but I can't support Ms. Damoff's amendment as it is. A one-hour meeting with five RCMP officials; a one-hour meeting with the commissioner of the RCMP and, if it's amended, the deputy commissioner; and a one-hour meeting with the Minister of Public Safety and the deputy minister will not be near enough. I mean, if all five of these witnesses want to give five-minute opening remarks, that will eat up about half the meeting. Then we'll have only 30 minutes for actual substantive questions.

I would not support the amendment as is, but moving forward, let's have two two-hour meetings. One would be with the RCMP officials who were involved on the call. The other two-hour meeting would be with the commissioner and officials and the minister and officials.

I'm sensitive to what's happening next week. I think we can be flexible on that. I would certainly want to be flexible on that, but I think this one hour, one hour and one hour is way too short a time. It's not giving near enough attention to a very serious issue.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair:

Are there any other comments?

Mr. McKinnon, go ahead.

Mr. Ron McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.):

Thank you, Chair.

I'd certainly like to support Mr. MacGregor's subamendment. I'd actually like us to be able to vote on that particular subamendment, because I'd like to move a further subamendment, which I believe I can't do as long as that's on the floor. I'm going to propose an amendment so that instead of three one-hour meetings, we have one meeting, without being too specific about the panels.

Anyway, I can't move that until we deal with this subamendment.

(17940)

The Chair:

Go ahead, Mr. Van Popta.

Mr. Tako Van Popta:

Thank you.

I'm generally in favour of Mr. MacGregor's amendment. I think it's important that we have Mr. Brennan at the meeting. He was part of the call, and we want to hear from him.

I would also underline the fact that our investigation is going to be quite different from the Mass Casualty Commission investigation going on in Nova Scotia right now, which is really looking at operational matters—what happened on the ground, what didn't happen on the ground and timing issues. Our investigation is going to be more into allegations of political interference, which I think definitely falls within the realm of what this public safety committee needs to be doing.

I think it's an urgent matter. I think we need to move along just as quickly as we can. I understand that House of Commons resources will be limited over the next couple of weeks, but it is also my understanding that, for an emergency meeting, they can be made available. I think we need to use whatever tools are available to us, provided by the House of Commons, to conduct these meetings as soon as we can.

Thank you.

The Chair:

Go ahead, Ms. Damoff.

Ms. Pam Damoff:

Just for clarification, Mr. MacGregor's subamendment is to add the deputy commissioner to the motion. That's what we're voting on. Is that it?

Okay. Let's vote on that.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

It's also about timing, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Pam Damoff:

I think we should deal with those separately, if we could.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

It depends on what the subamendment was.

The Chair:

I didn't hear any reference to timing when Mr. MacGregor read his subamendment.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor:

Yes, Mr. Chair, and I'll confirm that. It's just to add the deputy commissioner at this point, because I think we're going to have a discussion on the timing after we pass the sub amendment.

The Chair:

Okay.

Colleagues, I'm looking at my clock. We vote in 11 minutes.

Clerk, how much time do we have to leave for members to vote in a timely way? How far do we run this clock down?

The Clerk:

I would say 10 minutes, Mr. Chair.

The Chair:

We have 10 minutes left, do you mean?

The Clerk:

Yes.

The Chair:

Why don't we stop the discussion now, vote, come back and then sort out the voting on the subamendment and the amendment?

Is that all right with everybody?

The Clerk:

Mr. Chair, we are doing the vote right now before suspending. Is that correct?

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

Mr. Chair, can we have clarification? Can we have the vote on the subamendment now and then suspend?

The Chair:

Is that the will of the committee?

Some hon. members:

Yes.

The Chair:

Let's take a vote on Mr. MacGregor's subamendment.

Mr. MacGregor, do you want to quickly read it, please?

Mr. Alistair MacGregor:

My subamendment is that the amendment be amended by adding Deputy Commissioner Brian Brennan of the RCMP to the panel with Commissioner Brenda Lucki.

The Chair:

That's clear.

(Subamendment agreed to: yeas 11, nays 0 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

The Chair:

Very good. Thank you, colleagues. The subamendment passes.

Now we're within the period where we should bear down on the vote.

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

Mr. Chair, I would like to move a subamendment as soon as we get back.

The Chair:

One thing at a time, Mr. McKinnon. Let's get the votes out of the way. There are a number of minutes left. I believe we have to wait 10 minutes after the vote has been announced in the House before we resume our deliberations. I will look to the clerk for a cue when those 10 minutes have passed, and then we will resume discussion of this item.

We'll see you in a few minutes.

(17945)

(18015)

The Chair:

Colleagues, I call the meeting back to order.

Just before we took the break to vote, we approved a subamendment by Mr. MacGregor. Just as we left the meeting, Mr. McKinnon wanted the floor.

Mr. McKinnon, go ahead.

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to move a subamendment, which is substantially what Ms. Damoff said, except when she said three meetings with one-hour panels, I wish to change that to one meeting with three panels.

