

Public Inquiry Into Foreign Interference in Federal Electoral Processes and Democratic Institutions

Enquête publique sur l'ingérence étrangère dans les processus électoraux et les institutions démocratiques fédéraux

Public Hearing

Audience publique

Commissioner / Commissaire The Honourable / L'honorable Marie-Josée Hogue

VOLUME 10 ENGLISH INTERPRETATION

Held at : Tenue à:

Library and Archives Canada Bambrick Room 395 Wellington Street Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0N4

Thursday, April 4, 2024

Bibliothèque et Archives Canada Salle Bambrick 395, rue Wellington Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0N4

Le jeudi 4 avril 2024

INTERNATIONAL REPORTING INC.

https://www.transcription.tc/ (800)899-0006

II Appearances / Comparutions

Commission Lead Counsel /

Shantona Chaudhury

Procureure en chef de la commission

Commission Counsel /

Avocat(e)s de la commission Erin Dann

Matthew Ferguson

Gordon Cameron

Hubert Forget

Howard Krongold

Hannah Lazare

Jean-Philippe Mackay

Kate McGrann Lynda Morgan Siobhan Morris

Annie-Claude Poirier

Gabriel Poliquin Natalia Rodriguez

Guillaume Rondeau Nicolas Saint-Amour

Daniel Sheppard

Maia Tsurumi Leila Ghahhary

Emily McBain-Ashfield

Hamza Mohamadhossen

Commission Research Council /

Conseil de la recherche de la

commission

Geneviève Cartier

Nomi Claire Lazar

Lori Turnbull

Leah West

Commission Senior Policy Advisors /

Conseillers principaux en politiques de la

commission

Paul Cavalluzzo

Danielle Côté

III Appearances / Comparutions

Commission Staff / Annie Desgagné

Personnel de la commission Casper Donovan

Michael Tansey

Ukrainian Canadian Congress Donald Bayne

Jon Doody

Government of Canada Gregory Tzemenakis

Barney Brucker

Office of the Commissioner of Christina Maheux

Canada Elections Luc Boucher

Nancy Miles

Human Rights Coalition Hannah Taylor

Sarah Teich

Russian Canadian Democratic Mark Power

Alliance Guillaume Sirois

Michael Chan John Chapman

Andy Chan

Han Dong Mark Polley

Emily Young

Jeffrey Wang

Michael Chong Gib van Ert

Fraser Harland

Jenny Kwan Sujit Choudhry

Mani Kakkar

IV Appearances / Comparutions

Churchill Society Malliha Wilson

The Pillar Society Daniel Stanton

Democracy Watch Wade Poziomka

Nick Papageorge

Canada's NDP Lucy Watson

Conservative Party of Canada Nando de Luca

Chinese Canadian Concern Group on

The Chinese Communist Party's

Human Rights Violations

Neil Chantler

Erin O'Toole Thomas W. Jarmyn

Preston Lim

Senator Yuen Pau Woo Yuen Pau Woo

Table of Content / Table des matières	
	PAGE
MR. DAVID MORRISON, Affirmed/Sous affirmation solennelle	1
MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN, Affirmed/Sous affirmation solennelle	2
Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoire en-chef par Mr. Jean-Philippe MacKay	2
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Ms. Hannah Taylor	20
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Guillaume Sirois	23
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Sujit Choudhry	28
COMM MICHAEL DUHEME, Sworn/Assermenté	33
D/COMM MARK FLYNN, Sworn/Assermenté	33
Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoire en-chef par Ms. Lynda Morgan	33
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Ms. Leslie Schumacher	56
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Guillaume Sirois	58
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Ms. Hannah Taylor	63
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Sujit Choudhry	68
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Matthew Johnson	73
MR. DAN ROGERS, Sworn/Assermenté	75
Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoire en-chef par Ms. Erin Dann	75
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Guillaume Sirois	98
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Ms. Leslie Schumacher	103
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Ms. Hannah Taylor	105
MS. MICHELLE TESSIER, Affirmed/Sous affirmation solennelle	115
MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT, Affirmed/Sous affirmation solennelle	115
MS. CHERIE HENDERSON, Affirmed/Sous affirmation solennelle	115

VI Table of Content / Table des matières

	PAGE
Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoire en-chef par Mr. Gordon Cameron	115
Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoire en-chef par Me Jean-Philippe Mackay	121
Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoire en-chef par Mr. Gordon Cameron (cont'd/suite)	143
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Gib van Ert	169
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Nando de Luca	188
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Sujit Choudhry	197
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Prabjot Singh	205
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Guillaume Sirois	217
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Ms. Hannah Taylor	227
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Barney Brucker	233
MR. BO BASLER, Sworn/Assermenté	236
Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoire en-chef par Gordon Cameron	236
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Ms. Mani Kakkar	244
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Gib van Ert	251
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Ms. Hannah Taylor	258
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Guillaume Sirois	261
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Prabjot Singh	264

VII Exhibit List / Liste des pièces

No.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
WIT 37	Public Summary of the Classified Interview of: Global Affairs Canada (Marta Morgan, Cindy Termoshuizen, Philippe Lafortune, Tara Denham, Gallit Dobner)	2
CAN.DOC 7	Global Affairs Canada (GAC) Institutional Report – UNCLASSIFIED	3
CAN.DOC 7.001	Annex to the GAC Institutional Report – UNCLASSIFIED	4
CAN.DOC 8	Affaires Mondiales Canada (AMC) Rapport Institutionnel - NON CLASSIFIÉ	4
CAN.DOC 8.001	Annexe du Rapport Institutionnel d'Affaires Mondiales Canada (AMC) - NON CLASSIFIÉ	4
CAN 8822	Influence and Interference: distinctions in the context of diplomatic relations and democratic processes	8
CAN 5551	REMINDER: UPCOMING FEDERAL ELECTIONS: Non-interference by foreigners in Canadian elections RAPPEL: PROCHAINES ÉLECTIONS FÉDÉRALES: Non-ingérence étrangère dans les élections canadiennes	14
CAN 134	RRM Canada Weekly Trend Analysis	25
WIT 42	Michael Duheme Public Summary of Classified Interview	35
CAN.DOC 19	Institutional Report - RCMP	36
WIT 38	Mark Flynn Public Summary of Classified Interview	37
CAN 12856	SITE TF Situational Report: 14 September 2021	59
CAN.DOC 20	Gendarmerie Royale du Canada - Rapport Institutionnel - Non Classifié	74
WIT 39	Public Summary of Classified Interview of: Shelly Bruce, Alia Tayyeb, Dan Rogers	76
WIT 33	Public Summary of Classified In Camera Examination of: Ms. Alia Tayyeb, Mr. Dan Rogers	77
CAN.DOC 5	Communications Security Establishment (CSE)	78

VIII Exhibit List / Liste des pièces

No.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
CAN.DOC 6	Rapport institutionnel - Centre de la sécurité des télécommunications	79
CAN.SUM 1	Don Valley North (DVN) Liberal Party Nomination Race in 2019	112
CAN.SUM 2	Intelligence Relating to Han Dong and Communication with People's Republic of China Officials Regarding the "Two Michaels"	112
CAN.SUM 3	People's Republic of China Officials - Foreign Interference Activities in Greater Vancouver in the 2019 General Election	113
CAN.SUM 4	Possible People's Republic of China Foreign Interference-Related Mis or Disinformation	113
CAN.SUM 5	Country Summary: People's Republic of China	113
CAN.SUM 6	Country Summary: Russia	113
CAN.SUM 7	Country Summary: India	113
CAN.SUM 8	Country Summary: Pakistan	113
CAN.SUM 9	Country Summary: Kingdom of Saudi Arabia	113
CAN.SUM 10	People's Republic of China - Threat Actors, Contact with Candidates and Staff, and Funding of Threat Actors	113
CAN.SUM 11	Threat Reduction Measure Conducted in 2019	114
CAN.SUM 12	Government of India Foreign Interference Activities in the 2021 General Election	114
CAN.SUM 13	Comments by Individual People's Republic of China Officials on Expressed Partisan Preferences in the 2019 and 2021 General Election	114
CAN.SUM 14	Country Summary: Iran	114
CAN.DOC 17	Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) Institutional Report - unclassified	116

VIX Exhibit List / Liste des pièces

No.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
CAN.DOC 17.001	Appendix B2 to CSIS Institutional Report - 2021 CSIS Public Report	116
CAN.DOC 17.002	Appendix D to CSIS Institutional Report - Briefings Related to the Threat or Incidence of Foreign Interference in Canadian Democratic Institutions since 2019 01 01	116
CAN.DOC 17.003	Appendix G to CSIS Institutional Report - Overview of Foreign Interference Threat Reduction Measures 2019 - Present	116
CAN.DOC 18	Rapport Institutionnel du Service Canadien du Renseignement de Sécurité (SCRS) - non classifié	116
CAN.DOC 18.001	Annexe B2 du Rapport Institutionnel du SCRS - Rapport public du SCRS 2021	117
CAN.DOC 18.002	Annexe D du Rapport Institutionnel du SCRS - Séances d'information sur l'ingérence étrangère et sur ses répercussions sur les institutions démocratiques du Canada depuis le 1er janvier 2019	117
CAN.DOC 18.003	Annexe G du Rapport Institutionnel du SCRS - Aperçu des mesures de réduction de la menace prises contre l'ingérence étrangère de 2019 à aujourd'hui	117
WIT 48	In Camera Examination Summary: Mr. David Vigneault, Ms. Michelle Tessier, Ms. Cherie Henderson	119
WIT 35	Public Summary of Classified Interview of: Canadian Security Intelligence ADR Directorate Witnesses	121
WIT 43	In Camera Examination Summary: A Branch within the CSIS ADR Directorate	121
CAN 2919	Memo to the Minister: Update on threat to democratic institutions threat reduction measures - foreign interference activities	132
COM 54	CSIS Public Report 2019	147
COM 322	Foreign Interference Threats to Canada's Democratic Process	149
CAN 4728	Foreign Interference in the 2019 Federal Campaign of Dong Han - CNSB 23/19	162

X Exhibit List / Liste des pièces

No.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
CAN 3128	Email: RE: CNSB RSESN 22/19 - 2019 10 29 - CSIS National Security Brief (CNSB) / Rapport du SCRS sur les enjeux de sécurité nationale (RSESN)	166
MMC 20	117-2023-231 (CSIS) - release - C (CSIS briefings on PRC elxn inter)	171
WIT 41	D. Vigneault, M. Tessier and C. Henderson Public Summary of Classified Interview	174
CAN 2359	SITE TF - After Action Report (2021 Federal Election)	184
CAN.DOC 22	Commission request for summary information on briefing to Erin O'Toole	195
CAN.DOC 24	Commission request for summary information on briefing to Kenny Chiu	195
CAN 19304	Meeting between CSIS and the OCCE 2021-11-02	206
CAN 3771	Ministerial Briefing : Foreign Interference - 2021-12-13	208
CAN 19456	Speaking Points for EC Brief	213
COM 156	NSICOP Annual Report 2020	218
CAN 5824	SITE TF Update On Foreign Interference Threats To Canadian Democratic Institutions – 2021	219
JKW 7	Special Report on the Government of Canada's Framework and Activities to Defend its Systems and Networks from Cyber Attack	221
WIT 45	Public Interview Summary: Mr. Lyall King, Ms. Tara Denham, Ms. Gallit Dobner, Mr. Eric Gordon, CSIS Representative	224
WIT 36	CSIS Regions Officials Public Summary of Classified Interview	236
JKW 69	CSIS pamphlet provided to Jenny Kwan during the 44th election	246
HRC 6	Combatting Transnational Repression and Foreign Interference in Canada: A Paper by Secure Canada and Human Rights Action Group	258

1	Ottawa, Ontario
2	Upon commencing on Thursday, April 4, 2024 at 9:32 a.m.
3	THE REGISTRAR: Order, please.
4	This sitting of the Foreign Interference
5	Commission is now in session. Commissioner Hogue is
6	presiding.
7	The time is 9:32 a.m.
8	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Today it is counsel
9	MacKay who is starting.
10	And good morning to you.
11	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: Jean-Philippe
12	MacKay for the Commission.
13	Commissioner, the witnesses before you this
14	morning are Mr. David Morrison and Ms. Cindy Termorshuizen.
15	And I would ask the witnesses be sworn or affirmed, please.
16	THE REGISTRAR: Mr. Morrison, would you
17	prefer to be sworn or affirmed?
18	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Affirmed, please.
19	THE REGISTRAR: Could you please state your
20	name and spell your last name for the record.
21	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Yeah. My name is David
22	Morrison. My last name is spelled M-O-R-R-I-S-O-N.
23	MR. DAVID MORRISON, Affirmed:
24	THE REGISTRAR: And will you, Ms I forget
25	your last name, but
26	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: Termorshuizen.
27	THE REGISTRAR: Thank you very much. Could
28	you please state your full name and spell your last name for

1	the record.
2	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: Yes. Cindy
3	Termorshuizen, and the spelling of the last name is
4	T-E-R-M-O-R-S-H-U-I-Z-E-N.
5	THE REGISTRAR: Okay. And will you be
6	affirming or swearing in?
7	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: I will be
8	affirming.
9	THE REGISTRAR: Okay.
10	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN, Affirmed:
11	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY:
12	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MACKAY: Mr. Court
13	Operator, can you pull up document WIT 37, please.
14	EXHIBIT No. WIT 37:
15	Public Summary of the Classified
16	Interview of: Global Affairs Canada
17	(Marta Morgan, Cindy Termoshuizen,
18	Philippe Lafortune, Tara Denham, Gallit
19	Dobner)
20	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MACKAY: So Ms.
21	Termorshuizen, do you recall being interviewed by Commission
22	Counsel in a classified setting on February the 9th, 2024,
23	with various individuals whose names appear on this document?
24	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: Yes, I do.
25	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MACKAY: Have you reviewed
26	this document before this morning?
27	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: Yes, I do. Yes, I
28	have.

1	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MACKAY: And do you have
2	any corrections, additions, or deletions that you would like
3	to make to this document?
4	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: I have no
5	corrections.
6	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MACKAY: Okay. And is it a
7	reflection of the information you have given to the
8	Commission?
9	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: Yes, it's a
10	reflection of the information I gave.
11	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MACKAY: Okay.
12	Now, Mr. Court Operator, can you pull up
13	CAN.DOC 7, please.
14	EXHIBIT No./PIÈCE No. CAN.DOC 7:
15	Global Affairs Canada (GAC)
16	Institutional Report - UNCLASSIFIED
17	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MACKAY: Madam Commissioner,
18	this is the institutional report prepared by Global Affairs
19	Canada, GAC.
20	Both of you, have you had the chance to
21	review the document before this morning?
22	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Yes.
23	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: Yes.
24	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MACKAY: And can you
25	confirm that GAC prepared the report and that it represents
26	GAC's evidence before the Commission?
27	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Yes.
28	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MACKAY: So this document

1	will be filed along an annex identified as CAN.DOC 7.001.
2	If we can pull that up, please.
3	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 7.001:
4	Annex to the GAC Institutional Report
5	- UNCLASSIFIED
6	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MACKAY: So the same is
7	true for the annex, the unclassified annex that we see here.
8	This was prepared by GAC, and you confirm that it represents
9	GAC's evidence before the Commission?
10	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Yes, I do.
11	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MACKAY: Okay. So
12	Madam Commissioner, we don't need to pull the French versions
13	of those documents up, but they will be filed as CAN.DOC 8.0
14	CAN.DOC 8 and CAN.DOC 8.001. So both the report and the
15	annex are filed before you in their French version.
16	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 8:
17	Affaires Mondiales Canada (AMC)
18	Rapport Institutionnel - NON
19	CLASSIFIÉ
20	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 8.001:
21	Annexe du Rapport Institutionnel
22	d'Affaires Mondiales Canada (AMC) -
23	NON CLASSIFIÉ
24	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
25	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MACKAY: And before I
26	begin, Madam Commissioner, I'd like to say a word about the
27	scope of this examination.
28	The witnesses before you today will testify

1	concerning the distinction between foreign interference and
2	foreign influence. That is the scope of the examination.
3	Other areas of GAC's mandate and activities may be relevant
4	to other aspects of your mandate, but this evidence will not
5	be heard today through those witnesses.
6	Other GAC witnesses will be appearing before
7	you tomorrow and next week to discuss topics related to the
8	Panel of Five, the SITE Task Force, and the Rapid Response
9	Mechanism in relation to general elections in 2019, 2021.
10	And Mr. Morrison will be back with us on Monday to testify in
11	relation to his participation on the Panel of Five in 2021 in
12	his role as a former national security and intelligence
13	advisor to the Prime Minister.
14	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
15	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: [No interpretation]
16	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Go ahead and I'll see if
17	it's relevant to discuss it now.
18	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: In the summary of
19	interview that was filed at 10:00 p.m. last night, it says
20	that it was filed in evidence in February-March 2024 during
21	Commission Inquiry. I haven't found any of those things in
22	the party database. I wonder when it will be submitted and
23	where.
24	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: The reason is that
25	this issue, the GAC witnesses did not
26	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS:this summary of
27	interview can be submitted as evidence whereas it's evidence
28	on the testimony of Ms. Cindy Termorshuizen if she was not

1	present at that time.
2	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: Madam
3	Commissioner, this document, WIT 37, is a summary of
4	interview, not a summary of in camera interrogation. It's
5	just there for information for my colleague, counsel Morgan,
6	Mme Denham, Dobner.
7	Those are witnesses that you will see during
8	these hearings and Mr. Lafortune, you will get an affidavit.
9	For this document, yes, it is as evidence for you for Ms.
10	Termorshuizen, but for other witnesses the same procedure
11	will apply with those witnesses and they will tell us if they
12	have anything to correct or add or retract from the document.
13	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: And the summaries of in
14	camera hearings on those witnesses will be filed in due time.
15	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: Yes, absolutely.
16	I will begin my examination with a general
17	question concerning your current roles within GAC.
18	MR. DAVID MORRISON: I am currently the
19	Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs at Global Affairs Canada.
20	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: And I'm the
21	Associate Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs and also the G7
22	Personal Representative of the Prime Minister.
23	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: And when were you
24	appointed in those positions?
25	MR. DAVID MORRISON: I was appointed in
26	October 2022 to my current position.
27	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: And I was appointed
28	in January 2022 as Associate Deputy Minister of Foreign

1 Affairs.

3

11

13

15

16

18

20

21

25

26

27

28

MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: And if we can pull

up CAN.DOC 7, please. It's the institutional report. And

4 I'll bring you to page 2 of that document.

5 I'll just give a moment to Mr. Court Operator

6 to pull it up.

7 So at the beginning of page 2. Thank you.

8 We see that the first topic addressed in the

9 institutional report is an overview of GAC's mandate. Could

10 you please -- you can refer to the document, but you can also

just explain what is the mandate and what are the activities,

broadly, that GAC is undertaking?

MR. DAVID MORRISON: Thank you.

14 GAC is, as the document says, responsible for

the conduct of Canada's international relations for advancing Canada's international relations. Every country in the world

17 has a foreign ministry. In Canada it's called Global Affairs

Canada.

19 We are a little bit unique in that we have a

very broad mandate. We have three Ministers responsible for

three parts of our overall mandate to advance international

relations.

There's the Foreign Minister, who takes the

lead on foreign policy. There's the Trade Minister, who

takes the lead on international trade policy and the

promotion of Canadian exports abroad and the attraction of

investment into Canada. And there's the Minister of

International Development, who oversees Canada's spending

1	around the world.
2	All of this is to the greater objective of
3	promoting and protecting Canada's prosperity and security.
4	One final part of the two final parts of
5	the mandate. The first is consular affairs. We are
6	responsible through our network of missions around the
7	world represented in 112 countries with about 180 offices, we
8	are responsible for looking after Canadians in distress, so
9	that may be a new passport, it may be an evacuation such as
10	we're doing in Haiti as we speak.
11	The final part of the mandate has to do with
12	assistance and support for foreign embassies here in Canada,
13	so embassies, consulates, consulates general, high
14	commissions. Just for the record, an embassy or a high
15	commission is in a capital city. Consulates tend to be
16	across the country. So Global Affairs Canada has a liaison
17	function with diplomates posted here in Canada and foreign
18	ministries around the world perform that same function for
19	our diplomats posted abroad.
20	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: I will take you to
21	document CAN008822. Can we pull it up, please?
22	EXHIBIT No. CAN 8822:
23	Influence and Interference:
24	distinctions in the context of
25	diplomatic relations and democratic
26	processes
27	COURT OPERATOR: Can you repeat that again,
28	please?