I'm going to read the whole of the motion as applicable to my subamendment. At the end it retains the indication of timing that was in Ms. Damoff's motion. I understand that is something still to be discussed. I propose, if we can focus on just this subamendment and deal with just that as a subsequent issue, we'll move along most effectively.

The motion, as amended, would read that the committee study the allegations of political interference in the 2020 Nova Scotia mass murder investigation and communications, and that the committee hold one three-hour meeting that will include (a) a panel to hear from the

following officials from the Nova Scotia RCMP: (i) Superintendent Darren Campbell, support service officer, Nova Scotia RCMP; (ii) Assistant Commissioner Lee Bergerman, Nova Scotia RCMP; (iii) Chief Superintendent Chris Leather, Nova Scotia RCMP; (iv) communications director Lia Scanlan, Nova Scotia RCMP; and (v) senior communications manager Sharon Tessier, RCMP; (b) a panel to hear from (i) Brenda Lucki, commissioner of the RCMP; and (ii) Deputy Commissioner Brian Brennan; (c) a panel to hear from (i) former minister of public safety and emergency preparedness Bill Blair; and (ii) deputy minister of public safety Robert Stewart; and (d) that these meetings be held following the commissioner's testimony at the Mass Casualty Commission.

I understand there are some issues around the particulars there, but I suggest we vote on that particular subamendment and then we can deal with the particulars as further potential amendments.

Thank you.

The Chair:

Has that subamendment been circulated to members of the committee?

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

No, it has not. Because we don't have it translated exactly, the clerk can't distribute it.

The Chair:

Ms. Dancho, I see your hand up.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I appreciate Mr. McKinnon's amendment; however, I do feel it's a bit of a semantics amendment. I don't know how substantial it is, but I would make the point that three hours for, I think, about 10 witnesses, according to the original motion, is not nearly enough time. When we think that in the first hour we're inviting the numerous RCMP officials who were mentioned in the Halifax Examiner, that is not nearly enough time.

Mr. Lloyd made the point that they all have five-minute opening statements, and that would perhaps allow for one, maybe two, rounds of questioning. They are certainly a focus of this study. It would not do justice to the study and what we're trying to accomplish, which is to provide more insight into the legal testimony that was provided. Again, one hour is not nearly enough time to have opening statements and to provide rounds of questioning to each party, when it is important for the democratic process to get the full story from these witnesses.

I have great issue with the time constraints being put on the Liberal members on this. I think if we want to be open and transparent, we need substantially more time. That's why we originally proposed a full two-hour meeting for all the RCMP officials. I think that is very important and we need to stick to that.

Therefore, we don't support this subamendment.

(18020)

The Chair:

Do any other members of the committee have commentary on the subamendment?

Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Dane Lloyd:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

One point for clarification, do we know exactly when the commissioner is speaking to the Mass Casualty Commission? Do we have a firm date? I wouldn't want to commit to a subamendment such that anything could happen and then the commissioner's testimony to the Mass Casualty Commission could be delayed. That would then force us, by supporting this amendment, to further delay our meetings.

Also, I think the point has been made by some of our colleagues around the table that this issue is separate from what the Mass Casualty Commission is talking about. This is about political interference. It's not about the details the Mass Casualty Commission is focused on. I don't think it should be a prerequisite that we wait until the commissioner has testified before we do that. I'd also like to know if Mr. McKinnon knows the date that the commissioner is testifying, because I can't commit to a subamendment unless I know what the date would be.

Ms. Pam Damoff:

On a point of order, Chair, right now the only change is changing the word "meeting" to "panel". I had already submitted the amendment on the timing, so maybe we can stick to a discussion of Mr. McKinnon's subamendment, which is changing this to "panel" from the word "meeting" and suggesting one three-hour meeting. It's the only change right now. The timing of the appearance of the meeting itself has already been submitted, so right now it's just "panel" that we're discussing.

The Chair:

Go ahead, Mr. McKinnon.

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

On the same point of order, I guess the other change is that, instead of specifying "one-hour panels", the subamendment just specifies "panels", so it could be an hour-and-a-half panel for the large panel, and it could be a two-hour panel for the large panel. That's really up to the committee to decide separately. I would reiterate that.... Let us vote on the subamendment and we can deal with the particulars separately.

The Chair:

Are there any other comments from members?

Mr. Alistair MacGregor:

Yes, I think it's already been covered. I think this vote is on a very specific part of the language, and then the discussion on the dates will resume when we're back to debating Ms. Damoff's principal amendment.

The Chair:

Okay.

Mr. Van Popta, do you have a comment before we go to the vote?

Mr. Tako Van Popta:

I do. I have a question for clarification.

I think Mr. McKinnon is saying that his subamendment was just technical and reordering things, but I want clarification on whether it would be "(v) Minister Blair's former press secretary Mary-Liz Power". Is she still on or is part of the amendment to have her removed? Then, on "(v) any other department officials involved in the 2020 Nova Scotia mass murder investigation", are they still in or are those out?

The Chair:

Go ahead, Mr. McKinnon, for clarification.

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

Thank you, Chair.

Those witnesses were removed by Ms. Damoff's amendment, so that still has to be voted on once we get through the subamendments. Those particular witnesses were dropped by Ms. Damoff's amendment.

[Translation]

Ms. Kristina Michaud:

On a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[English]

The Chair:

Madame Michaud, go ahead.

[Translation]

Ms. Kristina Michaud:

Could Mr. McKinnon please read his subamendment again before the vote?

[English]

The Chair:

That's always a good idea.

Mr. McKinnon, please read your subamendment before the vote.

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

Thank you, Mr. Chair, I would certainly be delighted to do that.

The motion, after my subamendments are applied, would read as follows: that the committee study the allegations of political interference in the 2020 Nova Scotia mass murder investigation and communications, and that the committee hold one three-hour meeting that will include (a) a panel to hear from the following officials from the Nova Scotia RCMP: (i) Superintendent Darren Campbell, support service officer, Nova Scotia RCMP; (ii) Assistant Commissioner Lee Bergerman, Nova Scotia RCMP; (iii) Chief Superintendent Chris Leather, Nova Scotia RCMP; (iv) communications director Lia Scanlan, Nova Scotia RCMP; and (v) senior communications

manager Sharon Tessier, RCMP; (b) a panel to hear from (i) Brenda Lucki, commissioner of the RCMP; and (ii) Deputy Commissioner Brian Brennan; (c) a panel to hear from (i) former minister of public safety and emergency preparedness Bill Blair; and (ii) deputy minister of public safety Robert Stewart; and (d) that the meeting be held following the commissioner's testimony at the Mass Casualty Commission.

The substantive subamendment really is to change Ms. Damoff's language about three meetings with one panel each to one meeting with three panels.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

(18025)

The Chair:

Ms. Dancho, I see your hand up.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to clarify something. Mr. McKinnon said that the timing for the three panels had not been identified, but when he just read his subamendment again, he said three hours of three panels, I believe.

Could he clarify that? Are the hours open and it's three panels, or is it three panels in three hours?

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

It's that the committee hold one three-hour meeting that will include (a) panel, (b) panel and (c) panel.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Mr. Chair, to my point, Mr. McKinnon may have misspoke earlier. He mentioned that the timing for the hours was open with his amendment, but it is, in fact, defined to three hours. To my point, that is not nearly enough time for all of the witnesses to testify fully.

The Chair:

Are there any other comments before we put the matter to a vote?

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

I have a clarification, Mr. Chair.

The Chair:

Yes.

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

My point earlier was that we did not specify one-hour panels. Within the context of the broader meeting, we can set those panels to be whatever length makes sense in that context.

The Chair:

Are we ready for the question?

(Subamendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

(18030)

The Chair:

We'll return to debate on Ms. Damoff's amendment, I believe, as amended.

Do we have a speakers list to address Ms. Damoff's amendment?

The Clerk:

Yes, Mr. Chair.

The Chair:

Ms. Dancho, I think I see your hand up.

The Clerk:

I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. First, it was Mr. MacGregor and then Ms. Dancho.

The Chair:

Mr. MacGregor, go ahead.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor:

I'll make this quick.

I want to put on the record that I support 90% of what Ms. Damoff is proposing here. My disagreement with the amendment is on the timing.

I feel strongly that this meeting should happen next week. I can't pick out parts of the amendment, so overall that's why I will have to vote against it.

The Chair:

Go ahead, Ms. Dancho.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Mr. Chairman, I am going to move a subamendment, but I have a question for the clerk first. The scheduled maintenance is to begin the week following next. My understanding is that if Parliament requires an urgent meeting—and I believe we've established that this is urgent—we can meet during scheduled maintenance.

Mr. Clerk, could you confirm that, please?

The Clerk:

Yes, Ms. Dancho, the House administration would provide support if necessary.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have one more question before I move my subamendment. The point has been made that next week there is a memorial on Wednesday, and we could perhaps have this meeting on Thursday. To Mr. MacGregor's point and the points that have been made, this is an urgent matter. I recognize that Liberal members and perhaps our Bloc colleague would prefer not to

have it the same week as the memorial. If that's the case, I think perhaps a compromise, a "purple tie" moment, may be that we host the meetings in the first week of the scheduled maintenance.

I would like to move a subamendment to the Liberal motion.

Mr. Chair, I don't have the amendment with the subamendment in front of me, so I'm not sure how we proceed in this type of situation. The objective of my amendment is as follows. The panels have been divided into three groups. We have the RCMP officials, Commissioner Lucki, and the deputy minister and the minister. Is that correct? Can we clarify since we don't have it in front of us?

Oh, I have it now. We have a panel with the RCMP officials. We have a panel with Commissioner Lucki and Deputy Commissioner Brennan, and we have a panel with Minister Blair and the deputy minister.