1	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: 8822.
2	Do you recognize this document?
3	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Yes.
4	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: Okay. So we see -
5	- we can scroll down a little bit, please.
6	Thank you.
7	We see here definitions, interference, malign
8	foreign influence and foreign influence. Could you please
9	describe those notions for us, please?
10	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Yes, I will. And I'll
11	begin with foreign influence because that is the business of
12	diplomacy.
13	Canada has diplomats all over the world. We
14	pay them to develop relationships, to build networks, to get
15	to know everyone they can in a in the country to which
16	they're posted, call it Guatemala, so that they can have
17	influence. So there's an old joke about diplomacy is letting
18	the other fellow have things your way. That's about
19	influence. So we have diplomats posted around the world so
20	that we can promote and protect Canada's interests with
21	proactively by encouraging governments and others,
22	influencers within society to take positions or defensively,
23	dissuading for from taking positions that would be
24	contrary to Canada's interest.
25	We do this in a general sense. We want
26	Canada to be well thought of around the world. I said we're
27	or I'll say we're a trading nation, so our reputation
28	abroad matters. It matters to whether students want to come

here, whether people want to trade with us, whether people
want to invest in Canada.

So there's broad foreign policy goals around broad issues like climate change.

We also try to exercise influence against very specific objectives that come up in all countries from time to time. The first example I will give is at the United Nations every fall, Canada leads on a resolution to condemn Iran's human rights record. So we do that through building relationships all year long that can then be deployed when that issue comes to a vote.

Another example which I think is given in the paper that is in front of us is when we do a trade agreement. We negotiate the agreement, we sign the agreement with the counterpart government, but very often then that agreement has to pass through a legislative process. So we seek to have influence with the people that will eventually be voting for or against the trade agreement that the executive of the government has signed.

So we target all kinds of influencers on that decision, be they legislators, be they staff members of legislators. In some cases, it may be a mayor or a farmers' group, depending on exactly the issue before us in the trade agreement.

I mentioned the evacuation that is going on right now in Haiti as part of our consulate functions. We have needed to exercise our influence with the government of the Dominican Republic because up until very recently, we

evacuation.

were taking people out of the embassy in Port-au-Prince and flying them into the territory of the Dominican Republic for onward transport to Santo Domingo, so we need to use those -- that influence and those relationships with government authorities in the neighbouring country to Haiti.

There's another example in the paper in front of us about the White Helmets, which were a group of human rights workers in Syria that we had to bring all of the influence we had to bear in the course of a very constrained two-day period when everything came together on a single night to ensure that those human rights workers who had saved lives could be let out of Syria, cross a third country and into Jordan where they ended up. And we -- there's some of the document redacted, but we pulled out all of the -- pulled out all of the stops in terms of using our influence with three governments in that case in order to effectuate that

So that's -- those are examples of how diplomats use influence.

If I might, I would say that -- I would say two final things. The influence doesn't happen by accident. It is in the nature of any relationship, you need to have laid the track, you need to have built up the relationship over time in order to be able to deploy the influence.

And you know, there was a program some time ago when we were trying to get out the word about Canada's fossil fuel industry. We flew congressional staffers up from Washington to the oil sands in Alberta so that they could see

1	that so that they could see that for themselves. We paid
2	their way up so that they could not be unduly influenced by
3	other forms of information. They could see things
4	themselves. So there's nothing untoward about paying, as
5	long as it is overt.
6	It's sometimes not very polite when I mention
7	trade agreements. We threaten retaliation when we're doing
8	trade agreements. We put up lists of products publicly that
9	we'll retaliate against if things don't go our way. It's a
10	contact sport sometimes and we go into the corners with our
11	elbows up when Canada's interests are at threat.
12	But Canadian diplomats it's not always in
13	the public domain. We do do things behind closed doors. But
14	we don't do things covertly. We don't do things
15	clandestinely. And we don't threaten people. We don't say,
16	"If you don't vote for this Canadian trade agreement, the
17	following will happen to your family."
18	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: And I presume that
19	what you describe as being the conduct that Canada's adopting
20	in its diplomatic relations, those rules are derive from
21	certain sources, international sources, that also apply to
22	diplomats working in Canada? That's correct?
23	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Absolutely.
24	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: Okay.
25	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: I have one question. Is
26	there any limitation as to what the diplomats can do in that
27	context? If it's an electoral context in the foreign country
28	where they are located?

1	MR. DAVID MORRISON: We will never get
2	involved in the election of a foreign country. And my
3	colleague Cindy can take us through the relevant parts of the
4	Vienna Convention, which is the covenant that governs
5	diplomatic behaviour that is in bounds and diplomatic
6	behaviour that is out of bounds and we would argue crosses
7	the line into foreign interference.
8	We can all diplomats cover elections.
9	Diplomats can go and report on electoral events. As we all
10	know, 2024 is a year that will have a huge number of
11	elections. Some of them very consequential for Canadian
12	interests. So I can guarantee you that our teams, for
13	example, across the United States, are covering the election
14	very closely.
15	Our Ambassador to the United States has, in
16	the past, attended the nominating conventions of the
17	political parties in the United States.
18	But no Canadian diplomat will ever suggest to
19	foreigners how they should vote. No Canadian diplomat will
20	ever get financially involved in another country's election.
21	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: But can they try to
22	influence the way people will vote?
23	MR. DAVID MORRISON: No.
24	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: No?
25	MR. DAVID MORRISON: No, they cannot. They
26	can speculate on who might win, which is kind of a water
27	cooler activity throughout the world. They can opine on
28	whether if Party A wins, as opposed to Party B, that would be

1	better or worse for their country's interests, but they must
2	refrain from making public statements and they must refrain
3	from getting directly involved.
4	And again, Cindy, will take us through what
5	we remind diplomats in Canada of before every General
6	Election, which is it's simply reminding them of the rules
7	that they're meant to abide by at all times.
8	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Okay. So their role is
9	much more limited when there's an election going on abroad?
10	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Yes. They are meant to
11	be very, very cautious. We don't take kindly when diplomats
12	opine on our democratic processes at any time, but we
13	explicitly remind them not to get involved in our elections.
14	I distinguish that from policy positions.
15	Diplomats might like or not like what Canada is a law
16	Canada is going to pass or is thinking of passing. That's
17	advocacy, and if it's done openly. Advocacy and lobbying are
18	very close. That's the business of diplomats. But getting
19	involved in the outcome of an election is off bounds.
20	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: If I may,
21	Commissioner, your question is a good segue for the next
22	document.
23	If we can pull up CAN5551? CAN5551.
24	EXHIBIT No. CAN 5551:
25	REMINDER: UPCOMING FEDERAL ELECTIONS:
26	Non-interference by foreigners in
27	Canadian elections RAPPEL:
28	PROCHAINES ÉLECTIONS FÉDÉRALES: Non-

1	ingérence étrangère dans les
2	élections canadiennes
3	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: And as Mr.
4	Morrison mentioned, this question is for you, Ms.
5	Termorshuizen. It's a notice to Diplomatic Corps in the
6	context of the General Election in 2019.
7	If we can scroll down a little bit, please?
8	So just briefly, we had a preview from Mr.
9	Morrison briefly what is this document. And could you please
10	expand on this? My time is almost up. I have, like, seven
11	minutes left. So I'll invite you to answer that question
12	within the five to seven minutes.
13	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: Okay. Great.
14	Thank you. So yes, indeed. In advance of both the 2019 and
15	2021 elections, a notice like this was sent out to the entire
16	diplomatic corps.
17	And as Mr. Morrison said earlier, one of the
18	responsibilities of Global Affairs Canada is to provide the
19	supports for the diplomatic and consular community here in
20	Canada.
21	There are about 8,000 diplomatic and consular
22	officials in Canada, so it's a large group of people. We
23	have a variety of responsibilities around them, but one of
24	the things we do is provide information to them about a range
25	of issues. And we have a tradition of sending out a message
26	in advance of an election to ensure that diplomats and
27	consular officials are reminded of the particular constraints
28	we expect them to abide by in an electoral period, given the

1	sensitivities that Mr. Morrison has just spoken about.
2	The basis upon which we do this is the Vienna
3	Convention on Diplomatic Relations and the Vienna Convention
4	on Consular Relations. These two conventions are enshrined
5	in Canadian law under the Foreign Missions and International
6	Organizations Act. And those conventions prohibit
7	interference in the internal affairs of the state in which
8	diplomats and consular officials are located.
9	And so with respect to electoral periods in
10	particular, the notice, for instance, and you'll see that in
11	the first paragraphs, makes clear that diplomatic and
12	consular representatives should not conduct activities which
13	could be perceived as inducing electors to vote for a
14	particular candidate, or prohibiting them from voting for a
15	candidate in any way during an election period.
16	And then we also note in the message that
17	they are prohibited from making financial contributions to a
18	candidate, political party, or political event.
19	So we're quite specific here because we want
20	to be clear on, in Canada, what we what our kind of
21	detailed understanding is of that requirement not to
22	interfere in the internal affairs of the state.
23	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: I'm just curious. Do
24	you know how many countries signed these two conventions?
25	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: I don't.
26	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Roughly. Roughly. Are
27	we talking about a large number of countries throughout the
28	world? Or

1	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: I would suspect so,
2	but I don't the exact numbers.
3	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: You don't know.
4	MR. DAVID MORRISON: I think it would be safe
5	to say that almost every single country in the world is a
6	party, because these conventions, the larger conventions of
7	the that govern diplomatic relations and consular
8	relations, are the conventions that give effect to diplomatic
9	communities. So if you're not a party, you're not sending
10	people abroad.
11	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: I see.
12	MR. DAVID MORRISON: So I think we can safely
13	assume that every country or almost every country.
14	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
15	MR. JEAN-PHILLIPE MacKAY: And
16	notwithstanding the international law, diplomats and
17	officials working in Canada must respect the host state's
18	laws and
19	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Yes.
20	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: Correct. And that
21	applies to Canadian diplomats and consular officials abroad
22	as well with respect to the laws of the countries to which
23	they are assigned.
24	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MACKAY: So unless my lead
25	counsel has a note for me Yeah, we'll go back to the
26	discussion about foreign interference and foreign influence
27	and malign foreign influence.
28	Mr. Morrison, you provided explanations, but

could you go back, either of you, on the distinction between those notions and how foreign influence can slide into malign foreign influence and then into foreign interference?

MR. DAVID MORRISON: Sure. The difference, and I hope it was implied in what I said in my original remarks, is that foreign interference is covert, which you could take that to mean deceptive, it is clandestine, which you could take that to mean as entirely secret, or it involves threats to an individual.

Now, clearly there -- an example of clandestine foreign interference would be secretly funding a political party for a candidate. Covert would be disguising the fact that you are funding a candidate by having the funding run through an entirely legitimate person or organisation, like a proxy, in the -- is the term that we use. And a threat would be "If you don't vote, or if you vote one way or another on a certain bill, we will ensure your relatives don't get a visa so they can't visit you or your offspring are denied a place in university."

Your question had to do with also malign foreign influence, or this middle ground, which makes it hard sometimes to distinguish what is foreign interference and what is not foreign interference. So an example I would give is during an election campaign a diplomat posted in Canada attends a community event. A diaspora community has an event in a banquet hall and the diplomat attends that. There's nothing wrong with that, even during a writ period. It's not an explicitly political event, it's just an event.

If the person stands up and makes a speech
and says, "vote for this party and not that party", that's
foreign interference. If the person goes into a back room
and meets with candidates, we don't know unless, unless we
know exactly what was said. And in general diplomats should
not be meeting privately with candidates during an election
campaign.

So there is kind of a ambiguous area or a grey zone where legitimate diplomatic activity can be -- can transition into -- can transition into foreign interference.

I'll give you one more example, and that would an academic who writes op-eds or articles or is interviewed, and adopts -- and advocates policies very much in line with a foreign government, and we know that that diplomat has a relationship with the representatives of that foreign government in Canada. That academic may simply share the ideological view, maybe there is a free trip in it for that person, but maybe that person has a reason for wanting to visit the country anyhow.

So we need to be very cautious when assuming that because somebody meets with a diplomat that is -- even a diplomat from a country that doesn't share values with Canada, that is necessarily nefarious. A person might attend a community meeting at the bidding of a diplomat, or they may be starting a business, and they may be handing out business cards in support of that business, or it may be a combination of the two.

So it's -- there is an area of ambiguity, I

1	would say, between clear-cut diplomacy, and the business of
2	influence, and clear-cut foreign interference, which is
3	against the relevant conventions and laws.
4	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MACKAY: Do you have
5	anything to add to that, Ms. Termorshuizen?
6	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: No. Thank you.
7	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MACKAY: Those were my
8	questions, Madam Commissioner.
9	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
10	So first cross-examination will be conducted
11	by Human Rights Coalition.
12	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. HANNAH TAYLOR:
13	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Good morning. Could I
14	ask the Court Operator to please call up CAN 008822.
15	My friend pulled it up this morning, and I
16	believe we confirmed you're familiar, but you can correct me,
17	of course.
18	If we could turn to page 3, please.
19	There is a header
20	Right there.
21	Examples of Canada's Foreign Influence In
22	Other Countries, and then a number of examples, of course.
23	And then if we scroll to page 4, we see a section called
24	Lines That Canada Never Crosses. And the final line
25	A little lower.
26	Then the final line there reads:
27	"Canada never engages into
28	transnational repression, i.e.

1	intimidating or threatening
2	individuals, or coercing them to take
3	particular action."
4	You would agree this is because transnational
5	repression is a form of foreign interference and/or malign
6	foreign influence?
7	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Yes.
8	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: We heard earlier this
9	week from Mr. Mehmet Tohti, who's a Uyghur activist in
10	Canada, who told us that last year, right before he was mean
11	to appear in Parliament for the vote on M-62 on the M-62
12	motion for the resettlement Uyghur refugees in Canada, he
13	received a call from Chinese State Police. The police put a
14	relative of his on the phone, who told Mehmet that his mother
15	and two sisters were dead. Mr. Tohti explained that this
16	call was meant to send a message to him, implying that this
17	is the cost he would keep paying if he continued his
18	advocacy.
19	Is this foreign interference?
20	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Yes.
21	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: I'll pose a hypothetical
22	to you. Say a campaign volunteer goes to a community member
23	and says, "You better not vote for a certain candidate."
24	They don't say explicitly "or else there will be
25	repercussions for your loved ones back home." Is this
26	foreign interference?
27	MR. DAVID MORRISON: The question of whether
28	someone directs voting or simply implies the way they would

1	like you to vote is is a tricky one to answer. The threat
2	or the an a threat, explicit or implied, in my books
3	would put that over the line into foreign interference.
4	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: And one more
5	hypothetical. Say that person then goes to another community
6	member and talks about the experience, and that second
7	community member feels pressured to do the same, though no
8	one ever spoke to them directly about it. Is this foreign
9	interference?
10	MR. DAVID MORRISON: I don't think that's
11	direct foreign interference, but I think the essence of the
12	question gets to what, in my personal view, is an a aspect
13	of foreign interference and the ecosystem around foreign
14	interference, which is not well enough understood in Canada.
15	The chilling effect is how I would think of it.
16	It was meant to have been the second part of
17	the mandate of the independent special rapporteur that took -
18	- whose work took place a year ago, and I know it's a larger
19	area that this Commission will get into. It is not right
20	that certain people in Canada, Canadian citizens, or
21	permanent residents of Canada, should feel any fear, fear of
22	repression for exercising the rights that all Canadians
23	should enjoy.
24	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Thank you very much.
25	Thank you, Commissioner.
26	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
27	Next one is RCDA.
28	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Good morning.

Т	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Good morning.
2	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS:
3	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: I want to discuss
4	about I'm Guillaume Sirois, counsel for the RCDA.
5	I want to discuss about social media or
6	internet influence campaigns by foreign state actors.
7	Do you believe that the identification of
8	divisive events and trends in rival states to conduct
9	influence campaigns by Russia, for instance, would constitute
10	foreign interference?
11	MR. DAVID MORRISON: So your question is
12	about internet campaigns and promoting divisions within
13	societies, and you're clear that that internet campaign is
14	sponsored by Russia. I just want to make certain I've
15	understood your
16	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Yes. Let's say
17	there's for now, let's assume there's a clear link between
18	Russia and this influence campaign. For instance, we see
19	that it's a URL that links to the Russian Federation, for
20	instance.
21	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Yes. State-sponsored
22	disinformation that is designed to sew cleavages within
23	societies, democratic societies like Canada, that is foreign
24	interference.
25	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: And let's say that
26	trying to blur the lines a little bit. Let's say there was
27	no direct link with Russia because there was no, for
28	instance, URL that links to the Russian Federation. But

1	let's say it was a lot of social media accounts that seem
2	friendly to Russia but that are based in Canada that promote
3	these divisive events and trends on the social media at a
4	large scale. Would that possibly constitute foreign
5	interference as well?
6	MR. DAVID MORRISON: That could constitute
7	foreign interference if it was more likely than not that the
8	amplification of the information was being done
9	inauthentically, whether from abroad or here in Canada.
10	I think you said that the accounts were here
11	in Canada.
12	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Okay. And how does
13	how can we determine that this influence campaign is done
14	inauthentically rather than an authentic campaign?
15	MR. DAVID MORRISON: It's challenging. The
15 16	MR. DAVID MORRISON: It's challenging. The online space is challenging, including during electoral
16	online space is challenging, including during electoral
16 17	online space is challenging, including during electoral campaigns. There are there is a body of scholarship
16 17 18	online space is challenging, including during electoral campaigns. There are there is a body of scholarship existing in Canada at places like McGill and the University
16 17 18 19	online space is challenging, including during electoral campaigns. There are there is a body of scholarship existing in Canada at places like McGill and the University of Toronto that has devised methodologies to try to be able
16 17 18 19 20	online space is challenging, including during electoral campaigns. There are there is a body of scholarship existing in Canada at places like McGill and the University of Toronto that has devised methodologies to try to be able to determine with some degree of certainty whether something
16 17 18 19 20 21	online space is challenging, including during electoral campaigns. There are there is a body of scholarship existing in Canada at places like McGill and the University of Toronto that has devised methodologies to try to be able to determine with some degree of certainty whether something is simply goes viral, which I would call organic. It's a
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	online space is challenging, including during electoral campaigns. There are there is a body of scholarship existing in Canada at places like McGill and the University of Toronto that has devised methodologies to try to be able to determine with some degree of certainty whether something is simply goes viral, which I would call organic. It's a topical issue and people are interested, especially in an
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	online space is challenging, including during electoral campaigns. There are there is a body of scholarship existing in Canada at places like McGill and the University of Toronto that has devised methodologies to try to be able to determine with some degree of certainty whether something is simply goes viral, which I would call organic. It's a topical issue and people are interested, especially in an election campaign, in discussing things about the election.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	online space is challenging, including during electoral campaigns. There are there is a body of scholarship existing in Canada at places like McGill and the University of Toronto that has devised methodologies to try to be able to determine with some degree of certainty whether something is simply goes viral, which I would call organic. It's a topical issue and people are interested, especially in an election campaign, in discussing things about the election. Or whether it is being inauthentically amplified by people
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	online space is challenging, including during electoral campaigns. There are there is a body of scholarship existing in Canada at places like McGill and the University of Toronto that has devised methodologies to try to be able to determine with some degree of certainty whether something is simply goes viral, which I would call organic. It's a topical issue and people are interested, especially in an election campaign, in discussing things about the election. Or whether it is being inauthentically amplified by people that aren't even people, bots or, in other cases, people that