I would move an amendment that we make the first meeting with the RCMP officials two hours, the panel with Commissioner Lucki and Deputy Commissioner Brennan one hour, and the panel with Minister Blair and the deputy minister one hour, and that we provide a 30-minute recess between each panel. That's one part of the amendment.

The second part of the amendment is that, in the hour that Minister Blair and his deputy minister are coming, a representative from the Prime Minister's Office come. Obviously, we require someone from the Prime Minister's Office to speak because they have been mentioned in two different accounts in the legal witness testimony provided to the Mass Casualty Commission. This investigation at this committee would be incomplete without a representative of the Prime Minister's Office, so that's the second part of my amendment.

Then the third part is that we meet in the first week of the scheduled maintenance. I propose Monday. I'm not sure of the exact date, but it's a Monday.

The Chair:

We have the subamendment on the table.

I now would invite members of the committee to comment.

Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Dane Lloyd:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's important to note that this subamendment, to clarify and summarize what my colleague was saying, adds an hour. That addresses my concern, because one hour for five officials from the RCMP to present on one panel, even if, as Mr. McKinnon said, we could extend it by a half an hour within the three-hour time frame, is not enough time for us to properly cross-examine these officials.

I agree with the two hours, but I would also note that this subamendment would basically, because we are setting a date during the maintenance period, invalidate the amendment that Ms. Damoff made that we await the commissioner's testimony at the Mass Casualty

Commission unless that testimony takes place before that, but I don't believe it will. It's important to note that this subamendment would be eliminating that requirement.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

(18035)

The Chair:

Ms. Damoff.

Ms. Pam Damoff:

Thanks, Chair.

In the spirit of collegiality with my colleague from the Conservatives, I think we could agree to a four-hour meeting, but I would reiterate that the commissioner is testifying at the inquiry in July at some point. I continue to stress that she should come following her testimony. Even if we moved it to that first week of July, it would be prior to her testimony. We don't have a date. I know Mr. Lloyd and I were having a sort of off-line conversation on that, but my understanding is that there is not a date for the commissioner to testify.

It's also my understanding that, when she testifies, there's no time limit on it. It could be a day. It could be two days. It could be three days. It could be a week. It depends on the commissioner and how many questions they want to ask her. If we're having these officials come, I strongly urge colleagues to do this after she has testified and we have all the facts on the table. That would likely be in August.

We could support changing it to a four-hour meeting but not the end part. I think we'd have to vote against Ms. Dancho's amendment and then perhaps, depending on how that turns out, we could amend again to make it a four-hour meeting, but we would have to vote against it the way it is worded now.

The Chair:

Ms. Dancho, I see your hand up.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I thank Ms. Damoff for her comments, but I would reiterate the point that's been made several times. The inquiry is investigating something separate to what we are investigating at the public safety committee. Our responsibility is to hold the government accountable for their actions in all regards and all departments in public safety. This is an urgent matter, a shocking revelation from the Mass Casualty Commission, that we will be further investigating, which is our duty as opposition members and as members of this public safety committee.

I would reiterate that the inquiry is investigating matters separate from what we are investigating. We have an obligation to move forward, and to move forward quickly, frankly, given the revelations that were made and how shocking they are. I believe the public deserves answers rather than waiting four, five or six weeks to hear.

I would respectfully disagree with my colleague on that.

The Chair:

Are there any other comments from members of the committee on the subamendment?

Go ahead, Mr. McKinnon.

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

On a point of order, I would like to caution or bring to attention regarding Ms. Dancho's words that these are not revelations so much as allegations. I think we should keep to that language.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

On a point of order, Mr. Chair. This is legal witness testimony as part of the Mass Casualty Commission, just to be clear.

The Chair:

Are there any other comments from members of the committee before we put the subamendment to a vote?

Mr. MacGregor, go ahead.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I guess I would seek clarification from our clerk with regard to the critical maintenance. It did say that, if there's an urgent request for a House committee to meet, so if we do decide to meet that week of July 4, it is possible.

The Clerk:

Yes, Mr. MacGregor, it's indeed the case. Yes, it would be possible, if required by the committee. Exceptionally, we would be able to hold the meeting.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor:

That was my only question.

The Chair:

Go ahead, Ms. Damoff.

Ms. Pam Damoff:

Mr. Chair, I'll defer to Ms. Michaud, and then I'll go.

[Translation]

Ms. Kristina Michaud:

Thank you, Ms. Damoff.

I know that if it's urgent, we can arrange for the committee to meet. However, the resources of the House require three weeks a year to do maintenance work on the system and reprogram it so that everything is ready for the next session of Parliament.

I understand that the committee wants to meet for four hours, because we have a lot of witnesses to hear. However, with all due respect to the resources of the House, I think we could postpone the meeting until after the commissioner's testimony.

I will have to vote against the subamendment. I agree that the committee should meet for four hours, but I do not agree with the timing of the meeting, unfortunately. If we could separate the two proposals, we could reach a compromise. Otherwise, I will be obliged to vote against the subamendment.

(18040)

[English]

The Chair:

Mr. Shipley, I see your hand up.

Ms. Pam Damoff:

I'm sorry, Chair. I was next. I deferred to Ms. Michaud.

The Chair:

Madam Damoff, go ahead.

Ms. Pam Damoff:

Thanks, Chair.

As a further comment to Ms. Dancho's, we wouldn't support a half-hour break in between each panel as well. That's getting into quite a lengthy meeting. We don't normally do that.

The other thing I think we need to be mindful of is that the five individuals who've been asked to testify, and who are now being asked to testify for two hours, are individuals who were deeply traumatized by what happened in Nova Scotia. They have publicly acknowledged that they have had mental health issues following that, and we're asking them to then appear for two hours at our committee. I think we should be mindful of that and give the option of one or two hours in order to be respectful of the mental health challenges they've had.

I'm not quite sure how we deal with that in the motion, but I wanted to raise that as a concern for all of us. I know that the members of this committee do take the mental health of our public safety officers very seriously, especially these individuals who have experienced so much trauma.

The Chair:

Yes, Mr. Shipley.

Mr. Doug Shipley (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC):

Thank you, Chair.

I really think this is an extremely important issue for a lot of people, starting with the people who were involved with this incident and the people who lost loved ones in this incident, the residents of Nova Scotia and all Canadians.

There are some serious allegations out there right now, and I think it is our job, our duty, to look into these allegations as soon as possible. The fact that we're discussing putting it off is quite shocking to me. The House has indicated that the resources would be available for the week after July 4. To put it off for six weeks minimum is just not doing our jobs properly. I think it's the

sooner the better to look into these serious allegations, find out what happened and move forward.

I'll be supporting doing this as soon as we possibly can, keeping in mind that, yes, we won't do it next week when the memorial is on—I think that's respectful—but the week after that, I think, would be more than fine. I think we owe it to people—we owe it to Canadians—to find out what really happened and move forward.

Thank you, Chair.

The Chair:

Ms. Dancho.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I agree with my colleague Mr. Shipley about the urgency of this.

I don't think that provides answers for Canadians or the families of victims who have likely been shocked by the information at the Mass Casualty Commission.

I do appreciate Ms. Damoff's comments about the mental health of the witnesses, certainly. We do know from the testimony that was reported that they also suffered as a result of the meeting with Commissioner Lucki, who, from the testimony, was seen that to be under significant pressure. To quote the testimony as written by Superintendent Campbell, she was very "upset", and that was stressed consistently in the reporting of the Mass Casualty Commission's findings of the written testimony from Mr. Campbell.

Again, I think that some of the responsibility for the impact on these individuals would seem to lie with those who were putting the pressure on them to reveal information and to interfere for political purposes in a criminal investigation. That is why we should be meeting urgently to discuss this matter.

Again, I would just reiterate that to wait five, six or maybe even seven—we're not sure—weeks is inappropriate and unacceptable, frankly.

The Chair:

Thank you.

Are there other comments from members of the committee?

Mr. Lloyd, go ahead.

Mr. Dane Lloyd:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I wanted to address one of the points that Ms. Damoff raised. It is going to be a long four-hour meeting, and if we don't have any recesses between the panels, it's going to be very long for us and for the witnesses.

I think the IT team is probably going to have to work to get.... Because maybe all these people won't be here physically and they'll be here virtually, there is going to be a 10- to 20-minute period to get these witnesses on. I just think that there's no reason why we shouldn't have a 30-minute recess so that people can go and get a coffee or go to the bathroom, just so we can have time to get the witnesses changed over. I don't see why there would be a problem with having a 30-minute recess in this case, since we probably are going to be taking 10 to 15 minutes to get the witnesses changed over anyway. I would stand by that subamendment.

(18045)

The Chair:

Are there other comments from members of the committee on the subamendment?

If not, Clerk, would you please administer the vote?

(Subamendment negated: nays 6; yeas 5 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

The Chair:

The subamendment is defeated. We now move back to Ms. Damoff's amendment to the main motion.

Do we have speakers who wish to resume debate?

Ms. Dancho, off you go.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just to be clear, we are now looking at a situation in which this meeting is to follow up on the recent testimony from the Mass Casualty Commission that there was political interference from the Liberal government and pressure put on the RCMP to interfere in a criminal investigation. The Liberal position currently is to wait over four, five, maybe six weeks to hear from those witnesses, to take those 10 witnesses—pardon me, nine witnesses—and put them in a three-hour meeting, five to six weeks from now. That's nine witnesses in three hours.

Also, they refuse to allow a member of the Prime Minister's Office to attend. They're avoiding accountability on this. I'm actually quite shocked that members of the Liberal Party on this committee are so keen to avoid transparency on this. It's very disappointing, Mr. Chair. The amendment as it stands now is completely unacceptable and certainly does not do justice for the victims' families, who are continuing to be shocked and traumatized by this.