1	might be disinformation, which is information that is
2	deliberately designed to well, it's fake, it's false.
3	It's deliberately designed to distort and create impressions
4	that are incorrect.
5	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Okay. I want to show
6	you a document. It's CAN 000134, just to give you a concrete
7	example of what the Commission will be dealing with.
8	EXHIBIT No. CAN 134:
9	RRM Canada Weekly Trend Analysis
10	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: It's at page 2. And
11	again, it's on the same topic.
12	We see here that there's there has been
13	reports of Russia-friendly accounts on the internet
14	amplifying People's Party of Canada related content in the
15	final weeks leading up to the election, 2021.
16	I'm giving you the time to read the document.
17	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Okay.
18	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Do you see any
19	indications that there may be foreign interference?
20	MR. DAVID MORRISON: I'm not certain that in
21	this short write-up there's enough information. It says
22	Russian-friendly accounts. There can be Canadian citizens
23	and permanent residents in Canada that are friendly to Russia
24	and they might simply agree with something and, therefore,
25	reTweet it or whatever the equivalent is on Yonder.
26	And again, just in terms of the lack of
27	certainty here, the end of the sentence says "RRM Canada
28	judges that, at the individual account level, analytic

1	confidence of attribution is low", so this can't necessarily
2	be tied directly back to Russia. And it says they hope that
3	confidence will grow in the future.
4	So the online space is, I would say,
5	devilishly difficult because you need to make a tie to a
6	foreign government and there's a Canadian citizens in an
7	electoral context are allowed to talk about the election and
8	they are allowed to have a full range of views on electoral
9	issues and they are allowed to debate and explain those views
10	online.
11	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: And actually, in Canada,
12	freedom of expression is protected.
13	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Absolutely.
14	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: So you have to take into
15	consideration, I guess?
15 16	consideration, I guess? MR. DAVID MORRISON: We absolutely have to
16	MR. DAVID MORRISON: We absolutely have to
16 17	MR. DAVID MORRISON: We absolutely have to take that right of Canadians and permanent residents, people
16 17 18	MR. DAVID MORRISON: We absolutely have to take that right of Canadians and permanent residents, people living in Canada into account. So while some people might
16 17 18 19	MR. DAVID MORRISON: We absolutely have to take that right of Canadians and permanent residents, people living in Canada into account. So while some people might think something is linked to a foreign government or being
16 17 18 19 20	MR. DAVID MORRISON: We absolutely have to take that right of Canadians and permanent residents, people living in Canada into account. So while some people might think something is linked to a foreign government or being inauthentically amplified, actually, acting without a certain
16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. DAVID MORRISON: We absolutely have to take that right of Canadians and permanent residents, people living in Canada into account. So while some people might think something is linked to a foreign government or being inauthentically amplified, actually, acting without a certain degree of confidence might deny Canadians their right to
16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. DAVID MORRISON: We absolutely have to take that right of Canadians and permanent residents, people living in Canada into account. So while some people might think something is linked to a foreign government or being inauthentically amplified, actually, acting without a certain degree of confidence might deny Canadians their right to freedom of expression. And that's a right that I would argue
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. DAVID MORRISON: We absolutely have to take that right of Canadians and permanent residents, people living in Canada into account. So while some people might think something is linked to a foreign government or being inauthentically amplified, actually, acting without a certain degree of confidence might deny Canadians their right to freedom of expression. And that's a right that I would argue is particularly important in the context of Canada's
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. DAVID MORRISON: We absolutely have to take that right of Canadians and permanent residents, people living in Canada into account. So while some people might think something is linked to a foreign government or being inauthentically amplified, actually, acting without a certain degree of confidence might deny Canadians their right to freedom of expression. And that's a right that I would argue is particularly important in the context of Canada's democratic institutions and especially during an election
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. DAVID MORRISON: We absolutely have to take that right of Canadians and permanent residents, people living in Canada into account. So while some people might think something is linked to a foreign government or being inauthentically amplified, actually, acting without a certain degree of confidence might deny Canadians their right to freedom of expression. And that's a right that I would argue is particularly important in the context of Canada's democratic institutions and especially during an election campaign.

1	engagement from accounts that generally amplify Russian state
2	forces and also, as you noted, analytic confidence should
3	increase with aggregate monitoring of many accounts.
4	I think you concur that this, in itself, does
5	not constitute foreign interference, but is it enough to
6	justify inquiring further into the situation maybe to try to
7	find a link or attribute this campaign to the Russian
8	government?
9	MR. DAVID MORRISON: So there's a group of
10	people that are going to appear before the Commission
11	tomorrow from the SITE Task Forces for the 2019 and the 2021
12	elections, and I think you would be better placed to pose
13	those questions to the real experts. RRM, which is one of
14	the entities that monitors the online space, is part of
15	Global Affairs, which is why I have gone ahead and answered
16	your questions, but whether there emerged a greater degree of
17	certainty on the Russia-friendly accounts that you're
18	inquiring about I think is a question better put to the SITE
19	Task Force tomorrow.
20	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Okay. Then this will
21	be my last question.
22	On the very specific subject matter of your
23	testimony today, the difference between foreign influence and
24	foreign interference, can we say, at the very least, that
25	this is maybe on the fence both definitions? It's not
26	clearly foreign influence, it's not clearly legitimate, it's
27	not clearly
28	MR. DAVID MORRISON: I simply do not have

1	enough information to say. I didn't I've forgotten what's
2	at the top of whether this is a weekly report or a daily
3	report.
4	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Weekly.
5	MR. DAVID MORRISON: Okay. It is not it
6	is not an issue that I believe emerged as a significant
7	issue. We have a summary or a summary was produced as
8	part of the papers produced for this Commission that does go
9	into some detail on a couple of incidents that did seem to be
10	at least potentially significant. This wasn't one of them.
11	MR. SIROIS: Thank you.
12	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
13	Counsel for Jenny Kwan.
14	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY:
15	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Good morning. For the
16	record, my name is Sujit Choudhry; I'm counsel for Jenny
17	Kwan.
18	So I'd like to take the panel to a document
19	that Commission counsel put up, which is the Note to the
20	Diplomatic Corps, if we may.
21	And so Mr. Registrar, that's CAN 5551. Thank
22	you.
23	And so just to kind of reiterate, so in the
24	first paragraph this Note to the Diplomatic Corps invokes and
25	reminds them of their obligations under Articles 41 of the
26	Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, and Article 55 on
27	the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations; correct?
28	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: Correct.

1	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: And it's also your
2	evidence that those two the relevant portions of those two
3	conventions have been incorporated into domestic law by a
4	federal statute.
5	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: Correct.
6	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Right, the Foreign
7	Missions and International Organizations Act.
8	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: Correct.
9	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Good. So now can we
10	scroll down to the second paragraph that we didn't discuss
11	but I just want to draw your attention to it?
12	So if you look three lines from the bottom,
13	is it true that in this paragraph you also bring to the
14	attention of the Diplomatic Corps certain provisions of the
15	Canada Elections Act.
16	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: That's correct.
17	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: And could you please
18	explain what those provisions are, and why you brought them
19	to the attention of the Diplomatic Corps?
20	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: I mean, what was
21	important for us is just to draw the attention of the
22	Diplomatic Corps to the various provisions in Canadian law
23	with respect to elections, and the prohibitions in those. So
24	in the Canada Elections Act there are specific provisions,
25	for instance, with respect to foreign financing of campaigns
26	and so on.
27	So we wanted to ensure that if diplomats were
28	not already familiar with that legislation, that they were

given an opportunity to familiarize themselves with it, given 1 that we were entering a writ period at the time that this 2 3 documentation was sent out to all missions. MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: So if foreign diplomats, 4 then, violate Articles 41 or 55 of the two Vienna 5 6 Conventions, or if they violate these provisions of the Canada Elections Act, they are breaking the law, is that 7 right? 8 9 MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: And they are not just 10 breaking international law, they're breaking Canadian law; 11 right? 12 13 MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: Correct. 14 MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: And so then the question 15 that I think we'd like to have some guidance on is, what are the consequences for breaking Canadian law for a foreign 16 diplomat? If a foreign diplomat breaks Canadian law by 17 funding a campaign; paying for a campaign event; providing 18 19 funding to a political party; any one of a number of activities either prohibited by international directly, or 20 specifically by prohibitions in the Elections Act, what flows 21 22 as a consequence? Are they charged; are they prosecuted; are they expelled; are they cautioned? Could you please tell us? 23 MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: So a lot will 24 25 depend on the specific violation and that would -- in terms of actual violations of law, if that becomes a criminal 26 offence, for instance, that would fall under the purview of 27 the RCMP or police of jurisdiction -- in this case probably 28

1	the RCMP to investigate. But so a lot would I guess
2	I would just say without having a specific example, a lot
3	would depend on the case, the evidence behind it, and then
4	the consequences would flow from that.
5	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: And they might be
6	expelled, or asked to leave?
7	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: Again, I don't want
8	to speculate on the particular situation but there certainly
9	is a provision that would enable a diplomat to be expelled if
10	the conditions warranted that.
11	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: And then what
12	MR. MATTHEW FERGUSON: Excuse me.
13	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Yes.
14	MR. MATTHEW FERGUSON: We're just getting a
15	message from the interpreters to if we could just slow
16	down the thank you.
17	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Yes, of course. Sorry.
18	And maybe just one last question. And so
19	would this type would foreign interference, as you've
20	describe it very helpfully, either as defined by Articles 41
21	and 55 of the two Vienna Conventions, or as specifically
22	prohibited by certain provisions of the Canada Elections Act,
23	would those fall within or outside the scope of diplomatic
24	immunity for criminal prosecution?
25	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: Again,
26	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: If you know.
27	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: Yeah.
28	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: If you know.

1	MS. CINDY TERMORSHUIZEN: I think a lot would
2	depend on the particular situation at hand. So I wouldn't
3	want to speculate broadly, but I do think that there yeah,
4	a lot would depend on the particular situation.
5	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Okay, thank you for your
6	time.
7	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
8	AG?
9	MS. HELENE ROBERTSON: No questions for these
10	witnesses. Thank you.
11	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Re-examination, Maître
12	MacKay?
13	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: [No
14	interpretation]
15	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
16	So thank you to both of you, you're free to
17	go.
18	MR. MATTHEW FERGUSON: For now.
19	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Do we have to break for
20	yes, five minutes for having the new witnesses with us?
21	THE REGISTRAR: Order, please.
22	This hearing is now in recess until 10:30.
23	Upon recessing at 10:25 a.m.
24	Upon resuming at 10:33 a.m.
25	THE REGISTRAR: Order please.
26	This sitting of the Foreign Interference
27	Commission is back in session.
28	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Now Ms. Morgan?

1	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Good morning,
2	Commissioner. Yes, so it's Lynda Morgan, Commission counsel.
3	Commissioner, the witnesses before you are Commissioner
4	Duheme and Deputy Commissioner Flynn. Could both witnesses
5	please be sworn or affirmed?
6	THE REGISTRAR: Mr. Duheme, do you wish to be
7	sworn or affirmed?
8	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: I can swear in.
9	THE REGISTRAR: Okay.
10	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Yeah.
11	THE REGISTRAR: Please state your name and
12	spell your last name for the record.
13	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: My name is Michael
14	Robert Duheme. Last name is spelled D-U-H-E-M-E.
15	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME, Sworn:
15 16	THE REGISTRAR: Thank you.
	<u> </u>
16	THE REGISTRAR: Thank you.
16 17	THE REGISTRAR: Thank you. And, Mr. Flynn, it's your turn.
16 17 18	THE REGISTRAR: Thank you. And, Mr. Flynn, it's your turn. D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I'll swear as well.
16 17 18 19	THE REGISTRAR: Thank you. And, Mr. Flynn, it's your turn. D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I'll swear as well. THE REGISTRAR: You'll be swearing? Please
16 17 18 19 20 21	THE REGISTRAR: Thank you. And, Mr. Flynn, it's your turn. D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I'll swear as well. THE REGISTRAR: You'll be swearing? Please state your name and spell your last name for the record.
16 17 18 19 20 21	THE REGISTRAR: Thank you. And, Mr. Flynn, it's your turn. D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I'll swear as well. THE REGISTRAR: You'll be swearing? Please state your name and spell your last name for the record. D/COMM MARK FLYNN: It's Mark Andrew Flynn,
16 17 18 19 20 21	THE REGISTRAR: Thank you. And, Mr. Flynn, it's your turn. D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I'll swear as well. THE REGISTRAR: You'll be swearing? Please state your name and spell your last name for the record. D/COMM MARK FLYNN: It's Mark Andrew Flynn, F-L-Y-N-N.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE REGISTRAR: Thank you. And, Mr. Flynn, it's your turn. D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I'll swear as well. THE REGISTRAR: You'll be swearing? Please state your name and spell your last name for the record. D/COMM MARK FLYNN: It's Mark Andrew Flynn, F-L-Y-N-N. THE REGISTRAR: Thank you.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE REGISTRAR: Thank you. And, Mr. Flynn, it's your turn. D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I'll swear as well. THE REGISTRAR: You'll be swearing? Please state your name and spell your last name for the record. D/COMM MARK FLYNN: It's Mark Andrew Flynn, F-L-Y-N-N. THE REGISTRAR: Thank you. D/COMM MARK FLYNN, Sworn:
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	THE REGISTRAR: Thank you. And, Mr. Flynn, it's your turn. D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I'll swear as well. THE REGISTRAR: You'll be swearing? Please state your name and spell your last name for the record. D/COMM MARK FLYNN: It's Mark Andrew Flynn, F-L-Y-N-N. THE REGISTRAR: Thank you. D/COMM MARK FLYNN, Sworn: THE REGISTRAR: Thank you very much.

1	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Commissioner Duheme, you
2	have a lengthy history of service with the RCMP. For today's
3	purposes, I just want to focus on a brief snapshot of your
4	career. So I understand you were appointed Commissioner of
5	the RCMP in March of 2023?
6	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: I have, but do you want
7	us to correct some of the records I have here?
8	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: I will. I
9	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Okay. Sorry. Sorry.
10	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: I will.
11	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Okay, yes, that's
12	correct.
13	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Okay. Thank you. And you
14	were Deputy Commissioner of federal policing from June 2019
15	to March 2023?
16	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: That's correct.
17	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And Deputy Commissioner
18	Flynn, I understand that you were appointed Deputy
19	Commissioner for federal policing in March of 2023; is that
20	right?
21	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: That's correct.
22	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And before that, you were
23	the Assistant Commissioner responsible for governance and
24	oversight of the RCMP federal policing national security and
25	protected policing programs; is that correct?
26	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: That's correct.
27	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: I'd ask that document WIT,
28	W-I-T 42 be pulled up, please?

1	EXHIBIT NO. WIT 42:
2	Michael Duheme Public Summary of
3	Classified Interview
4	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And, Commissioner Duheme,
5	you were interviewed by Commission counsel on February $5^{\rm th}$,
6	2024 in a classified environment?
7	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: That's correct.
8	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And did you review a
9	classified version of a summary of your evidence after that
10	interview?
11	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: I have.
12	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And the document on the
13	screen in front of you is a publicly disclosable version of
14	the classified summary. Have you reviewed this document?
15	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: I've reviewed it.
16	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And do you agree that the
17	summary accurately reflects your evidence?
18	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: There's actually one
19	minor change to bring at page 4. The paragraph just above
20	RCMP Investigation. It says,
21	"The RCMP is both a producer and a
22	consumer intelligence. While the RCMP
23	is a contributor SITE DF, it is more
24	often the consumer." (As read)
25	The next line, "The RCMP had no" We
26	should have "foreign interference election related
27	investigation."
28	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Okay. Thank you. So the

1	insertion of the word
2	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: And the word.
3	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: a few words, foreign
4	interference.
5	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Yeah. The rest is
6	correct.
7	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Okay. Thank you. And so
8	with that correction, do you adopt the summary as part of
9	your evidence before the Commission today?
10	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Yes.
11	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Thank you.
12	I'll ask as well for CAN.DOC 19 to be pulled
13	up, please.
L4	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 19:
L5	Institutional Report - RCMP
16	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And this is a RCMP
L7	institutional report. Commissioner Duheme, have you had a
18	chance to review that document?
19	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: I have.
20	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And I understand there's
21	one correction to be made to this document. If we could pull
22	up page 24, please? And I understand there's a date entry in
23	this table that states May 6, 2023?
24	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Yeah, if we can go up?
25	Exactly.
26	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And stop there, please.
27	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: That first line I
28	just want to make sure I have the right document. Yeah.

1	That first line should read "May 6, 2022" and not "2023".
2	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: 2022. Okay. And with
3	that correction being made, can you confirm that this
4	accurately reflects the RCMP's evidence?
5	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: I confirm.
6	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Thank you. One last
7	document I'll ask be pulled up is WIT, W-I-T 38, please.
8	EXHIBIT No. WIT 38:
9	Mark Flynn Public Summary of
10	Classified Interview
11	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Thank you. And Deputy
12	Commissioner Flynn, you were interviewed by Commission
13	counsel on February 15th, 2024 in a classified space?
14	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: That's correct.
15	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And this is a summary of
16	the publicly disclosable content from that interview. Have
17	you had an opportunity to review it?
18	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: Yes, I have.
19	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And do you have any
20	addition, changes, or deletions to be made?
21	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: One minor change on page
22	5 in the section that is titled "Relationship With CSE". The
23	last sentence in that section says,
24	"While the RCMP can ask for
25	unsuppressed identities. "That request
26	renders" is the language in the report,
27	and it should read "That request
28	frequently renders".