I would ask committee members that we move forward on something better than waiting until over a month from now, squeezing nine witnesses into three hours, and preventing the Prime Minister's Office, which has been accused twice in the testimony, from appearing. They need to face accountability. We need to be transparent, and this needs to be a fulsome investigation, Mr. Chair.

The Chair:

Mr. Lloyd, you're next.

Mr. Dane Lloyd:

Mr. Chair, I would note that Ms. Damoff had indicated earlier that she would be supportive of extending the three hours to four hours. I think there's an indication that there would be a recess, but we just wouldn't need to specify that it would be 30 minutes. It would be subject to the will of the committee, I believe, for a period of time between the panels so that members could take the appropriate time to reflect and to think about the testimony they're hearing, take a break and go to the washroom.

I would say I will move a subamendment, which I think will get support, that we extend this to a four-hour meeting. Then we can just clear that out of the way.

The Chair:

Okay. We now have a subamendment on the table, as just articulated by Mr. Lloyd.

Is there commentary on the subamendment?

Mr. Noormohamed.

(18050)

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:

I was simply going to say that it makes good sense to do that. I think it allows us to ensure that we not lose time while we change panels and so on, and it provides, I think, a good compromise for us to move forward.

I think it's a good thing.

The Chair:

Okay.

Are there other comments?

Mr. Dane Lloyd:

I just want to clarify something, Mr. Chair.

The Chair:

Go ahead.

Mr. Dane Lloyd:

If there is any recess time in that, we just want to clarify that it is not taken away from the four hours of meetings. There will be four hours of witness testimony total. I just want to get that on the record.

The Chair:

Is that clear to members of the committee? Okay.

I'll ask you, Mr. Lloyd, to read your subamendment before we move to a vote.

Mr. Dane Lloyd:

I would just move to ask for unanimous consent from the committee to consent to four hours.

The Chair:

Do we have unanimous consent from the committee to move to four hours?

(Subamendment agreed to)

The Chair:

Yes, we do. Therefore, we have unanimous consent to approve the proposed subamendment.

The Clerk:

Next is Ms. Dancho, Mr. Chair, and then.... No, actually, it's Mr. Van Popta and then Ms. Dancho.

The Chair:

Go ahead, Mr. Van Popta.

Mr. Tako Van Popta:

I'll defer to Ms. Dancho. I think her hand was up first.

The Chair:

It's always tough to know.

Go ahead, Ms. Dancho.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to move a subamendment on the witness list for the panel the minister and deputy minister are attending, so that it includes a representative from the Prime Minister's Office who was working on this file at the time of the meeting mentioned in the MCC testimony that was within that first week of the massacre.

I move an amendment to include a representative from the Prime Minister's Office who was involved at that time and who was mentioned in the Halifax Examiner article.

The Chair:

Yes, but just for clarity, did we deal with Mr. Lloyd's subamendment? I believe we did by unanimous consent.

Is that everybody's understanding?

A voice:

Yes.

The Chair:

Then we can move on to the additional subamendment that is now being put forward by Ms. Dancho.

I will open up discussion of that subamendment to members of the committee.

The floor is open.

Mr. Tako Van Popta:

I believe I am up next.

The Chair:

Go ahead, Mr. Van Popta.

Mr. Tako Van Popta:

I completely support that motion to have a witness from the Prime Minister's Office attend. The evidence that was given by the superintendent of the RCMP for Nova Scotia, Darren Campbell, indicates that there was pressure from the Prime Minister's Office to disclose certain information at a press conference that Mr. Campbell was not comfortable presenting or making public at that time so as not to jeopardize the ongoing investigation.

It's extremely important for this committee, the parliamentary standing committee on public safety, to hear from an appropriate witness from the Prime Minister's Office.

The Chair:

Are there other comments on this subamendment?

The Clerk:

I see Madame Michaud, Mr. Chair.

[Translation]

The Chair:

Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

Ms. Kristina Michaud:

Actually, I'd like to ask for clarification.

Is today's meeting going to end at 1 p.m.? If it is the case and we don't have time to vote on the motion when will we have the opportunity to come back to it?

[English]

The Chair:

Clerk, what is the status of the time available to us for this meeting?

The Clerk:

We can go beyond 1 p.m., Mr. Chair.

The Chair:

How far beyond?

The Clerk:

I'm not sure, Mr. Chair. I can get back to you.

The Chair:

Okay.

We can go beyond the top of the hour, and we'll see what further information is passed on to us.

Are there other comments on the subamendment? Are there any other hands up? Can we call the vote?

Ms. Dancho, for clarity, please repeat for members of the committee the substance of your subamendment.

(18055)

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My subamendment is to add to the witness list a member of the Prime Minister's Office who was involved at the time of the reports from the Mass Casualty Commission that is the subject of the 106(4) motion.

The Chair:

Okay.

Go ahead, Clerk—

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Pardon me. For clarification, it's someone who was involved with the Prime Minister's Office and communicating with Minister Blair and Commissioner Lucki.

The Chair:

Is that clear to all members of the committee?

Okay. We'll go ahead and administer the vote on the subamendment by Ms. Dancho.

(Subamendment negatived: nays 5; yeas 4 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

The Chair:

We now move back to a discussion of Madam Damoff's amendment.

Who would like the floor to resume that debate?

Go ahead, Ms. Damoff.

Ms. Pam Damoff:

Thank you, Chair.

Being mindful of the time and the fact that we have another vote at 1:30 p.m., perhaps I could encourage our colleagues to maybe move to a vote on my amendment and see where that lands. I would very much like us to finish this today. I don't want us to have to come back another day for this meeting. We're all here today. This is the last day of Parliament. If colleagues are okay with it, perhaps we can move to a vote on my amendment and go from there.

The Chair:

Do we have agreement from colleagues that we can move to a vote on Ms. Damoff's amendment?

No, we don't. There are hands up.

Mr. Lloyd, go ahead.

Mr. Dane Lloyd:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think we're coming very close to the end of what we're going to do here. I think there's maybe really only one outstanding issue. I know Ms. Michaud expressed concern about when we would have this meeting. I know she expressed concern that there is a maintenance period in the House of Commons from July 4 to July 22. I note that the clerk did say that resources could be made available, and I know Ms. Michaud knows that, because she was told that. We were all told that before, so what I would propose is a subamendment that we meet by July 23 or when the maintenance ends, whichever is sooner. I think that might be a compromise that the committee could agree on.

The Chair:

We have a subamendment on the table.

Is there any commentary on Mr. Lloyd's subamendment?

Ms. Damoff.

Ms. Pam Damoff:

Quickly, Mr. Lloyd, do you want to clarify as to whether it is the week of July 25 or when the maintenance is completed? It could go later, too, so do you want to amend it to say, "the week of July 25"?

(18100)

Mr. Dane Lloyd:

To clarify, what my amendment is saying is that we recognize that this maintenance is happening. It's scheduled from the 4th to the 22nd, so we want to get this done as soon as the maintenance is done. I had originally suggested the 22nd, but the clerk told me that is a Saturday, and I don't think we want to be having this meeting on a Saturday, so I would.... That's the 23rd. I'm sorry.

I am clarifying that my subamendment is that it would be the 25th, which would be the Monday. If the maintenance is still ongoing on the 25th, we would still have the meeting. If the maintenance ends before the 25th, then we could have the meeting the day after. The idea is that it would be whichever happens sooner, the maintenance ends or the 25th of July. I hope that will be good for the committee.

The Chair:

Are there any other comments?

Madame Michaud.

[Translation]

Ms. Kristina Michaud:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Lloyd. I'm grateful to you for making this compromise. I'm very happy with your proposal.

[English]

The Chair:

Okay.

Are we ready for the vote? Are there any other hands up?

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Mr. Chair, just to clarify, in sum, we are having nine witnesses appear through three panels for a four-hour meeting the day after the maintenance is done, and we are having zero representation from the Prime Minister's Office. Can you confirm that's the case, that we are meeting in a month, with no representation from the Prime Minister's Office?

The Chair:

Clerk...?

The Clerk:

Mr. Chair, that's my understanding.

The Chair:

Okay. Are we ready for the vote?

(Subamendment agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

The Chair:

The subamendment passes. We now revert to Ms. Damoff's amendment.

Are there any other comments?

I'm very conscious of the time, and I would encourage members to keep their interventions short so that we can move this to a vote.

Are there any hands up?

Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Dane Lloyd:

Mr. Chair, given that this has been heavily amended, I think it would be a good opportunity for the clerk to give us a final reading on what we will be voting on with the amendments.

The Chair:

I agree. It's always a good idea.

Clerk, would you please read out Ms. Damoff's amendment as amended?

The Clerk:

Yes, Mr. Chair.

The motion as amended by Ms. Damoff would read that the committee study the allegations of political interference in the 2020 Nova Scotia mass murder investigation and communications, and that the committee hold one four-hour meeting that will include a panel to hear from the following officials from the Nova Scotia RCMP: (i) Superintendent Darren Campbell, support services officer, Nova Scotia RCMP; (ii) Assistant Commissioner Lee Bergerman, Nova Scotia RCMP; (iii) Chief Superintendent Chris Leather, Nova Scotia RCMP; (iv) communications director Lia Scanlan, Nova Scotia RCMP; and (v) senior communications manager Sharon Tessier, RCMP; the second panel will be held to hear from (i) Brenda Lucki, commissioner of the RCMP; and (ii) Deputy Commissioner Brian Brennan; the third panel to hear from (i) former minister of public safety and emergency preparedness Bill Blair; and (ii) deputy minister of public safety Robert Stewart; and that the meeting be held on the week of July 25.

(18105)

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

I have a point of order. The clerk's read-back was essentially correct; however, the language did not specify a second panel or a third panel. It just said "a panel" and "a panel".