1	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Thank you.
2	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: So the addition of the
3	word "frequently".
4	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And with that addition
5	being made, does this accurately reflect your evidence?
6	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: Yes, it does.
7	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And are you prepared to
8	adopt the summary as part of your evidence today?
9	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: Yes, I am.
10	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Thank you. So I want to
11	first ask about the RMCP's mandate in relation to foreign
12	interference, specifically relating to elections.
13	Commissioner Duheme, can you start by
14	describing the RCMP's working definition of foreign
15	interference?
16	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: I will. It is in my
17	statement as well.
18	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: So you're making reference
19	to your witness summary, which is WIT42?
20	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: My witness summary at
21	page 2. I explain that foreign interference is any overt or
22	covert illegal activity conducted at the direction or the
23	benefit of a foreign entity which targets Canadian interests
24	or interferes with Canadian society.
25	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And with that
26	understanding, what is the RCMP's mandate in relation to
27	foreign interference?
28	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Well the RCMP's

1	mandate, it's through our National Security Program, which
2	reports under D/Comm Flynn, has the responsibility to
3	investigate, under our National Security Program, there's the
4	responsibility to investigate any terrorism incidents, money
5	laundering incidents when it comes to financing, and also the
6	foreign interference side of any offence, criminal offence.
7	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Does the RCMP have a
8	narrower or more specific mandate in relation to election
9	related foreign interference?
10	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: The RCMP has a
11	memorandum of understanding with the Commissioner of Canada
12	Elections, which we can share resources, can investigate
13	jointly, share technology, and work together. But really,
14	anything to do with the electoral process usually goes to the
15	OCC.
16	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Okay. And when you've
17	oh.
18	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: If I may
19	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Yes.
20	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: add to that, back
21	when the RCMP first started in foreign actor interference
22	investigations with respect to the election, we were focused
23	on very specific types of offences, and as the Commissioner
24	said, we did look at it from the point of view of offences
25	under the Election Act, as well as Security of Information
26	Act.
27	However, I would say it is important to look
28	even post GE 43 and 44 and what we are doing today. We've

1	expanded our understanding of the threat and how it does come
2	into even frontline policing type responses with respect to
3	threats and intimidation, diaspora, and in more subtle
4	elements that overtime combine to have a more significant
5	impact.
6	MR. MATTHEW FERGUSON: I just have a small
7	request from the interpreters again to please slow down.
8	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I'll just write this
9	down.
LO	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Thank you. We can do
11	that.
12	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I apologize for that.
13	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And when we talked about
L4	the RCMP's mandate in relation to foreign interference, did
L5	it change, formally change, between GE 43 and GE44?
16	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: I think Mark just
17	covered some of it, but in reality, the mandate as such
18	hasn't changed. We've learned a lot more. That's for sure.
19	And we've actually brought about some changes to our internal
20	structure to better address what we're seeing.
21	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Thank you. And during
22	I'll focus my questions on kind of stepping back into 2019
23	and 2021. What tools during GE 43 and GE 44 did the RCMP
24	have available to it to respond to election related
25	allegations of foreign interference?
26	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: Yes, I can answer that.
27	So the RCMP uses a broad number of authorities, and I would
28	say in 2019 and into 2021, the primary focus was looking at

1	Criminal Code offences or Security of Information Act
2	offences in relation to foreign states and their involvement
3	in Canada.
4	However, our tool set included general
5	authorities that we have to keep the peace, public safety,
6	various case law authorities as well, under which we could
7	act.
8	Post 2021, as I already spoke about, our
9	thinking has evolved and when we are looking at foreign
10	interference activities, we are looking at leveraging the
11	full extent of the Criminal Code, such as uttering threats,
12	intimidation, harassment type offences that we would look at
13	that traditionally were not considered National Security
14	tools.
15	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Thank you. So I want to
15 16	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Thank you. So I want to move on now to ask you, kind of high level, about the RCMP's
16	move on now to ask you, kind of high level, about the RCMP's
16 17	move on now to ask you, kind of high level, about the RCMP's relationship with other agencies. So we'll start with CSIS.
16 17 18	move on now to ask you, kind of high level, about the RCMP's relationship with other agencies. So we'll start with CSIS. Comm Duheme, are you able to describe, again,
16 17 18 19	move on now to ask you, kind of high level, about the RCMP's relationship with other agencies. So we'll start with CSIS. Comm Duheme, are you able to describe, again, kind of high level, the RCMP's relationship with CSIS?
16 17 18 19 20	move on now to ask you, kind of high level, about the RCMP's relationship with other agencies. So we'll start with CSIS. Comm Duheme, are you able to describe, again, kind of high level, the RCMP's relationship with CSIS? COMM MICHAEL DUHEME:excellent. The
16 17 18 19 20 21	move on now to ask you, kind of high level, about the RCMP's relationship with other agencies. So we'll start with CSIS. Comm Duheme, are you able to describe, again, kind of high level, the RCMP's relationship with CSIS? COMM MICHAEL DUHEME:excellent. The Director, we see each other at least a week at various Deputy
16 17 18 19 20 21	move on now to ask you, kind of high level, about the RCMP's relationship with other agencies. So we'll start with CSIS. Comm Duheme, are you able to describe, again, kind of high level, the RCMP's relationship with CSIS? COMM MICHAEL DUHEME:excellent. The Director, we see each other at least a week at various Deputy Minister meetings. And when the need arises to discuss of a
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	move on now to ask you, kind of high level, about the RCMP's relationship with other agencies. So we'll start with CSIS. Comm Duheme, are you able to describe, again, kind of high level, the RCMP's relationship with CSIS? COMM MICHAEL DUHEME:excellent. The Director, we see each other at least a week at various Deputy Minister meetings. And when the need arises to discuss of a topic or a file, we just call each other up.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	move on now to ask you, kind of high level, about the RCMP's relationship with other agencies. So we'll start with CSIS. Comm Duheme, are you able to describe, again, kind of high level, the RCMP's relationship with CSIS? COMM MICHAEL DUHEME:excellent. The Director, we see each other at least a week at various Deputy Minister meetings. And when the need arises to discuss of a topic or a file, we just call each other up. But I would say that the RCMP with CSIS, the
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	move on now to ask you, kind of high level, about the RCMP's relationship with other agencies. So we'll start with CSIS. Comm Duheme, are you able to describe, again, kind of high level, the RCMP's relationship with CSIS? COMM MICHAEL DUHEME:excellent. The Director, we see each other at least a week at various Deputy Minister meetings. And when the need arises to discuss of a topic or a file, we just call each other up. But I would say that the RCMP with CSIS, the relation is excellent. We have mandates that are slightly

1	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: I am the same type of
2	sinner.
3	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: I'd like to ask you about
4	the One Vision framework. Can you explain what it is and
5	practically how it operates?
6	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: So I'll look to Mark
7	there to further explain.
8	One Vision came about where we want to make
9	sure that both organizations are in lockstep as to what's
10	going on, who is doing what. Like a deconfliction, but it's
11	also an opportunity to share some information.
12	And I invite Mark to share some, because he's
13	participated in some One Visions.
14	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: Yes, given the role that,
15	and distinct role, that our two organizations play in public
16	safety, and very complimentary roles that we play, it's
17	important as we are both working primarily domestically with
18	respect to this type of activity. We have the One Vision
19	process that ensures that we are focused on the vision being
20	public safety and prevention of harm to Canada. And it
21	allows us to discuss in a headquarters environment, not in a
22	primarily investigative environment, although sometimes it
23	does include meetings between investigators and regional
24	staff from CSIS. It is primarily a discussion about what is
25	the problem, what is each organization doing with respect to
26	either a larger problem or a specific incident that we are
27	investigating.

And the outcome of that today is a letter

1	from the Service, or an understanding during the
2	conversation, as to how the information can be used by the
3	RCMP or cannot be used by the RCMP to move ahead. It allows
4	us to make sure that our independent actions are not
5	compromising the operations that we are independently
6	executing.
7	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And so when you describe
8	potentially being able to use or not use information, I
9	understand there's a distinction between what's called
10	actionable intelligence and non-actionable intelligence. Are
11	you able to explain the difference?
12	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: Yes, I am. So given the
13	intelligence role that the Service has, there are times when
14	they will have information that is very useful for the RCMP
15	to have to give us a better understanding of what is
16	happening in any given situation, or to understand a threat
17	that may be present.
18	That information can be provided to us in
19	what I'll characterize as a non-actionable, a strategic
20	information type of category. And then actionable would be
21	where they have specific information about a threat, they are
22	prepared for that information to be used in judicial
23	processes and other ways that would reveal it to the public,
24	and that is the category that I would call actionable,
25	because it is the genesis of many of our investigative
26	efforts.
27	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And is that concept

distinct from what's described as the intelligence to

evidence problem?

fact, they are very interrelated because frequently the information that we will receive that is not able to be utilized in our judicial processes, the non-actionable is given that non-actionable category because of the fact that there is no effective way of it being able to be presented or used by us in a manner that does not risk it being presented in court or in some way leading to information that would reveal either their sources or their techniques that are deemed to be important to be preserved.

COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Can I just add, this is not limited to the Service. Our international partners, it's the same thing. If we have information or raw intelligence come in from the partners, we run into the same hurdles, if you wish, with regards to actionable items for intelligence.

COMMISSIONER HOGUE: I have one question.

And would you say that the vast majority of the intelligence you're receiving from CSIS is non-actionable?

D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I would not characterise it as vast. There are many discussions, Madam Commissioner, that lead up to sometimes a discrete line, that that discrete line that is provided to us in an actual way allows us to take steps to build a case to present sometimes a very similar picture. However, there is a large amount of discussion that can be had to lead to one discrete line that comes out, but the teams work very hard to get to that point where we can provide that information.

1	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: I see. And it takes
2	time.
3	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I would not characterise
4	it as vast. There are many discussions, Madam Commissioner,
5	that lead up to Takes time.
6	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And in a circumstance
7	where the RCMP is not in a position to lay or pursue criminal
8	charges because of the genesis of the underlying information,
9	are there alternative available steps or responses to the
10	RCMP?
11	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: So there are always
12	options to some extent, and sometimes the option is that we
13	will wait, we will continue the engagement with the Service
14	while they work under the mandate to gather information. And
15	that's a really important part that needs to be understood.
16	We have complementary mandates, and we do collaborate and we
17	do manage the threats to Canada and Canadian public safety
18	collaboratively.
19	So the fact that the RCMP can't always take
20	information that the Service has and action it in our mandate
21	under a judicial process or an intent to come out with a
22	prosecution at the end of it, doesn't mean that there is
23	necessarily a fault in the system.
24	The other is we have moved away from
25	prosecution being the only objective or the primary objective
26	of our mandate in the RCMP, and it's not considered what
27	you'll hear as referred to as the "gold standard" anymore.
28	We have to focus on the public safety as being the outcome,

1	and there are times where we will receive information that we
2	do have a caveat that says you cannot use it in judicial
3	process, and we will take additional action to mitigate or
4	manage a threat such as physical surveillance or other types
5	of activities that we are authorised to do.
6	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Thank you. So I'll move
7	now to the RCMP's relationship with CSE. Deputy

now to the RCMP's relationship with CSE. Deputy

Commissioner Flynn, how would you describe the RCMP's with

CSE?

partner in the public safety space. In the national security and intelligence space we have the RCMP. As the Commissioner had stated early -- earlier, there are many committees and forums that we interact in regularly.

Given the fact that CSE does not gather intelligence on Canadians, there is a much less significant flow of information. However, we do have access to CSE information through special models that are set up in -- between our organisations for sharing intelligence.

If there is information in their holdings that is relevant for our operations, whether it be foreign or domestic, and if there are what I'll refer to as "suppressed identities" because as you are likely aware, CSE does not collect information on Canadians, but if there is information that ends up in CSE systems it is suppressed if it relates to Canadians. If there's something in there that is important for the RCMP, we can seek or make a request to unsuppress that information, and there is a formal process that that

flows both ways.

20

24

25

26

27

28

- goes through to make that determination. 1 MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Thank you. And I'll move 2 -- I -- Commissioner Duheme, you already touched briefly on 3 the relationship with the OCCE. I understand the RCMP has an 4 MOU, memorandum of understanding, which you touched upon. 5 6 COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Correct. 7 MS. LYNDA MORGAN: In terms of the information flow and kind of avenues of exchange between the 8 9 two bodies, would you describe the relationship as a push or a pull or does information flow both ways? 10 COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: I would say information 11 flows both ways. And are you referring to between us and the 12 13 Service, or the community at large? 14 MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Between the RCMP and the 15 OCCE. COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Oh, OCCE. Okay. I 16 would say that it flows both ways. If we have come across 17 information that is benefit to them, we will transfer it to 18 19 them. If they require assistance, we will help them. And it
- MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Thank you. I'll move now to some specific GE43, GE44 questions for you in our limited timeframe.

So the Commission is -- the Commissioner is going to hear about SITE TF, which is the Security and Intelligence Threats To Elections Task Force, but we know that the RCMP is one of the members of what's described as SITE TF. And so how would you describe the RCMP's role on

1 SITE?

5

8

9

10

11

19

28

the organisation.

COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Well, the RCMP has a 2 3 key role on SITE bringing the perspective to the table of what we're seeing in the criminal space. The RCMP is also 4 uniquely positioned where we can coordinate some of the 6 information that has to go up the SITE through the Canadian 7 Association of Chiefs of Police, all chiefs of police across the country, and also with what's going on with the Five So we bring to the table really a focus on -- from the criminal angle, within our mandate, obviously. MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And through the RCMP participation on SITE TF, if the RCMP representative gains 12 13 knowledge of intelligence or information from other members, 14 what use can the RCMP make of that information? 15 COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Well, for starting -the starting point is SITE is more or less of a hub where 16 information flows in and then informs the Panel of Five. 17 Anything that comes out of -- if it's new information, which 18 I'd be surprised because with the number of deputy minister meetings that we have, that information would probably have 20 been already shared with the organisations. But the point is 21 22 that anything that flows from that, there's a proper process to share information with the entities. So if the RCMP, if 23 it learns about something, cannot just take the information, 24 and run with it. We'll reach out to the Service, if it's 25 coming from the Service, discuss it and then action the 26 proper protocols in place to have that information come into 27

1	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And you've described the
2	kind of link between SITE TF and the Panel of Five. Through
3	its participation in SITE TF, did the RCMP also participate,
4	to the best of your knowledge, in briefing the Panel of Five
5	during
6	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: M'hm.
7	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: the 2019 or 2021 writ
8	periods?
9	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: So the rules with SITE
10	are that the entities that are a part of it are a part of the
11	briefings for the Panel of Five. We did have some challenges
12	in gathering some information specific to which individuals
13	were there, but we believe, yes, that there would have been
14	RCMP members at some of those briefings.
15	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And so I take it by your
16	collective answer, neither of you were present for
17	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: No.
18	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: a Panel of Five
19	briefing?
20	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: No, it would have been
21	the representative who's on SITE.
22	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: And we understand that
23	the representative will be here speaking, but in the interest
24	of keeping testimony clean, we have not had those discussions
25	specifically with them.
26	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Thank you. And setting
27	aside kind of the SITE flow of information and information
28	exchange, were there other avenues of information flow to the

here is within
of information to
to the Deputy
me. The flow of
going on,
l again, the
y Commissioner,
es there's
l awareness that
efed on it, but
not important
MEs that are
my position as
material that I
3 or GE44,
ged foreign
rea?
recall having
said, there is
rious deputy
peration
er DM meetings.

MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And during GE43, or 44,

1	Commissioner, were you made aware of allegations of reported,
2	quote, "vote buying", end quote, in Richmond, British
3	Columbia?
4	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: No, because I believe
5	that that could have been a municipal matter which didn't tie
6	to our national security framework that we have.
7	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Okay. And same timeframe,
8	GE43 or 44, were you made aware of any information in
9	relation to Mr. Dong and alleged PRC foreign interference in
10	the Don Valley North?
11	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: No, not to my
12	recollection.
13	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: During GE44, Commissioner,
14	were you made aware of any information about alleged PRC
15	foreign interference in the 2021 election?
16	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: I'm not 100 percent
17	sure if it's during the election. Like I said, building up
18	to the elections with the DM meetings that we've had,
19	sometimes there's some briefings, some situational awareness
20	briefings that are being provided, but during the election
21	period I'm not 100 percent sure.
22	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And during GE43 or GE44,
23	were you made aware of any alleged Chinese state media or
24	other online disinformation activities?
25	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: And my answer would be
26	the same, that during that period because there's a lot of
27	chat with regards to different social media that were used.

There could have been discussions before, actually, the

1	election. But during the election, I'm not 100 percent sure.
2	But yes, I've been privy to some of the
3	discussions. Just not quite sure if it's within that time
4	period.
5	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Thank you.
6	And I will ask you about investigations
7	generally. I understand there's some information you're not
8	able to share.
9	During GE43 and GE44, are you able to tell us
10	whether the RCMP provided SITE TF with any information
11	relating to election relating to allegations of election-
12	related foreign interference?
13	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: The RCMP did not have
14	any foreign interference election criminal investigation
15	during 43 and 44.
16	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And after GE44,
17	Commissioner, has the RCMP opened any foreign interference
18	criminal investigation or investigations involving elections
19	and/or democratic institutions?
20	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: We did receive some
21	information later on that some of the files are still under
22	investigation.
23	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: You've described for us
24	the kind of individual relationships with between the RCMF
25	and CSIS, the RCMP and CSE, the RCMP and OCCE. We heard
26	evidence yesterday from a number of current and former MPs,
27	some of whom expressed the view that, from their perspective,
28	there appears to be a lack of coordination between different

- 1 intelligence and investigative agencies.
- 2 Are you able to detail any challenges that
- you faced in terms of coordinating efforts between the
- 4 various agencies? And again, this question is specific to
- 5 the timeframe of 2019 to 2021.
- 6 COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Yeah. I didn't listen
- 7 to yesterday's testimonies. What I can say is prior to the
- 8 43 and 44, SITE didn't exist. You didn't have a hub in which
- 9 people could come together and share what different agencies
- are seeing, so I would say that are we better off in 43 and
- 11 44 than what we were in 42? Yes. Can we build on that? I
- think so.
- I do think there are also other mechanisms
- 14 through different Deputy Minister meetings that information
- is shared, but I do think that we're in a better place today
- than we were in 42.
- 17 D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I would like to add to
- 18 that, if I may.
- MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Yes.
- 20 D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I believe that there has
- 21 been a very strong coordinated collaborative effort amongst
- the community in the national security space, which includes
- foreign actor interference. I'm very proud of the
- relationship that exists. I've stated that publicly several
- times.
- The number of meetings, the informal
- 27 discussions, the interactions between the staff and the RCMP
- and our partners in this area is sometimes hourly during the

1 week. We have a large number of experts.

In some of your previous questions and the Commissioner's answers, I want to make sure that there's an understanding that what makes it all the way to the Commissioner in briefings and what is discussed and what is done collaboratively between our organizations are two different things.

We have a large number of experts. We're a very large organization with many, many mandates, and I would not want you or Madame Commissaire to walk away with the impression that some things that the Commissioner may not have known means that organizationally that we were not collaborating in that space because that is not the reality. We have very strong relationships and very collaborative relationships in this space.

MS. LYNDA MORGAN: In terms of briefing certain information or intelligence up to the Commissioner, just following up on what you said, what type of information, generally speaking, would get briefed up to the Commissioner?

D/COMM MARK FLYNN: So large-scale problems, issues that are specific to actions that the RCMP is taking.

Briefing materials in relation to discussions that we know

I know you have a large number of documents for various DM, Deputy Minister, Assistant Deputy Minister level meetings and in some of those, you will see different things that we bring to the Commissioner's attention so that he or she at the time are prepared to discuss the role of the

that the Commissioner will be attending.

1	RUMP in addition to what they are hearing from the partners.
2	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: There's not a clear
3	policy on what needs to be briefed up. If you look at if
4	you take away the foreign interference side and national
5	security, we respond to three million calls a year across the
6	country, so I rely on the commanding officers in different
7	divisions what needs to be briefed up. And it's the same
8	thing when I'm dealing with the portfolios here in National
9	Headquarters.
10	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: Thank you.
11	Those are my questions. Thank you.
12	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Thanks. Thank you.
13	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
14	We'll take the break, the morning break, for
15	20 minutes. So we'll be back at 11:25.
16	THE REGISTRAR: Order please.
17	This sitting of the Foreign Interference
18	Commission is now in recess until 11:25.
19	Upon recessing at 11:05 a.m.
20	Upon resuming at 11:26 a.m.
21	THE REGISTRAR: Order please.
22	This sitting of the Foreign Interference
23	Commission is back in session.
24	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: So cross-examination.
25	The first one will be counsel for UCC. UCC
26	stands for the Ukrainian Congress Canadian Congress.
27	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Resumed:
28	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: Resumed:

1	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER:
2	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Yes, exactly.
3	Good morning. My name is Leslie Schumacher.
4	My first question is, was the RCMP aware of
5	Russian engaging in foreign interference in Canada during the
6	2019 and 2021 General Elections?
7	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: I would say "aware" is
8	probably a strong word in the sense that, as I testified
9	earlier, prior to elections there's been regular DM meetings
10	that touch different spheres of activities and I remember
11	that country being mentioned, but that's to that extent.
12	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Okay. So was the
13	RCMP in possession of any information that indicated that
14	there was any Russian interference?
15	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: No.
15 16	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: No. MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Was Russian
16	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Was Russian
16 17	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Was Russian interference a concern of the RCMP at the time of either
16 17 18	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Was Russian interference a concern of the RCMP at the time of either election?
16 17 18 19	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Was Russian interference a concern of the RCMP at the time of either election? COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Every country that
16 17 18 19 20	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Was Russian interference a concern of the RCMP at the time of either election? COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Every country that exerts an influence is a concern to the RCMP, but not just
16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Was Russian interference a concern of the RCMP at the time of either election? COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Every country that exerts an influence is a concern to the RCMP, but not just the RCMP, but I think the Canadian government. Mark?
16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Was Russian interference a concern of the RCMP at the time of either election? COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Every country that exerts an influence is a concern to the RCMP, but not just the RCMP, but I think the Canadian government. Mark? D/COMM MARK FLYNN: Yeah, I'd further add
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Was Russian interference a concern of the RCMP at the time of either election? COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Every country that exerts an influence is a concern to the RCMP, but not just the RCMP, but I think the Canadian government. Mark? D/COMM MARK FLYNN: Yeah, I'd further add that in preparation for the 2019 election, the RCMP actually
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Was Russian interference a concern of the RCMP at the time of either election? COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Every country that exerts an influence is a concern to the RCMP, but not just the RCMP, but I think the Canadian government. Mark? D/COMM MARK FLYNN: Yeah, I'd further add that in preparation for the 2019 election, the RCMP actually work with Ukrainian authorities in their election to learn
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Was Russian interference a concern of the RCMP at the time of either election? COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Every country that exerts an influence is a concern to the RCMP, but not just the RCMP, but I think the Canadian government. Mark? D/COMM MARK FLYNN: Yeah, I'd further add that in preparation for the 2019 election, the RCMP actually work with Ukrainian authorities in their election to learn from and prepare for anything that we might see in the GE43.

1	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: No, it was not.
2	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: We're talking from law
3	enforcement criminal perspective; correct?
4	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: And so in the 2021
5	general election, was Russian interference something that the
6	RCMP was also actively looking into?
7	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: During both elections we
8	looked at all potential areas of concern.
9	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Did the RCMP take any
10	steps to counteract Russian interference?
11	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Neither in 43 or 44
12	none. But again, the steps to counter it in a non-criminal
13	element does not rest with the RCMP.
14	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: In a criminal way,
15	does the RCMP take any steps to counteract Russian
16	interference in elections?
17	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Well, if we came across
18	any type of interference, would be the normal process is we
19	would investigate, but as I said, we didn't do not come
20	across any Russian interference for 43 and 44.
21	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: And what type of
22	information would the RCMP need to determine whether to
23	proceed with an investigation into election interference?
24	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: So that is a complex
25	question because foreign interference in election can take
26	many forms, so, generally speaking though, we need some point
27	to start an investigation, so we need to have some
28	information and often referred to as "evidence" because most

T	of the authorities that the RCMP have grow from an
2	evidentiary pathway and judicial processes and judicial
3	authorities. So we either need complaints to come forward,
4	or for information that can be action to come forward that
5	would allow us to generate investigative efforts.
6	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Right. And so when
7	you say complaints or information, is there a before you
8	said you had no information about any Russian interference
9	into the elections. Were there any complaints, or is there a
10	difference between those two things?
11	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: There's not a
12	difference in the answer.
13	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Okay. Thank you.
14	Those are my questions.
15	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: Thank you.
16	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
17	Next one is RCDA. Russian Canadian
18	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Merci.
19	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Alliance, Canadian
20	Alliance.
21	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Merci.
22	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Yes
23	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Democratic Alliance
24	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Exactly. Yeah, the
25	Russian Canadian Democratic Alliance. I am counsel at.
26	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS:
27	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: I'm going to be asking
28	my questions in English because I prepared them in English,

28

1	but feel free to answer them in any official language of your
2	choice.
3	I want to pull CAN 012856, please.
4	EXHIBIT No. CAN 12856:
5	SITE TF Situational Report: 14
6	September 2021
7	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: And this is a
8	situation report from the SITE Task Force. I won't be asking
9	any questions regarding the RCMP's participation in the SITE
10	Task Force. I just want to provide some context. This is
11	the report is dated September $14^{\rm th}$, so 1 week before the 2021
12	election. I want to go at page two, third bullet point,
13	please.
L4	This document talks about anti-vaccine, anti-
L5	lockdown, anti-mask grievances that are continuing to drive
16	both online discussions and in-person protests. And then it
17	goes on to explain a lot of different instances of protest,
18	even threats of violence and so on that the RCMP is
19	monitoring in this context. What can you tell me a little
20	bit more about this sort of divisive content being promoted
21	during the final weeks before the 2021 election?
22	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Yeah, I can I'll
23	start off and Mark can add for sure, but during the GE 44,
24	what was saw is an escalation, if you wish, of individuals at
25	different parts of the country manifesting their displeasure
26	with the government at the time. COVID, again, was part.

Vaccination was another thing. And what we did from an

organization perspective, we made sure that all our

commanding officers that are in each province and territory were aware, but we also engaged Canadian police to just make them aware of what we're seeing across the country, so that if they see anything, they can react and report it back up.

I have to highlight too is during that period, we did have a lot of input in SITE with regards to IMVE, the ideological motivated violent extremists, which we saw a rise during that period. It was a concern for the RCMP, and we just want to make sure that law enforcement across the country were well positioned to answer any of these uprising by citizens.

D/COMM MARK FLYNN: And a key element of that discussion that the Commissioner just -- we just had with you on this, it's important to understand the context of what we are doing here in looking at that narrative is not to determine what the different sides of the narrative are in that social media platform. It is wholly from the public safety perspective ---

MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: I see.

of parliamentarians, the protection of the democratic processes of the elections, the campaigns, et cetera, because if politicians are not able to run for office, campaign and feel safe, they will not come forward. And we're seeing that and that's a bit of an epidemic in Canada where we have seen politicians at municipal, provincial and federal level who have left their roles due to concerns for their safety, and that is a primary mandate of the RCMP.

1	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Okay. So there's a
2	lot to unpack in your both of your answers, and,
3	unfortunately, I don't have time today to unpack everything.
4	But I will just continue on. Just to clarify, in the 2021
5	election I know it's a broader problem than the election,
6	but during the election, did you see what can you tell me
7	about the momentum of this sort of content? Was it
8	increasing in the days leading up to the election, or was it
9	increasing, decreasing?
10	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: So if I had to compare
11	it to 2019, right, we've seen a shift, a dramatic shift
12	because of what took place in society as the rise with IMVs,
13	but of memory, I don't recall too many instances that
14	occurred. Mark, I don't know if you can fill in but
15	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I would say during the
15 16	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I would say during the 2021 election campaign, we saw more instance than we had seen
	-
16	2021 election campaign, we saw more instance than we had seen
16 17	2021 election campaign, we saw more instance than we had seen in the past with respect to our protective policing mandate.
16 17 18	2021 election campaign, we saw more instance than we had seen in the past with respect to our protective policing mandate. The rise of IMV has been rising since before the 2021 and it
16 17 18 19	2021 election campaign, we saw more instance than we had seen in the past with respect to our protective policing mandate. The rise of IMV has been rising since before the 2021 and it has risen since then and the broader terrorism threat has
16 17 18 19 20	2021 election campaign, we saw more instance than we had seen in the past with respect to our protective policing mandate. The rise of IMV has been rising since before the 2021 and it has risen since then and the broader terrorism threat has grown as well. So it has risen. I without further
16 17 18 19 20 21	2021 election campaign, we saw more instance than we had seen in the past with respect to our protective policing mandate. The rise of IMV has been rising since before the 2021 and it has risen since then and the broader terrorism threat has grown as well. So it has risen. I without further analysis, it would be difficult for me to put it in the
16 17 18 19 20 21	2021 election campaign, we saw more instance than we had seen in the past with respect to our protective policing mandate. The rise of IMV has been rising since before the 2021 and it has risen since then and the broader terrorism threat has grown as well. So it has risen. I without further analysis, it would be difficult for me to put it in the context of the 2021 election as opposed to just a simple
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	2021 election campaign, we saw more instance than we had seen in the past with respect to our protective policing mandate. The rise of IMV has been rising since before the 2021 and it has risen since then and the broader terrorism threat has grown as well. So it has risen. I without further analysis, it would be difficult for me to put it in the context of the 2021 election as opposed to just a simple timeline context that could involve many things, and
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	2021 election campaign, we saw more instance than we had seen in the past with respect to our protective policing mandate. The rise of IMV has been rising since before the 2021 and it has risen since then and the broader terrorism threat has grown as well. So it has risen. I without further analysis, it would be difficult for me to put it in the context of the 2021 election as opposed to just a simple timeline context that could involve many things, and specifically, the COVID pandemic has been a significant
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	2021 election campaign, we saw more instance than we had seen in the past with respect to our protective policing mandate. The rise of IMV has been rising since before the 2021 and it has risen since then and the broader terrorism threat has grown as well. So it has risen. I without further analysis, it would be difficult for me to put it in the context of the 2021 election as opposed to just a simple timeline context that could involve many things, and specifically, the COVID pandemic has been a significant element, and, obviously, the 2021 election is right in the

1	contents during the election as opposed to before the
2	election?
3	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Again, if I had to
4	compare between 43 and 44, yeah, 44 was slightly different
5	than 43 where there's more presence on social media. We've
6	seen people more in the streets. There was more division, if
7	you wish, but to what extent I'd be hard pressed to put a
8	number on it.
9	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Okay.
10	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: And we are not monitoring
11	the divisive content.
12	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: No.
13	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: We are monitoring the
14	public safety threat and any threat to individuals. So the
15	number of incidents, as I stated, have arisen, but we are not
16	monitoring, cataloguing, statistically analysing divisive
17	content. It's threat materials that we are monitoring.
18	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Okay. These threats,
19	did they increase during the election?
20	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: Yes, they did.
21	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: And do what causes
22	this increase in violence maybe during the election?
23	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: So I would characterise
24	it as threats during the election as opposed to violence.
25	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Threats
26	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: And the sheer number of
27	public appearances, engagements and such in an election
28	campaign present far more opportunities. Speeches, the type

1	of content that are in speeches give rise to people
2	expressing lawfully and, in some cases, unlawfully, their
3	opinions on the positions of politicians are taken during
4	campaigns.
5	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Okay. Maybe I have
6	one or two
7	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: One last question.
8	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Okay. Thank you.
9	So we've heard evidence, and it's been
10	reported multiple places, that Russia seeks to amplify
11	divisive contents, such as this one, the one that we
12	discussed. Is it possible that some of the divisive content
13	or increase in threats of violence can be traced back to the
14	Russian Federation?
15	COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: Well, again, it's not
16	in our mandate to go through social media to track it down.
17	That would be better posed to CSE or the service, but it
18	doesn't fall in the RCMP mandate to monitor everything that's
19	going on in social media.
20	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Okay, thank you.
21	COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: You're welcome.
22	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
23	COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: Thank you. Merci.
24	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Human Rights Coalition?
25	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. HANNAH TAYLOR:
26	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Good morning. I
27	understand that individuals can report potential foreign
28	interference, including potential election interference, to

1	the RCMP's National Security Information Network; is that
2	correct?
3	COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: That's correct.
4	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Did you receive reports
5	from diaspora members regarding potential election
6	interference in the 2019, 2021 elections?
7	COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: Twenty nineteen
8	(2019); 43 and 44 there was three referrals made to the OCCE
9	but I'm not quite sure of the outcome of it. And I don't
10	think it was foreign interference.
11	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Were those
12	COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: It was information
13	that was brought to our attention that we shared with the
14	OCCE.
15	D/COMM. MARK FLYNN: Yes, not related to
16	foreign interference.
16 17	foreign interference. MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Were those three do
17	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Were those three do
17 18	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Were those three do you know if those three were brought to your attention by
17 18 19	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Were those three do you know if those three were brought to your attention by members of diaspora communities?
17 18 19 20	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Were those three do you know if those three were brought to your attention by members of diaspora communities? COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: I wouldn't be able to
17 18 19 20 21	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Were those three do you know if those three were brought to your attention by members of diaspora communities? COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: I wouldn't be able to confirm that.
17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Were those three do you know if those three were brought to your attention by members of diaspora communities? COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: I wouldn't be able to confirm that. MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Okay. Is that something
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Were those three do you know if those three were brought to your attention by members of diaspora communities? COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: I wouldn't be able to confirm that. MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Okay. Is that something that's tracked in complaint mechanisms to an extent, or is
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Were those three do you know if those three were brought to your attention by members of diaspora communities? COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: I wouldn't be able to confirm that. MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Okay. Is that something that's tracked in complaint mechanisms to an extent, or is that something that you would be aware of generally, or no?
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Were those three do you know if those three were brought to your attention by members of diaspora communities? COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: I wouldn't be able to confirm that. MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Okay. Is that something that's tracked in complaint mechanisms to an extent, or is that something that you would be aware of generally, or no? COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: Normally, the course

1	D/COMM. MARK FLYNN: If I may, not ask a
2	question but respond. To track your question in its
3	entirety, I didn't that you were saying specifically at the
4	time of GE 43, 44. I think you were asking in the broader
5	context of 43, 44, and I would say in a broader context, and
6	in the broad definition of foreign interference, even outside
7	of the election, we've had strong engagement with various
8	diaspora about transnational repression-type activities.
9	But, again, outside of the context of the timeframe and
10	specifically related to the GE 43 and 44 at that time.
11	And there's obviously other matters, as we've
12	referred earlier, that are under investigation that are
13	outside the terms of reference of this, the hearing due to
14	the public interest in maintaining both the integrity and the
15	outcome of those investigations.
16	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: And so turning back
17	specifically to that specifically to the National Security
18	Information Network, so that mechanism, do members of the
19	public, in your opinion, tend to know that they can contact
20	you with complaints in this way? How is that shared with
21	people; how is that information shared?
22	D/COMM. MARK FLYNN: So I would say over
23	time, our opinion and our work in that area has shifted. I
24	would say, generally speaking, no, they have not in the past.
25	However, you will see a lot of the material
26	in some of the campaigns that we are running, such as "See
27	Something, Say Something" which is broader national security
28	reporting, we are putting that material out in multiple

1	language, specifically focusing on languages of diaspora in
2	Canada, and specifically related to communities that may be
3	at risk of either terrorism threats; threats, intimidation
4	with respect to transnational repression, or foreign
5	interference. So those products that are produced by our
6	Prevention and Engagement Unit, and in collaboration with the
7	Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, Community for
8	Prevention and Engagement on Public Safety Matters are
9	produced in multiple language.

Gaining trust and confidence of the diaspora in Canada is something that we are concerned about, and we are actively engaging, and in some of our operations you will have seen where are taking a different approach of working what I would characterize as in the shadows, or in plainclothes. And you'll have seen instances where the RCMP has been, in our federal policing mandate, very much out front, in uniform and present, and part of the strategy of that is to gain trust and confidence in the community. So they see we are present, that we care, and that we are prepared to do something.

The reason I provide that information is because that has resulted in an increased number of calls that have come into our tip line, as well as direct communication outside of the tip line in reporting activities of concern that are subject of investigation.

MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Thank you. And so just to confirm, when it comes to the tip line, or the network, can individuals engage in that tip line or network in

languages other than English and French? 1 COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: There is ---2 3 D/COMM. MARK FLYNN: Primarily it is English and French as official languages in Canada. However, there 4 are mechanisms if someone does reach out that we can engage, 5 6 but it is an area that we need to pay attention to going forward and increase our capacity in that space, because it 7 is very challenging to do so today. 8 COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: Can I just add 9 something? Because you often refer to tip line and I know 10 some people watching, the tip line is to be used for if 11 there's no safety at risk to the individual. If there's an 12 immediate threat to the individual, the course of action is 13 14 call the police of jurisdiction; call 911 and get someone 15 there. But if it's a follow-up, things that they're seeing, trends, as Mark said, see it, report it; that tip line is 16 very useful. 17 MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: And are members of the 18 19 public offered confidentiality protections when they make a 20 complaint through this mechanism? 21 D/COMM. MARK FLYNN: So as with any 22 engagement with the police, we respect the wishes of the individual with respect to confidentiality. That does impact 23 what we can do with the information that they provide because 24 we do have legal disclosure requirements in criminal 25 proceedings that, depending on which route the proceedings 26 go, can present challenges for that. But we do have 27

confidential informant laws in Canada and practices in Canada

that can be utilized. 1 But, again, it depends on whether someone is 2 a confidential informant, a witness, a victim. So it really 3 depends upon the status of the individual within the 4 investigative process. 5 6 MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: And is ---COMMISSIONER HOGUE: This will be your last 7 question. 8 9 MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Thank you, Commissioner. And when it comes to the availability of 10 confidentiality protection, is that advertised in multiple 11 languages? 12 13 D/COMM. MARK FLYNN: I am not aware of that, 14 no. 15 MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you. 16 COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: Thank you. 17 COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Next one, Mr. Choudhry 18 19 for Jenny Kwan. --- CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: 20 MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Mr. Commissioner, Deputy 21 22 Commissioner, good morning. I just had a few follow-up questions from your examination in-chief. 23 Commissioner, I believe you stated, and just 24 would like you to confirm, that the RCMP did not open any 25 foreign interference election-related investigations for GE 26 43 and 44, but subsequent to 44 you had opened 27 investigations, and I believe you used the term plural --28

1	used that term in plural. Is that right?
2	COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: So during the 43 and
3	44 period, we did not, and you are right, sir, I did say that
4	after it, subsequently, we had received information that
5	prompted us to open an investigation.
6	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: And, you know,
7	Commissioner, I know that you're restrained in being able to
8	share with us the scope of that, but are we talking about
9	five; 50? I mean, are you able to give us a sense of the
10	order of magnitude?
11	COMM. MICHAEL DUHEME: I think it
12	MR. GREGORY TZEMENAKIS: Commissioner? With
13	all due respect, Commissioner, I'm going to ask these
14	witnesses not answer that question, pursuant to your terms of
15	reference, because we don't want to impact any aspect of an
16	ongoing investigation.
17	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Yeah, fair enough.
18	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: You
19	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Yes, thank you.
20	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: So there's no need to
21	answer the question.
22	D/COMM. MARK FLYNN: Does that count for a
23	question, though?
24	(LAUGHTER)
25	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: So I'm afraid it does
26	come off my list, but I have just two more.
27	So Deputy Commissioner, in your witness
28	statement you described in passing something called the

Foreign Actor Interference Team, but you didn't have a chance to give us a sense of what that is. And so I'm wondering — and I have a couple of questions about that. How big is that? And, also, in particular; what type of language skills do members of that team have? Can they — and so we know in this Commission that there are certain states that are targeting our diasporas, do members of that team have the linguistic skills to read social media posts, read media, engage with members of those communities?

is part of a much larger organization that has extensive language skills. So to speak to your first question in a multi-part question, the Foreign Actor Interference Team substantively was created in 2020. It is not the initial existence of a group within the RCMP that looked at foreign actor interference, because they're part of the National Security Program before that -- did that, and there was a small group with that assignment.

So I would characterise the 2020 as a formal team. The structure has been approximately -- I don't have the number in front of me, but notionally I would say it is around a dozen people. I'm not going to get into the full capacity of the organization, but that is with a core function. We are a large organization. We have multiple units that bring about many different types of investigative capacities to problems. So you should not interpret the number of that team to at all represent the capacity of the organization because that team is at Headquarters. It is a

the efforts at a national level, which involve all of our	Е	COMM MICHAEL DILLEME. If I can add to that?
the efforts at a national level, which involve all of our	4	which is in the thousands.
	3	federal policing investigative capacity across the country,
1 governance oversight, and what I'll call a focus team, for	2	the efforts at a national level, which involve all of our
	1	governance oversight, and what I'll call a focus team, for

5 COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: If I can add to that?
6 MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Of course.

organization, we're 30,000 across the country. So we have, in the past, mobilized people in different parts of the country to assist on a specific -- who have a specific language to assist us in an investigation. And we also mobilize some of our partners' resources when needed.

COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Within the

question with respect to capacity to look at the materials that are brought to our attention, or that we discover on our own, that is not a significant problem. It is a challenge, depending on the dialects in some of the material. But as the Commissioner said, we do go and get those resources where we need them to overcome it. Capacity is a challenge at times though.

MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: And then one last question if I may, Commissioner. So and this comes out of an exchange between Commission counsel and the Commissioner about the SITE Taskforce. And so I -- and you -- and Commissioner, if I recall correctly, I believe that in response to Commission counsel's question, you stated that before sharing any information that you -- the RCMP would receive on SITE within the organization, you'd have to seek

1	perm	nissio	on, 01	c 00	pera	tion,	or	acquies	scence	from	a	member	of
2	the	SITE	team	? Or	the	rele ⁻	vant	organi	ization	n that	c r	provided	b
3	the	infor	rmatio	on.									

So my question then follows from that, which is suppose an RCMP complaint is lodged with the RCMP that -- is there any way of connecting the dots between information that's shared with the RCMP at the Taskforce and a complaint that's received on the ground?

COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Yeah, so if I may, our SITE -- our person who is representing the organization at SITE will come back and debrief as to what was discussed.