Mr. Dane Lloyd:

I have a point of order as well, Mr. Chair.

The Chair:

Can we agree to make that modest change, colleagues?

Some hon. members:

Agreed.

The Chair:

I see yes.

Continue, Clerk.

Mr. Dane Lloyd:

I have a point of order. My point of order is just to clarify that the meeting would be held on July 25 or the day after the end of maintenance, whichever is sooner.

The Chair:

Yes, I believe I heard you say that.

Clerk, make sure that is included in the language that describes the amendment as amended. Okay. Are you finished reading or is there more?

Clerk, are you done?

The Clerk:

Yes, Mr. Chair.

The Chair:

Okay. Can we now put the question to members of the committee? That is Ms. Damoff's amendment as amended as articulated just now by the clerk.

Go ahead, Clerk.

(Amendment as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

The Chair:

Colleagues, I have some committee business that needs to be dealt with now—

(18110)

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

We still have to vote on the main motion itself, Mr. Chair.

The Chair:

Yes. We need to vote on main motion, of course.

Clerk, can you do the roll call on the main motion? Please read the main motion first.

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

Mr. Chair, the main motion, as we just passed the subamendment, is essentially identical. I wonder if we can just forestall that and go to the vote.

The Chair:

Is there agreement that we just go to the vote?

Ms. Dancho.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We can proceed shortly. I just want to make it clear that the Conservative members find it to be very important that a member from the Prime Minister's Office come and answer to the testimony provided to—

Ms. Pam Damoff:

On a point of order, Chair, are we not in the middle of a vote?

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

We are not voting, Ms. Damoff. We are free to discuss. I can bring forward a subamendment if I like, which I'm not doing.

Mr. Chair, I just want it to be clear that we believe it is very important to the testimony that an official from the Prime Minister's Office come and answer to the official legal testimony at the Mass Casualty Commission. The Liberal members led the way in ensuring that did not happen today. They also led the way in ensuring that this meeting does not happen for another month. For those reasons, we could not support this amended motion.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor:

I have a point of order.

With respect to Ms. Dancho, the date was selected through Mr. Lloyd's subamendment. I just think we need to be clear on that. The subamendment, which he offered as a compromise, and a very good compromise, did come from the Conservative side.

I think that needs to be on the record.

Ms. Raquel Dancho:

On that point of order, Mr. Chair, I think we were trying to have this meeting as soon as possible. Mr. Lloyd made a good-faith effort to try to get it to be as soon as possible. Our objective was to have it within the next week.

Just to the point, we were trying our best to get to this as quickly as possible. I appreciate Mr. Lloyd's work to ensure that this happens by the 25th. Of course, our initial motion was to have this next week, just to be clear.

The Chair:

Can we now get to the main motion, or do colleagues have something else to say before we do?

Seeing no hands, Clerk, would you please administer the vote on the main motion and read the main motion?

The Clerk:

Mr. Chair, do you want me to read the main motion?

The Chair:

Yes, please, unless members are content that they understand the main motion—there has already been a vote on it—and that we can now proceed to a vote on the main motion.

Is it agreed that we can do that?

Some hon. members:

Agreed.

The Clerk:

There seems to be agreement, Mr. Chair.

The Chair:

Let's move right to the main motion.

(Motion as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

The Chair:

Go ahead, Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Dane Lloyd:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I appreciate that you said we do have some committee business, but the clock is currently at 1:15 p.m. I move that we adjourn the meeting.

(18115)

The Clerk:

If I may, the bells are ringing, so we need unanimous consent to continue to sit before proceeding to other business.

The Chair:

Do we have unanimous consent to continue to sit?

We do not.

Clerk, what's the next move?

The Clerk:

Just one moment, please, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

Mr. Chair, we do have a motion to adjourn on the floor. It's dilatory. I think we should deal with that first.

I don't know what the process is, but the lights are going.

The Chair:

Clerk, where do you take us from here?

The Clerk:

Mr. Chair, because of the bells, we need to have unanimous consent before undertaking any other business. Without unanimous consent, we cannot move on to other business.

The Chair:

I called for unanimous consent and I didn't get it.

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

Mr. Chair, may I ask for the indulgence of the committee to give unanimous consent to continue until we deal with this matter of adjournment or not?

The Chair:

Do we have unanimous consent to deal with this matter of adjournment?

Yes, so let's deal with the matter of adjournment. Other committee business needs to be dealt with here, so what will be the sequence of events?

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

Mr. Chair, the motion to adjourn has been moved. It's not debatable.

The Chair:

Do we just go right to a vote on the motion to adjourn?

Mr. Ron McKinnon:

That would be my advice—yes.

The Chair:

Then let's vote on the motion to adjourn.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

(18120)

The Chair:

That means this meeting is adjourned.

Clerk, what happens to unfinished business that's still on the Order Paper?

The Clerk:

It will remain outstanding, Mr. Chair.

The Chair:

This meeting is formally adjourned.