But again, and I said it earlier, a lot of the information that's going to SITE is not a surprise to us, because it's probably been discussed at different levels from different organizations. And there's a validation process as well before it goes to SITE. But the expectation is that the individual will bring that information back, and then share it, and then whoever has that investigation to the program would connect the dots with other departments, if required.

MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Okay.

D/COMM MARK FLYNN: Yeah, and just to add to that, we do have multiple units within the RCMP and our National INTEL program, our Federal Policing National Security Operational Analysis, our Sensitive Information Handling Unit, that would have access to those materials through the SITE reporting who also are the criminal analysists and investigators that are looking to make those connections and to explore collaborative efforts where

1	they're possible, or to convert that information,
2	intelligence, into an actionable, useable product that we can
3	pull into our investigative stream. That is not always
4	possible, but when it is possible, those staff are the ones
5	that do that.
6	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Thank you, sirs.
7	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: Thank you. Merci.
8	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
9	AG. No? Okay. The next one.
10	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MATTHEW JOHNSON:
11	MR. MATTHEW JOHNSON: Good morning,
12	Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner. My name is Matthew
13	Johnson on behalf of the Attorney General of Canada. I just
14	have one question for you.
15	I'm going to take you back when you were
16	being questioned by my friend from Ukrainian Canadian
17	Congress. She asked you about whether you were aware of
18	Russia engaging in foreign interference.
19	When you said that you had no information
20	about that Russian about Russian foreign interference
21	efforts, were you speaking as to your personal knowledge or
22	on behalf of the RCMP as an organization, which does include
23	SITE Taskforce?
24	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: So I just want to
25	caveat here. I was referring to 43/44; right? But writ
26	large, at the larger perspective, yeah, we know that there's
27	some form of interference being done by Russia, and this is
28	from the numerous meetings that I have gone to at the DM

1	levels. And I think it was also noted in one of the SITE
2	reports, but I'm not 100 percent sure. But I've been privy
3	to some of the conversations about that type of influence.
4	MR. MATTHEW JOHNSON: Thank you, Madam
5	Commissioner. Those are my questions.
6	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you. Re-
7	examination?
8	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: I just have one
9	housekeeping matter for re-examination, which is I made
10	reference to the English version of the RCMP Institutional
11	Report. I'd just like to also reference CANDOC20, which is
12	the French version of the same institutional report.
13	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 20:
14	Gendarmerie Royale du Canada -
15	Rapport Institutionnel - Non
16	Classifié
17	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
18	MS. LYNDA MORGAN: And I would note as well
19	that the same qualification that was made to the English
20	version, page 24, changing the date, would be made to the
21	French version as well.
22	D/COMM MARK FLYNN: I would expect that.
23	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you. Thank you,
24	sir.
25	COMM MICHAEL DUHEME: [No interpretation]
26	MS. ERIN DANN: Commissioner, I wonder if we
27	could have five minutes just to bring in the next witness?
28	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Oh, yes. Sure.

1	MS. ERIN DANN: Mr. Registrar, we're taking
2	five minutes.
3	THE REGISTRAR: Order, please.
4	This hearing is in recess until 12:00.
5	Upon recessing at 12:00 p.m.
6	Upon resuming at 12:00 p.m.
7	THE REGISTRAR: Order please.
8	This sitting of the Foreign Interference
9	Commission is back in session.
10	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Good morning,
11	Mr. Rogers.
12	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Good morning.
13	MS. ERIN DANN: Good morning. Thank you,
14	Commissioner. It's Erin Dann, Commission Counsel. Our next
15	witness is Mr. Rogers. If the witness could be affirmed,
16	please.
17	THE REGISTRAR: Could you please state your
18	name and spell your last name for the record.
19	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Daniel Rogers,
20	R-O-G-E-R-S.
21	MR. DANIEL ROGERS, Affirmed:
22	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY MS. ERIN DANN:
23	MS. ERIN DANN: Mr. Rogers, we're going to
24	start today with a few housekeeping matters. Do you recall
25	being interviewed in a panel format alongside Shelly Bruce
26	and Alia Tayyeb by Commission Counsel on February 8th, 2024?
27	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes.
28	MS. ERIN DANN: If I can ask that WIT 39,

1	please.
2	EXHIBIT No. WIT 39:
3	Public Summary of Classified
4	Interview of: Shelly Bruce, Alia
5	Tayyeb, Dan Rogers
6	MS. ERIN DANN: This is a interview that took
7	place in a classified space. A publicly disclosable summary
8	of your interview was prepared. Have you had an opportunity
9	to review that? It's the document on the screen for you.
10	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, I have.
11	MS. ERIN DANN: And in relation to your
12	contributions, do you have any modifications, additions, or
13	deletions from the summary?
14	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: No.
15	MS. ERIN DANN: Does the summary accurately
16	reflect the substance of your interview that can be publicly
17	disclosed?
18	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes.
19	MS. ERIN DANN: Do you adopt your
20	contributions to the summary as part of your evidence before
21	the Commission?
22	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I do.
23	MS. ERIN DANN: Thank you.
24	You were also examined by Commission Counsel
25	during an in-camera proceeding in a panel format, alongside
26	Ms. Tayyeb, on March the 5th, 2024. Do you recall that?
27	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I do.
28	MS. ERIN DANN: If I could so we'll have

1	WIT 39, if that could be made the next exhibit. And I'd ask
2	the operator to pull up WIT 33.
3	EXHIBIT No. WIT 33:
4	Public Summary of Classified In
5	Camera Examination of: Ms. Alia
6	Tayyeb, Mr. Dan Rogers
7	MS. ERIN DANN: A publicly disclosable
8	summary of the evidence you gave in-camera was prepared, and
9	that appears on the screen before you. Have you had an
10	opportunity to review that summary?
11	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I have, yes.
12	MS. ERIN DANN: And do you have any
13	corrections, additions, or deletions, modifications to that
14	summary?
15	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: No.
16	MS. ERIN DANN: Does it accurately reflect
17	the substance of your evidence that can be made public?
18	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes.
19	MS. ERIN DANN: And do you adopt the summary
20	as part of your evidence before the Commission?
21	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I do.
22	MS. ERIN DANN: Thank you.
23	If that could be the next exhibit.
24	You're here today, Mr. Rogers, to provide
25	some evidence in respect to the Canadian Security
26	Establishment. Can you describe your history at CSE, and in
27	particular, your role there during 2019 and 2021 general
28	elections?

1	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes. I worked at the
2	Communications Security Establishment for many years,
3	starting in the early 2000s, mostly, almost exclusively in
4	the intelligence branch of the organisation. During the 2019
5	and 2021 elections, I was the Deputy Chief for the Signals
6	Intelligence Program within CSE. I later became the
7	Associate Chief of the organisation.
8	MS. ERIN DANN: And I'll just for both of
9	our sakes, I'll just remind both myself and you to if we
10	can take it slowly. We have a number of interpreters working
11	to assist us at the Commission.
12	So as a last piece of housekeeping, the CSE
13	prepared an institutional report.
14	That is CAN.DOC 5.
15	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 5:
16	Communications Security Establishment
17	(CSE) Institutional Report -
18	UNCLASSIFIED
19	MS. ERIN DANN: CSE prepared an institutional
20	report for the Commission. Have you had an opportunity to
21	review that report?
22	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I have.
23	MS. ERIN DANN: And can you confirm that CSE
24	prepared the report for the Commission and that it represents
25	CSE's evidence in relation for the Commission?
26	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes.
27	MS. ERIN DANN: Thank you very much.
28	And I'd ask that that institutional report be

T	entered into evidence, along with the French version of the
2	report, which is at CAN.DOC 6.
3	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 6:
4	Rapport institutionnel - Centre de la
5	sécurité des télécommunications
6	MS. ERIN DANN: Mr. Rogers, just before we go
7	on to talk about your role at CSE and the role of CSE in
8	relation to the matters before the Commission, I understand
9	that you're not currently working at CSE. Can you tell us
10	what your current role is and give a brief description of
11	that role?
12	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, that's correct.
13	Currently, I'm the Deputy National Security and Intelligence
14	Advisor to the Prime Minister, and the Deputy Secretary for
15	Emergency Preparedness within the Privy Council Office. In
16	that role, I support the National Security and Intelligence
17	Advisor in her duties, and Minister Sajjan in his duties with
18	respect to emergency preparedness.
19	MS. ERIN DANN: Thank you very much. At I
20	won't take you there, but at page 2 of the institutional
21	report, report indicates that CSE is Canada's national
22	cryptologic agency that collects signals intelligence or
23	SIGINT. Can you tell us what signals intelligence is?
24	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes. CSE is an
25	organisation that, as you said, collects SIGINT. SIGINT is a
26	type of intelligence collection related to the interception
27	of communications or getting information from what we call
28	the global information infrastructure. And this is you

1	know, colloquy, you can think of it as the internet, or any
2	type of interconnected device or the flow of communications
3	globally. So SIGINT for us is foreign intelligence
4	collection, and that's key, and as part of our mandate we
5	look at foreign targets outside of Canada to collect foreign
6	intelligence through SIGINT's means.
7	MS. ERIN DANN: And when you talk about that
8	foreignness element, do I understand correctly that that
9	means that you cannot direct your activities at Canadians or
10	persons in Canada?
11	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: That's correct. Under
12	our intelligence mandate, our foreign intelligence mandate,
13	we are barred from directing any activities at Canadians or
14	persons in Canada.
15	MS. ERIN DANN: The overarching mandate of
16	CSE is set out in section 15 of the CSE Act. It states that
17	CSE:
18	"is the national signals
19	intelligence agency for foreign
20	intelligence and the technical
21	authority for cyber security and
22	information assurance."
23	Is that right?
24	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: That's correct.
25	MS. ERIN DANN: And do I understand correctly
26	that foreign interference was one of CSE's intelligence
27	priorities during both the 2019 and 2021 General Elections?
28	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes. CSE's intelligence

1	priorities are set by Cabinet and by legislation. We must
2	conduct our intelligence activities in accordance with those
3	priorities. And in both General Elections, foreign
4	interference would have been captured by those priorities as
5	part of our work.
6	MS. ERIN DANN: And how does CSE define
7	"foreign interference"?
8	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: In the same way as
9	others. We accept the definition of "foreign interference"
10	that's been used here and by the service.
11	MS. ERIN DANN: I'm sorry, Mr. Rogers. Just
12	to for the sake of clarity, by "the service" you mean?
13	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Sorry. CSIS.
14	MS. ERIN DANN: CSIS.
15	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: In that we understand
16	foreign interference to be deceptive activities counter to
17	the interests of Canadians or involving a threat to
18	individuals. And CSIS has a robust definition of that.
19	I will say that in CSE's context, the precise
20	bounds of that definition matter slightly less. Our
21	activities with respect to foreign intelligence seek to
22	understand the intentions of states as they relate to Canada
23	more broadly, and so things which may not be deceptive may
24	still be of interest to us. And there is a broader
25	definition of foreign intelligence that applies when we
26	conduct our intelligence activities.
27	MS. ERIN DANN: And that sort of broader

range of activities, can you tell us what might be included

mandate?

1	in that that wouldn't be captured under the CSIS definition
2	of "foreign interference", for example?
3	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Sure. You know, for
4	instance, if we were we could seek to identify the plans
5	or intentions of a foreign state with respect to Canada that
6	could still be detrimental to the interests of Canada but may
7	not be intended to be carried out in a covert or clandestine
8	way, so it may be outside of the CSIS definition but still
9	within the definition we would use to inform the government
10	through our intelligence community.
11	MS. ERIN DANN: Thank you.
12	As I understand it, while there's one broad
13	aspect for CSE, it has or one broad mandate for CSE,
14	there's five aspects to it. I just want to go through those
15	briefly with you.
16	The first I think we've touched on, foreign
17	signals intelligence. And as I understand it, CSE collects
18	signals intelligence to determine, as you just mentioned,
19	motivations, intentions and capabilities of foreign entities.
20	Is that right?
21	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes.
22	MS. ERIN DANN: We'll return to the
23	<pre>intelligence aspect of your mandate, but or CSE's mandate,</pre>
24	but I first want to look at some of the other aspects of the
25	mandate.
26	The second is cyber security and information
27	assurance. Can you briefly describe this aspect of CSE's

1	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes. Under this aspect
2	of CSE's mandate, we can provide cyber advice, guidance and
3	services to help defend federal infrastructure, cyber
4	infrastructure, or infrastructure designated as important to
5	the Government of Canada. So this might include, you know,
6	putting defensive measures within the internet connected
7	devices of the federal government or other systems to help
8	defend them against all sorts of cyber threats, including
9	those from foreign states, but also include ransomware, crime
10	or other types of cyber threats.
11	MS. ERIN DANN: And can you describe how CSE
12	may have worked with, for example, Elections Canada during
13	the elections in 2019 and 2021 specifically in respect with
14	this regard to this aspect of CSE's mandate?
	<u>.</u>
15	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, of course.
15	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, of course.
15 16	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, of course. CSE worked very closely with Elections Canada
15 16 17	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, of course. CSE worked very closely with Elections Canada throughout the period, well before the elections began, to
15 16 17 18	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, of course. CSE worked very closely with Elections Canada throughout the period, well before the elections began, to help provide tailored advice, guidance and services
15 16 17 18 19	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, of course. CSE worked very closely with Elections Canada throughout the period, well before the elections began, to help provide tailored advice, guidance and services specifically to help defend the connected infrastructure of
15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, of course. CSE worked very closely with Elections Canada throughout the period, well before the elections began, to help provide tailored advice, guidance and services specifically to help defend the connected infrastructure of Elections Canada up to and during the federal elections.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, of course. CSE worked very closely with Elections Canada throughout the period, well before the elections began, to help provide tailored advice, guidance and services specifically to help defend the connected infrastructure of Elections Canada up to and during the federal elections. That included all sorts of cyber security services and
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, of course. CSE worked very closely with Elections Canada throughout the period, well before the elections began, to help provide tailored advice, guidance and services specifically to help defend the connected infrastructure of Elections Canada up to and during the federal elections. That included all sorts of cyber security services and advice, but it also included, you know, responding to
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, of course. CSE worked very closely with Elections Canada throughout the period, well before the elections began, to help provide tailored advice, guidance and services specifically to help defend the connected infrastructure of Elections Canada up to and during the federal elections. That included all sorts of cyber security services and advice, but it also included, you know, responding to security events during the election and around the election.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, of course. CSE worked very closely with Elections Canada throughout the period, well before the elections began, to help provide tailored advice, guidance and services specifically to help defend the connected infrastructure of Elections Canada up to and during the federal elections. That included all sorts of cyber security services and advice, but it also included, you know, responding to security events during the election and around the election. And I will say that it our work with respect to elections
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, of course. CSE worked very closely with Elections Canada throughout the period, well before the elections began, to help provide tailored advice, guidance and services specifically to help defend the connected infrastructure of Elections Canada up to and during the federal elections. That included all sorts of cyber security services and advice, but it also included, you know, responding to security events during the election and around the election. And I will say that it our work with respect to elections under the cyber security aspects of our mandate extend beyond

1	MS. ERIN DANN: And we heard some evidence
2	earlier this week about the advice that CSE provided to
3	political parties and political campaigns about cyber
4	security. Some of the evidence we heard from members of
5	political parties is that they would have liked to receive
6	more specific advice on this point.
7	Can you comment on that at all and describe
8	the type of guidance or advice you give to political parties
9	and campaigns in respect of cyber security?
10	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Certainly.
11	During the election period, as I think it was
12	mentioned earlier, CSE provided tailored briefings to
13	political parties around cyber security measures that can be
14	taken. Beyond that, we provided a hotline that any candidate
15	could call during the election should an incident occur where
16	we could help the candidate deal with those incidents.
17	We have information available tailored to
18	elections administrators, political parties and voters on the
19	website specifically tailored around elections and they lay
20	out various measures that people can take to defend
21	themselves and to help respond to an incident.
22	We remain available to consult should there
23	be anything that political parties need from us in terms of
24	tailored advice and guidance and that service is ongoing even
25	outside the course of an election.
26	MS. ERIN DANN: And how would a candidate
27	know they should call this how would they be informed
28	about this hotline or understand that they would be able to

1	contact CSE?
2	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Well, there were
3	briefings provided to the political parties at the outset of
4	those elections and during that process where that
5	information would have been relayed. It's also on our
6	website.
7	MS. ERIN DANN: Thank you.
8	And are you able to give one of the
9	witnesses we heard from thought that it would be useful to
10	have advice from CSE on specific types of software to avoid
11	or to use. They were looking for advice on particular
12	protections for Parliamentarians who are working in a hybrid
13	environment.
14	Is CSE able to give that kind of specific
15	advice about specific platforms or softwares that individuals
16	participating in democratic institutions would be better to
17	use or to avoid?
18	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I think it probably
19	depends on the specific case and the specific instance.
20	We're there to provide advice and guidance. A lot of times
21	that advice and guidance depends on the choices that need to
22	be made by the individuals using the software.
23	I know that those forums where we intended to
24	brief political parties were meant to discuss those types of
25	issues, but in general I think we can provide that kind of
26	advice.
27	MS. ERIN DANN: Right. Moving on to the next
28	aspect of CSE's mandate, active and defensive cyber

1	operations, can you describe this aspect of CSE's mandate
2	and, in particular, the difference between active and
3	defensive cyber operations?
4	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Of course.
5	Active and defensive cyber operations are
6	both aspects of CSE's mandates mandate where it can use
7	its cyber capabilities to not just collect intelligence or
8	defend, but to achieve an outcome through cyber means.
9	In the case of defensive cyber operations,
10	this might be taking action to disrupt an attack that's
11	coming in towards federal infrastructure or to systems of
12	importance to the Government of Canada. In the case of
13	active cyber operations, this might be used to for cyber
14	purposes, but maybe for non-cyber purposes, for instance, to
15	disrupt terrorist activity online.
16	MS. ERIN DANN: And does the foreignness
17	requirement that we talked about in relation to CSE's
18	intelligence gathering mandate, does that apply to cyber
19	operations as well?
20	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, it does.
21	So CSE in both of those both aspects
22	those two aspects of the mandate is required to direct those
23	activities outside of Canada, not at Canadians. And
24	specifically, also not at infrastructure within Canada.
25	MS. ERIN DANN: But a defensive cyber
26	operation, would that protect against an attack that was
27	coming domestically or is that aimed only at an attack that
28	is coming from a foreign entity?

1	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Domestic defensive
2	cyber operations can be well, there are many types of
3	defences that we might use to defend against cyber attacks,
4	and those range from normal cyber defences through to
5	defensive cyber operations.
6	CSE can disrupt cyber threats of any nature
7	regardless of their source. Defensive cyber operations are
8	intended to disrupt against foreign actors.
9	MS. ERIN DANN: Thank you for that
10	clarification.
11	I understand that defensive cyber operations
12	were planned in preparation for the elections in 2019 and
13	2021. Is that right?
14	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: That's correct.
15	MS. ERIN DANN: And were those actually
16	conducted?
17	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: No. CSE developed plans
18	for defensive cyber operations in both elections. The
19	capabilities were ready and the approvals were given and then
20	later made ready, but we did not have to use either of those
21	operations to defend networks.
22	MS. ERIN DANN: Thank you.
23	And then final aspect of the CSE mandate is
24	the assistance mandate.
25	Can you briefly describe this aspect of CSE's
26	mandate?
27	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Of course.
28	CSE's assistance mandate is the final aspect

1	of its mandate where we can provide assistance to a federal
2	law enforcement or security partner or to the Canadian Armed
3	Forces. When we operate under this aspect of our mandate, we
4	assume the authorities of the requestor, so if we are
5	operating under the request of CSIS or RCMP, or for instance,
6	the Canadian Armed Forces, we would take on the authorities
7	of those agencies and conduct a specific activity that they
8	are already authorized to undertake.
9	This comes into play when CSE has
10	capabilities or infrastructure that it uniquely has, given
11	its technical capabilities to be able to provide that
12	assistance so it doesn't have to be duplicated within those
13	other organizations.
14	MS. ERIN DANN: So you take on their
15	authorities or things they're authorized to do. Do you also
16	take on any limitations on what they are allowed to do?
17	MR. DAN ROGERS: Yes, thank you for asking.
18	Absolutely. We are acting within the authorities and
19	limitations of the requesting party.
20	MS. ERIN DANN: Thank you. Does CSE, either
21	as part of the assistance mandate or any other aspect of
22	CSE's mandate, play any role in detecting foreign
23	interference through online activity? And I'm thinking in
24	particular to address malicious online activity like
25	misinformation or disinformation campaigns.
26	MR. DAN ROGERS: All of the aspects of CSE's
27	mandate could come into play with respect to foreign
28	interference activities. You know, obviously our

1	intelligence the intelligence aspect of our mandate would
2	allow us to understand when foreign states are contemplating
3	or engaging in those activities. The cyber security and
4	information assurance mandate would allow us to, for
5	instance, for hack and leak attempts which could be used for
6	foreign interference, both active and defensive cyber
7	operations could be used to counter those types of activities
8	if coming from abroad, and the assistance mandate could be
9	used if one of our domestic partners required our assistance
10	to counter or identify foreign interference.
11	MS. ERIN DANN: I understand that in 2019,
12	CSE was asked to evaluate data collected by the RRM, the
13	Rapid Response Mechanism, in relation to potential social
14	media interference in Canadian democratic processes by a
15	foreign state. I won't bring you to it, but for your
16	benefit, this is discussed at paragraph 20 of the in-camera
17	hearing summary evidence, for the benefit of the parties.
18	Can you describe any difficulties or
19	limitations CSE faces in evaluating this type of data?
20	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes. And there are
21	probably two things I should say right away. When we
22	evaluate data of this nature, the limitations on our mandate
23	still apply. So we are looking at things that are not
24	domestic. By legislation, we're looking at foreign activity,
25	which means we can't start from a place where there are, on
26	its face, Canadians disseminating information on social media
27	and conduct an analysis. That is not foreign in nature and
28	so we would not start there.

1	When there are indications of foreignness,
2	for instance, if the RRM identifies what it believes to be
3	foreign information being posted on social media by a foreign
4	state, if they refer that to us, we might be able to use, for
5	instance, the intelligence aspect our mandate to seek to
6	corroborate or confirm the attribution or the scope and scale
7	of those activities.
8	There are still limitations on our ability to
9	do that, even when it's within our mandate. For instance,
10	the technical information available publicly around those
11	sorts of social media posts may be limited, which could limit
12	our ability correlate that information with our existing
13	intelligence holdings. And that those kinds of limits are
14	make attribution and detection fairly difficult.
15	MS. ERIN DANN: And I'm getting a reminder
16	once again for us both to slow down as best we can.
17	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Thank you.
18	MS. ERIN DANN: Turning to the 2021 election,
19	I understand that CSE was aware of allegations of a PRC
20	driven social media campaign targeting the Conservative Party
21	of Canada, specifically Erin O'Toole and Kenny Chiu.
22	Was CSE asked to evaluate data collected by
23	RRM or any other body in relation to this potential foreign
24	interference?
25	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: So that particular
26	incident related to information being shared within Canada,
27	as I recall. And so as I mentioned previously, it would fall
28	outside the scope of our mandate to look at information being

1	shared by Canadian media outlets or people in Canada, whether
2	or not that information was for any particular foreign
3	purpose.
4	MS. ERIN DANN: All right. And I know that
5	some of that activity was alleged to have occurred on WeChat,
6	which we know is a foreign owned social media entity. But do
7	I understand that because the activity, or if a user, a
8	WeChat user is within Canada, that would fall outside of
9	CSE's mandate?
10	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: That's right. Regardless
11	of the platform, if the individuals conducting the activities
12	are in Canada using these tools to share information, that
13	falls outside of our mandate.
14	MS. ERIN DANN: So if a foreign state, and
15	moving away from the specific example for a moment, but if a
16	foreign state used a proxy within Canada to conduct a
17	disinformation campaign by inauthentically amplifying
18	disinformation, CSE would not have authority to investigate
19	that type of activity?
20	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Well I should clarify.
21	We would not be able to act investigate the activity
22	occurring within Canada or done by Canadians. If a foreign
23	state you know, hypothetically if individuals within the
24	foreign state were planning or directing those activities in
25	Canada, we could look at the foreign component of that. And
26	that would be one way that our intelligence mandate could
27	confirm or refute any whether those activities were
28	foreign directed.

27

28

1	So our intelligence mandate can apply, but
2	not by looking at the Canadian elements of those
3	communications.
4	MS. ERIN DANN: Thank you. One of the
5	Commission's witnesses yesterday, MP Kwan, described her
6	experiences in interacting with various security and
7	intelligence agencies and departments. And I won't get the
8	exact quote I won't be able to quote her exactly, but said
9	something along the following, that it seemed to her that
10	everybody, all of these different agencies and departments,
11	had some of the ingredients, but they weren't necessarily
12	working together to bake the cake.
13	When you speak about the challenges of
14	detecting foreign interference through online activity and
15	attributing it to a particular foreign state, can you speak
16	at all to whether those challenges arise from not having the
17	right ingredients, in terms of the right sort of tool kit, or
18	having those ingredients spread out over various agencies?
19	Or perhaps the challenges relate to some other issue? Can
20	you comment on that?
21	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I can comment on that. I
22	think that's one of the reasons that the SITE Taskforce was
23	brought together, was because each of the various agencies
24	have a different aspect of any particular incident that they
25	can investigate. I know that the Rapid Response Mechanism
26	from Global Affairs can do the types of broader social media

analysis that is not within CSE's mandate. And as you

mentioned in the example earlier, if they identify foreign

1	components of that, then CSE can use the foreign components
2	to use its intelligence mandate to get more details.
3	And similarly, CSIS and RCMP have aspects.
4	The coordination function of SITE was
5	intended to bring those aspects of those mandates together so
6	that comprehensively, the issue can be dealt with.
7	I think I would say that, you know, that does
8	happen. The SITE Taskforce does look at these things. And
9	that it does that fairly effectively. That doesn't mean
10	there are no gaps and that doesn't mean there are no
11	challenges. But I do think that those elements come together
12	to create a broader whole for Canada.
13	MS. ERIN DANN: Thank you. I want to return
14	to the foreign signals intelligence aspect of CSE's mandate.
15	And I note I do note the time, so we'll just move through
16	this briefly.
17	But can you tell us, who are the primary
18	consumers of the intelligence collected by CSE?
19	MR. DAN ROGERS: There are consumers of our
20	intelligence across government. There are federal
21	governments and allies that consume our intelligence.
22	With respect to foreign interference,
23	certainly that includes Global Affairs Canada, CSIS, and the
24	RCMP, as you would note here. It also includes PCO,
25	including the Intelligence Assessment Secretariat, and there
26	are various clients of course.
27	MS. ERIN DANN: And can you tell us how
28	intelligence is shared? And perhaps I'll indicate my

1	understanding is that there's sort of two primary ways. One
2	is through intelligence products being uploaded to a central
3	database, and where they can be accessed by clients. And
4	then second, through client relations officers. If you could
5	speak to those two ways that the intelligence is
6	disseminated?
7	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yeah, CSE has invested in
8	fairly robust intelligence dissemination and tracking tools.
9	You've spoken to the two primary ones. There is a database
10	that is available on top secret systems to consumers of our
11	intelligence directly online. So individuals with the
12	appropriate clearance and need-to-know on accounts can access
13	that directly, consume intelligence products from us and from
14	other agencies. And that is recorded.
15	For those clients who may not want to avail
16	themselves of direct online access, for instance, ministers
17	who may not work regularly in a secure facility with those
18	accesses, we have client relations officers who work and are
19	embedded within various departments who bring packages of
20	intelligence to those people to read, and then return them.
21	Those client relations
22	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: More slowly, please.
23	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Oh, I'm so sorry. That's
24	the third time.
25	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: It's okay. It's okay.
26	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Those client relations
27	officers do track the viewer or the readership of the
28	intelligence they distribute and they typically provide the

1	intelligence as requested by the client on a periodicity
2	requested by the client. This can range from daily, and
3	weekly, and irregularly.
4	MS. ERIN DANN: You mentioned at the outset
5	of your testimony about the limitation on CSE in terms of not
6	collecting information targeted at Canadians or people in
7	Canada. Where Canadians are identified in your intelligence
8	gathering, the foreign intelligence that you do, are any
9	steps taken to protect their identities when the intelligence
10	products are disseminated to the various clients?
11	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes. In addition to not
12	being able to direct our activities at Canadians or anyone in
13	Canada, our legislation requires us to take measures to
14	protect the privacy of Canadians and people in Canada. One
15	of the most common ways we do this in our intelligence
16	reporting is by what we call "suppression of identities". So
17	if there happens to be an incidental collection of a or a
18	collection of a communication that incidentally has a
19	Canadian participant or mentions a Canadian, if that
20	intelligence is still important, relevant to international
21	affairs, defence, and security, we can still report it, but
22	as part of the report we suppress it. We will say something
23	like "Unnamed Canadian said the following:", and we take
24	measures to make sure we don't also contextually identify
25	those Canadians.
26	MS. ERIN DANN: What if the identity of those
27	Canadians is relevant to one of your partners that is
28	consuming this intelligence?

1	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: The Act accounts for
2	that, and we have the authorities to provide those identities
3	upon request to clients that can demonstrate that they have
4	that need to receive them. For instance, if CSIS or RCMP
5	received one of our reports and there is a suppressed
6	Canadian name, they can formally request that. That goes
7	through a validation to make sure that that identity can be
8	disclosed and that it is disclosed to those partners and
9	tracked.
10	MS. ERIN DANN: Thank you. And perhaps I'll
11	just take you to a specific example in 2021. I understand
12	from the summaries that we referred to earlier, that CSE
13	observed a consistent or sort of baseline amount of foreign
14	interference and malign influence activities during the
15	elections, as well as before and after the elections. But
16	the most significant piece of intelligence CSE collected in
17	relation to foreign interference and elections was collect
18	was obtained shortly after the 2021 election. Is that right?
19	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: That's correct.
20	MS. ERIN DANN: Okay. And I understand
21	you're not able to give us details about that intelligence,
22	but it involves some allegation of potential distribution of
23	funds.
24	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: That's correct.
25	MS. ERIN DANN: And can you confirm that that
26	intelligence was shared with or reported to the SITE Task
27	Force?
28	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, it was.

1	MS. ERIN DANN: And along with it was also
2	shared with the RCMP and with CSIS?
3	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes.
4	MS. ERIN DANN: And are you able to confirm
5	whether either CSIS or the RCMP took any action with respect
6	to that report?
7	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I can't confirm whether
8	they took investigative or other actions resulting from the
9	report. I do believe that we have information confirming
10	that they requested identities in that report, and that they
11	we do know that they have seen it.
12	MS. ERIN DANN: Thank you very much.
13	If I could just have a moment,
14	Madam Commissioner. Thank you, Commissioner. Those are all
15	my questions.
16	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
17	I have one question for you, Mr. Rogers. And
18	although it may be obvious to you, can you explain the reason
19	behind the restrictions imposed on CSE to collect information
20	on Canadians?
21	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Well
22	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: As far as you know, best
23	of your knowledge.
24	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes, I can. CSE has
25	fairly broad authorities, and the ability to collect
26	information. We don't have a system like CSIS does, where we
27	would go to the Federal Court and seek warrants. There is
28	mechanisms in our Act to have the intelligence commissioner

1	review ministerial authorisations, but it's a different legal
2	regime with different thresholds. And CSE, you know, is
3	careful that we don't want to convene contravene the
4	Charter or any domestic laws when we do this. And so the
5	regime is set up really with very, very firm privacy
6	protections and Charter protections for Canadians by assuring
7	that we are only looking outside of Canada for our
8	intelligence.
9	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
10	Cross-examination? First one is Mr. Choudhry
11	for Jenny Kwan.
12	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: No questions,
13	Commissioner.
14	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: No questions.
15	RCDA?
16	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS:
16 17	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Good morning, I'm Gil
17	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Good morning, I'm Gil
17 18	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Good morning, I'm Gil Sirois, counsel for the RCDA, the Russian Canadian Democratic
17 18 19	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Good morning, I'm Gil Sirois, counsel for the RCDA, the Russian Canadian Democratic Alliance.
17 18 19 20	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Good morning, I'm Gil Sirois, counsel for the RCDA, the Russian Canadian Democratic Alliance. I want to talk today about attribution of
17 18 19 20 21	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Good morning, I'm Gil Sirois, counsel for the RCDA, the Russian Canadian Democratic Alliance. I want to talk today about attribution of social media campaigns or influence campaigns that happen on
17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Good morning, I'm Gil Sirois, counsel for the RCDA, the Russian Canadian Democratic Alliance. I want to talk today about attribution of social media campaigns or influence campaigns that happen on the internet to a foreign state actor. You've explained in
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Good morning, I'm Gil Sirois, counsel for the RCDA, the Russian Canadian Democratic Alliance. I want to talk today about attribution of social media campaigns or influence campaigns that happen on the internet to a foreign state actor. You've explained in your summary, I believe, that CSE sometimes unable to
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Good morning, I'm Gil Sirois, counsel for the RCDA, the Russian Canadian Democratic Alliance. I want to talk today about attribution of social media campaigns or influence campaigns that happen on the internet to a foreign state actor. You've explained in your summary, I believe, that CSE sometimes unable to evaluate or attribute to a foreign state open source
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Good morning, I'm Gil Sirois, counsel for the RCDA, the Russian Canadian Democratic Alliance. I want to talk today about attribution of social media campaigns or influence campaigns that happen on the internet to a foreign state actor. You've explained in your summary, I believe, that CSE sometimes unable to evaluate or attribute to a foreign state open source information collected by the RRM. What did you mean by that?

1	Canadian focussed or they may have insufficient details for
2	us to conclude that they are directed by a foreign state. So
3	the difference between, you know, RRM identifying inauthentic
4	accounts and amplification of a certain narrative towards can
5	we confirm that a foreign state directed that, CSE's
5	intelligence would work by looking at the foreign end of that
7	and seeking to identify whether we can confirm why those
3	activities occurred.

So we might look at a foreign state's intelligence apparatus and see if we can find out whether or not that foreign state is directing that sort of activity, but we have intelligence gaps, and we don't know everything, so we would seek to do that. And we can also provide technical assistance to the RRM to help to identify those, but sometimes that can fall outside of our mandate.

MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: And what sort of indications would lead the CSE to believe that there was a foreign state actor involved in a disinformation campaign online?

MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Certainly one of the clearest indications for us might be if we collect intelligence or communications of the foreign state officials themselves speaking about their intention to do those activities, or the manner in which they are conducting those activities. So we may have intelligence of foreign officials in a foreign country discussing their intentions or their capabilities with respect to conducting disinformation campaigns.

1	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: So that that's
2	probably the easy solution is if you intercept something.
3	But is it true that, especially with a foreign state
4	developing more and more complex and developed ways at
5	promoting these influence campaigns, is it true that it
6	becomes more and more difficult to intercept such a
7	communication for instance?
8	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I would never say that
9	signals intelligence is an easy business. It's very complex
10	and it's becoming increasingly technical. So yes, that is
11	certainly a concern. We have a very technical and very
12	capable workforce at CSE, and we you know, it's our job to
13	keep ahead of that technical curve, but there are always
14	challenges and there are always things that we will find
15	challenging in that work.
16	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Okay. And also,
17	setting aside the challenges of intercepting a SIGINT in
18	itself, I've heard reports of foreign influence being more
19	and more domestic in Canada, and I understand that this is
20	not part of the CSE's mandate. Is it something that you've
21	known or that you've witnessed that foreign influence
22	campaigns may become more domestic?
23	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes. And I will try and
24	clarify a little. In with respect to our foreign
25	intelligence mandate, it is what we've discussed. There is a
26	lot that CSE does try to do to counter mis and disinformation
27	campaigns, even though it may be domestic.
28	So for instance, we work to provide

1	information to Canadians, and we work with the broader
2	Government of Canada to put out information on how to
3	identify mis and disinformation. This could be coming from a
4	foreign state, but it might be also, you know, something that
5	Canadians could use to detect any sort of mis and
6	disinformation within Canada through cyber means.
7	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Okay. And just to
8	give a concrete example. We've heard reports of Russia
9	friend accounts amplifying a specific political party during
10	the 2021 election. Can we be certain that this is not
11	this cannot be attributed to Russia?
12	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I think the strongest
13	thing I can say is that we did not conclude that there were a
14	broad born based campaign to conduct that activity.
15	Intelligence has gaps, so I can't tell you certainly one way
16	or another, but I can say that based on the intelligence that
17	CSE had, we did not see that.
18	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: But was it possible
19	that this influence campaign was, not directed necessary, but
20	originated from Russia or was influenced by Russia?
21	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I can't rule it out.
22	Certainly, CSE is limited in giving advice and information to
23	the intelligence holdings that it has and what it identifies
24	under our mandate, and so I can't really speak to anything
25	more than that.
26	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Okay, so it's still an
27	open question whether Russia was behind this disinformation.

MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I will say that CSE does

provide information to the government and various clients on 1 what we do know about foreign states' intentions and 2 activities, and sometimes that includes providing information 3 on the level of priority or the level of intent that a 4 foreign state has towards Canada. But I would say in this 5 6 case, you know, we have seen that Canada is a lower priority target for certain foreign states. But your question remains 7 and I think I can say that we just don't have any information 8 to conclude that it was a Russian campaign. 9 MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: So just to ask my 10 question again: It remains an open question. 11 MR. DANIEL ROGERS: CSE can't answer that 12 13 question. MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: My last question will 14 be do you believe that Russia had the intent and capability 15 to amplify divisive content or content related to a political 16 party during the final weeks leading up to the 44th general 17 election? 18 19 MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I think what we have said in our public reporting around the elections was that a lot 20 21 of foreign states, including Russia, have the capability to 22 do that. I think that we were less certain on the intent. And what we said was should any foreign state have the 23 intent, they have -- should a number of foreign states have 24 the intent, that they do have the capability. 25 MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: So the real question 26 is about the intent of the Russian intent. 27

MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Right. We've -- we have

1	not revealed any intelligence in these summaries that would
2	speak to the Russian intent. We do agree that they have the
3	capability.
4	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Thank you. Merci.
5	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
6	UCC?
7	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER:
8	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Good morning, my name
9	is Leslie Schumacher, and I am here representing the
10	Ukrainian Canadian Congress. I just have a few questions.
11	Was the CSE aware of Russia engaging in any
12	foreign interference in Canada during the 2019 and 2021
13	general elections?
14	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: We didn't conclude that
15	there were any foreign state backed disinformation campaigns
16	from Russia during those elections.
17	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: I understand about
18	disinformation campaigns, but I wonder if you can speak more
19	broadly about whether there was any foreign interference in
20	any aspect of the elections.
21	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Oh, I see. Well, I think
22	what we've said is that CSE does identify general foreign
23	interference activities of a number of foreign states,
24	including China, Russia, and others. We didn't see those
25	activities, you know what we have said here is that we
26	didn't see any disinformation activities coming from Russia,
27	and I think that's the extent of what I can say. Everything
28	that we have that we can say from our intelligence is in the

1	summaries.
2	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Right. And I guess
3	if you could speak to whether Russian interference was a
4	concern of the CSE at the time of either election.
5	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: But we are concerned, and
6	certainly even in advance of the elections we were clear in
7	our public reports on cyber threats to democratic
8	institutions that we were concerned with Russia, China, Iran,
9	and other actors. And so we did use the tools available to
10	us to be mindful and vigilant about that during the course of
11	the elections.
12	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: And so there was
13	this was something that the CSE was actively looking into
14	during this time?
15	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes.
16	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Can you speak to any
17	steps that the CSE takes to counteract Russian interference
18	-
	specifically?
19	
19 20	specifically?
	specifically? MR. DANIEL ROGERS: There are a few things I
20	specifically? MR. DANIEL ROGERS: There are a few things I can speak to. So one of them is obviously our foreign
20 21	specifically? MR. DANIEL ROGERS: There are a few things I can speak to. So one of them is obviously our foreign intelligence mandate, where we would look to identify
20 21 22	specifically? MR. DANIEL ROGERS: There are a few things I can speak to. So one of them is obviously our foreign intelligence mandate, where we would look to identify intelligence relating to those activities. And within
20212223	specifically? MR. DANIEL ROGERS: There are a few things I can speak to. So one of them is obviously our foreign intelligence mandate, where we would look to identify intelligence relating to those activities. And within Canada, we could share with agencies who could take action in
2021222324	specifically? MR. DANIEL ROGERS: There are a few things I can speak to. So one of them is obviously our foreign intelligence mandate, where we would look to identify intelligence relating to those activities. And within Canada, we could share with agencies who could take action in Canada to disrupt any threat that we identified.
202122232425	specifically? MR. DANIEL ROGERS: There are a few things I can speak to. So one of them is obviously our foreign intelligence mandate, where we would look to identify intelligence relating to those activities. And within Canada, we could share with agencies who could take action in Canada to disrupt any threat that we identified. We also, obviously, take action to defend our

1	something that we are constantly vigilant in defending
2	against, and that's something that we did during the course
3	of the elections also.
4	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: And just my final
5	question is just while you took these steps during the
6	election, there was no conclusion or evidence that Russia was
7	interfering in either election?
8	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Right. Certainly with
9	respect to cyber activity we didn't see any compromise of
10	election infrastructure during the elections. You know, that
11	said, we defend against all sorts of threats during the
12	election. We don't attribute all of them. There are many,
13	many defensive actions that we take during the course, but
14	none were successful in that case, and that's what I can say.
15	MS. LESLIE SCHUMACHER: Thank you very much.
16	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Thank you.
17	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
18	The Human Rights Coalition.
19	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. HANNAH TAYLOR:
20	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Good afternoon,
21	Mr. Rogers. I understand that there's a process that allows
22	the public to report cyber incidents, including those related
23	to potential election interference, online to the Canadian
24	Centre for Cyber Security. And that's an entity that's under
25	the umbrella or connected to the CSE; correct?
26	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: That's correct. Yes.
27	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Are confidentiality
28	protections provided to complainants through this process?

1	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes. Certainly, we keep
2	that information confidential.
3	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Okay. Can you tell me
4	more about those protections?
5	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Specifically, I know that
6	we take great strides to make sure that confidentiality
7	arrangements are in place with those disclosing information
8	to us. I think that it would probably depend on the nature
9	of the conversation and the event and the degree to which the
10	cyber centre would be included.
11	For instance, when we provide are you
12	speaking to the public specifically or
13	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: The public, yes.
14	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yeah. I think, you know,
15	the public will often will report those events, and the
16	nature of those events would determine the scope of
17	confidentiality and protections.
18	MR. MATTHEW FERGUSON: Pardon the
19	interruption. Getting another request. Thank you.
20	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Is the online reporting
21	tool available in languages besides English and French?
22	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: To my knowledge, it's
23	only available in English and French.
24	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Would that be valuable to
25	expand it to other languages?
26	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: It's something we could
27	consider.
28	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: IF CSE receives a

1	complaint and decides it does not merit any further
2	investigation from your agency are reasons provided to the
3	complainant?
4	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I think, again, it would
5	depend on the nature of the report. CSE also provides
6	advice, even before information is provided to the cyber
7	centre, when complainants go to report, to say things like if
8	this is something where we can see harm or a crime is
9	committed, it is better to refer it to the police. And there
10	are other venues that CSE tries to use to make sure that the
11	right mechanism is used when reporting an incident.
12	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: I understand that the CSE
13	provides educational materials to the public in a variety of
14	ways, including
15	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes.
16	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: with you sharing
17	unclassified threat assessments, sharing information to help
18	Canadians identify disinformation, and through the creation
19	of a dedicated webpage on cyber threats to elections. You've
20	referred to these materials I think
21	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Yes.
22	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: this morning. Is
22	
23	this information available in languages besides English and
24	this information available in languages besides English and French?
24	French?
24 25	French? MR. DANIEL ROGERS: It seems to me that we

1	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Okay. If they are not,
2	do you think it would be valuable that they would be?
3	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I think that would be
4	something we could look into, yeah.
5	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: If you become aware that
6	a device belonging to a number of a targeted member of the
7	public, a targeted diaspora community member has been hacked
8	by a foreign government agent or proxy, do you inform the
9	person who has been hacked and help them secure their device?
10	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: That would, again, depend
11	on the nature of the event. And I would just call attention
12	to the fact that different agencies have roles and
13	responsibilities within Canada that go beyond what CSE does.
14	So if there is some threat activity occurring with Canada, it
15	may be that the better place or organisation to deal with
16	that is the RCMP or CSIS. Which is why we work very closely
17	together when appropriate to make sure that if we identify
18	things like that, and let's say through our foreign
19	intelligence mandate we identify that there was potential
20	compromise in Canada, that information might be shared with
21	RCMP and CSIS to help address the issue rather than CSE
22	specifically.
23	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: And it's mentioned in
24	it's mentioned in one of your witness summaries, it's WIT 33,
25	but we don't have to pull it up necessarily, that
26	transnational repression would be captured by the CSE's
27	collection mandate. Can you tell us more about what exactly
28	in relation to transnational repression would be captured

referred.

28

within your mandate? 1 MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Of course. As I 2 3 mentioned earlier, we seek to identify the intentions, capabilities, and plans of foreign states, and specifically, 4 that could include their intentions toward Canada or 5 Canadians. If we identify activities, foreign interference 6 7 activities by a foreign state, for instance, around transnational repression, we could think about police 8 stations and kind of things like that, from China, these are 9 things that CSE can help to reveal through its foreign 10 intelligence collection and may be useful to agencies in 11 Canada like CSIS or RCMP. 12 13 MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: And you mentioned --14 turning back to when you talk about limitations of CSE's 15 mandate how a certain complaint might come in and another agency might be better suited to assist that person, I heard 16 you talk about potentially referring that person to that 17 agency. Is that correct? 18 19 MR. DANIEL ROGERS: It depends on the nature of the conversation, I think. What I would -- I think what I 20 was trying to refer to earlier is should we detect something 21 22 through our foreign intelligence mandate, we may refer that. Certainly, though, it may be the case that another agency is 23 better placed to assist an individual in Canada given the 24 25 nature of our mandate. And if that were to happen, I think we would have to have that conversation about who was best 26 placed to help and whether that information should be 27

1	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: And would that same kind
2	of referral, that same connecting somebody to or, I suppose,
3	transferring that file or that work to another agency, would
4	if a complaint came in from the public and within that
5	complaint it became evident it's outside of the mandate of
6	the CSE, would you then refer that complainant to another
7	agency who could support them?
8	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: That's possible, yes.
9	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Do you know if it
10	happens?
11	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: I suspect it has, but I
12	can't think of a specific incident.
13	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
14	Rogers.
15	MR. DANIEL ROGERS: Thank you.
16	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
17	Any questions from AG?
18	MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: No questions,
19	Commissioner.
20	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Re-examination?
21	MS. ERIN DANN: No, thank you.
22	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: We are just on time
23	today, so we'll come back at 2:10.
24	THE REGISTRAR: Order please.
25	This hearing is now in recess until 2:00.
26	We'll be back from recess at 2:10.
27	Upon recessing at 12:49 p.m.
28	Upon resuming at 2:23 p.m.

1	THE REGISTRAR: Order please.
2	This sitting of the Foreign Interference
3	Commission is back in session.
4	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: [No interpretation]
5	Ms. Chaudhury, you're conducting the
6	examination, this afternoon?
7	MS. SHANTONA CHAUDHURY: No, I'm not.
8	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: No, you're right, it's
9	Mr. Cameron.
10	MS. SHANTONA CHAUDHURY: No, I'm off duty.
11	Mr. Cameron's conducting the examination, but before the
12	examinations begin, Commissioner, we're just going to read
13	into the record the list of topical summaries that have been
14	produced at the Commission at to the Commission by the
15	Government of Canada, and that may be referenced in upcoming
16	examinations.
17	So I'll just ask the Clerk to have that list
18	ready, and to pull up the documents as I mention them.
19	I won't repeat the very long list of caveats
20	applicable to these summaries, but I will repeat that they
21	must be read in light of those limitations.
22	So a few of them have already been entered
23	into evidence, the rest are coming now. We'll start from the
24	beginning: CAN.SUM.1, Don Valley North Liberal Party
25	Nomination Race in 2019.
26	There we go, that one's already in evidence.
27	Thank you.
28	CAN.SUM.2, Intelligence Relating to Han Dong

a	nd Communication with PRC Officials Regarding the Two
M	ichaels. CAN.SUM.3, PRC Officials Foreign Interference
A	ctivities in Greater Vancouver in the 2019 General Election.
C	AN.SUM.4, Possible PRC Foreign Interference-Related Mis or
D.	isinformation.
	And Mr. Clerk, if you can just scroll through
t]	he document briefly as I do this, that would be helpful.
T]	hank you.
	CAN.SUM.5, Country Summary: People's Republic
0	f China. CAN.SUM.6: Country Summary: Russia. CAN.SUM.7,
С	ountry Summary: India. CAN.SUM.8, Country Summary:
P	akistan. CAN.SUM.9, Country Summary: Kingdom of Saudi
A:	rabia. CAN.SUM.10, PRC - Threat Actors, Contact with
C	andidates and Staff, and Funding of Threat Actors.
C	AN.SUM.11, [TRM] Threat Reduction Measure Conducted in 2019.
C	AN.SUM.12, Government of India Foreign Interference
А	ctivities in the 2021 General Election. CAN.SUM.13 we're
a.	lmost done, I promise Comments by Individual PRC
0	fficials on Expressed Partisan Preferences in the 2019 and
2	021 General Elections.
	Finally, CAN.SUM 14. It's Country Summary:
I	ran.
	And as I said, these can now be referenced in
u	pcoming examinations.
_	EXHIBIT No. CAN.SUM 1:
	Don Valley North (DVN) Liberal Party
	Nomination Race in 2019

--- EXHIBIT No. CAN.SUM 2:

ENGLISH INTERPRETATION 113

1		Intelligence Relating to Han Dong and
2		Communication with People's Republic
3		of China Officials Regarding the "Two
4		Michaels"
5 <u> EXHIBIT No</u>	. CAN.SUM	<u> 3:</u>
6		People's Republic of China Officials
7		- Foreign Interference Activities in
8		Greater Vancouver in the 2019 General
9		Election
10 <u> EXHIBIT No</u>	. CAN.SUM	· 4 :
11		Possible People's Republic of China
12		Foreign Interference-Related Mis or
13		Disinformation
14 <u> EXHIBIT No</u>	. CAN.SUM	<u>5:</u>
15		Country Summary: People's Republic of
16		China
17 <u> EXHIBIT No</u>	. CAN.SUM	<u>6:</u>
18		Country Summary: Russia
19 <u> EXHIBIT No</u>	. CAN.SUM	. 7 :
20		Country Summary: India
21 <u> EXHIBIT No</u>	. CAN.SUM	· 8:
22		Country Summary: Pakistan
23 <u> EXHIBIT No</u>	. CAN.SUM	· 9:
24		Country Summary: Kingdom of Saudi
25		Arabia
26 <u> EXHIBIT No</u>	. CAN.SUM	10:
27		People's Republic of China - Threat
28		Actors, Contact with Candidates and

1	Staff, and Funding of Threat Actors
2	EXHIBIT No. CAN.SUM 11:
3	Threat Reduction Measure Conducted in
4	2019
5	EXHIBIT No. CAN.SUM 12:
6	Government of India Foreign
7	Interference Activities in the 2021
8	General Election
9	EXHIBIT No. CAN.SUM 13:
10	Comments by Individual People's
11	Republic of China Officials on
12	Expressed Partisan Preferences in the
13	2019 and 2021 General Election
14	EXHIBIT No. CAN.SUM 14:
15	Country Summary: Iran
16	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Good afternoon, Madam
17	Commissioner.
18	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Good afternoon.
19	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Gordon Cameron.
20	Commission counsel. I will be conducting the examination of
21	this panel this afternoon with MR. MacKay. We will divide it
22	up between us, but I will begin by introducing the panel and
23	having them sworn.
24	THE REGISTRAR: Ms. Tessier, would you like
25	to be sworn or affirmed?
26	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Affirmed, please.
27	THE REGISTRAR: Okay. May I please have your
28	name, and spell your last name for the record?

1	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Certainly. C'est
2	Michelle Tessier. M-I-C-H-E-L-L-E T-E-S-S-I-E-R.
3	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER, Affirmed:
4	THE REGISTRAR: Thank you very much.
5	Mr. Vigneault, may we please have your first
6	name and spell your last again for the record?
7	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: David Vigneault. V-I-
8	G-N-E-A-U-L-T.
9	THE REGISTRAR: Okay. And did you want to be
10	sworn or affirmed?
11	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Affirmed, please.
12	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT, Affirmed:
13	THE REGISTRAR: Thank you very much.
14	And now your turn, Ms. Henderson. Would you
15	like to be sworn or affirmed?
16	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Affirmed.
17	THE REGISTRAR: Affirmed. Okay. May I
18	please have your full name, and your last name spelled out
19	for the record, please?
20	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Cherie Henderson. H-
21	E-N-D-E-R-S-O-N.
22	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON, Affirmed:
23	THE REGISTRAR: Thank you.
24	Counsel, you may proceed.
25	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY MR. GORDON CAMERON:
26	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you.
27	Panel, I'll begin with some housekeeping, and
28	then I'll let MR. MacKay take over for some of the questions.

1	But if I could ask you first to just answer a
2	few questions for me about the Institutional Report that the
3	Service filed with the Commission?
4	For the record, and for the assistance of
5	counsel and parties, the document has the number CANDOC many
6	zeros 17 in English and CAN.DOC many zeros 18 for the French
7	version. And then there are three appendices that go along
8	with that again, 17.01, 02, 03 and 18.01, 02, 03.
9	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 17:
10	Canadian Security Intelligence
11	Service (CSIS) Institutional Report -
12	unclassified
13	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 17.001:
14	Appendix B2 to CSIS Institutional
15	Report - 2021 CSIS Public Report
16	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 17.002:
17	Appendix D to CSIS Institutional
18	Report - Briefings Related to the
19	Threat or Incidence of Foreign
20	Interference in Canadian Democratic
21	Institutions since 2019 01 01
22	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 17.003:
23	Appendix G to CSIS Institutional
24	Report - Overview of Foreign
25	Interference Threat Reduction
26	Measures 2019 - Present
27	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 18:
28	Rapport Institutionnel du Service

1	Canadien du Renseignement de Sécurité
2	(SCRS) - non classifié
3	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 18.001:
4	Annexe B2 du Rapport Institutionnel
5	du SCRS - Rapport public du SCRS 2021
6	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 18.002:
7	Annexe D du Rapport Institutionnel du
8	SCRS - Séances d'information sur
9	l'ingérence étrangère et sur ses
10	répercussions sur les institutions
11	démocratiques du Canada depuis le 1er
12	janvier 2019
13	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 18.003:
14	Annexe G du Rapport Institutionnel du
15	SCRS - Aperçu des mesures de
16	réduction de la menace prises contre
17	l'ingérence étrangère de 2019 à
18	aujourd'hui
19	MR. GORDON CAMERON: And Mr. Vigneault, I'll
20	ask you if you can confirm that that Institutional Report was
21	prepared for the Commission and represents part of the
22	Service's evidence before the Commission?
23	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yes, it was.
24	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you.
25	I'll just mention for the benefit of parties
26	that the appendices that I just mentioned are specifically
27	drafted for disclosure to the public and that the body of the
28	Institutional Report refers to other appendices that have not

1	been filed because there's no public version of them, just to
2	avoid confusion on that.
3	Now, panel, we have two sets of documents
4	that I'm going to try to do at the same time with you. So
5	I'll just describe them globally and then ask you a few
6	questions about them.
7	One is, you three, the same three of you,
8	were interviewed by Commission counsel on February 13 th ,
9	2024. And you were also examined in-camera by the Commission
10	at a hearing shortly after that. And public summaries have
11	been prepared in respect of both that interview and your in-
12	camera evidence.
13	Have you reviewed these documents for the
14	purposes of accuracy?
15	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Yes.
16	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: I did.
17	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Yes.
18	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you. And do you
19	have any corrections that you would like to make to these
20	documents?
21	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Not from me.
22	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: No.
23	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: No.
24	MR. GORDON CAMERON: I'm just going to pause
25	a second and see if I can get counsel for the Attorney
26	General's attention, because we had wondered if there might
27	be a correction to one of the statements in the in-camera
28	examination summary?

1	MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: I believe there was, Mr.
2	Cameron. We discussed that before we resumed here. I'm not
3	sure which the paragraph is.
4	MR. GORDON CAMERON: If you look at paragraph
5	18,
6	MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: Yes.
7	MR. GORDON CAMERON: it might remind the
8	witnesses
9	MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: That's correct.
10	MR. GORDON CAMERON: of the point?
11	MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: That's correct.
12	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Mr. Vigneault, maybe if
13	you could look at paragraph 18 and tell us if you have a
14	correction to make to the summary of your in-camera evidence?
15	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yeah.
16	MR. GORDON CAMERON: And perhaps the Court
17	Officer could pull it up? It is WIT 48.
18	EXHIBIT No. WIT 48:
19	In Camera Examination Summary: Mr.
20	David Vigneault, Ms. Michelle
21	Tessier, Ms. Cherie Henderson
22	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: I believe it concerns
23	the timing of a TRM.
23 24	the timing of a TRM. MR. GORDON CAMERON: And if the Court Officer
24	MR. GORDON CAMERON: And if the Court Officer
24 25	MR. GORDON CAMERON: And if the Court Officer could scroll to paragraph 18 of that document?

1	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Ah, there we go.
2	MR. GORDON CAMERON: On this document, there
3	are some.
4	And, Mr. Vigneault, looking at that
5	paragraph, are you reminded as to whether or not you want to
6	make a correction to the information there?
7	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yes. Madam
8	Commissioner, paragraph 18 reads:
9	"Mr. Vigneault explained that a TRM
10	was conducted during the 2019
11	election"
12	And in discussion with counsel earlier, to be
13	more precise, the TRM was conducted prior to 2019 and some of
14	the intelligence and some of the outcome of this of course
15	took place during the election. But to be more precise, the
16	TRM was conducted prior to the election.
17	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you for that
18	correction.
19	And with that correction made, panelists, and
20	with respect to both the summary of your interview and the
21	summary of your in-camera evidence, do you adopt those
22	documents as part of your evidence before the Commission
23	today?
24	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Yes.
25	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: I do.
26	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Yes.
27	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you.
28	And just an explanatory note before I hand

1	over the microphone to MR. MacKay.
2	There are two other documents, Madam
3	Commissioner, that got filed representing the information of
4	CSIS representatives who will not be appearing as witnesses,
5	but I'll just mention them for the record. WIT 35 is an
6	interview summary of a CSIS ADR Directorate and WIT 43 is a
7	summary of the in-camera evidence in that regard. Thank you.
8	EXHIBIT No. WIT 35:
9	Public Summary of Classified
10	Interview of: Canadian Security
11	Intelligence ADR Directorate
12	Witnesses
13	EXHIBIT No. WIT 43:
14	In Camera Examination Summary: A
15	Branch within the CSIS ADR
16	Directorate
17	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY:
18	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY:in French to
19	our witnesses this afternoon. Of course, they are free to
20	answer in the language of their choice.
21	So we will start with general presentations,
22	so I will invite the panelists to introduce themselves and
23	explain the role that they play and that they have played
24	within CSIS before their departure.
25	So Mr. Vigneault, you may start.
26	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: David Vigneault. I am
27	head of the Centre since 2017 of CSIS, so my position as head
28	comprised general administration of the service,

27

28

1	responsibility for the services activities as well as the
2	main spokesperson for external relations with Canadians and
3	abroad.
4	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: Madam Tessier?
5	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Yes, hello.
6	I retired from CSIS in March last year, but I
7	worked for CSIS for 35 years as an intelligence officer. And
8	I ended up in the role of Deputy Head of Operations in
9	charge, essentially, of management and governance of the
10	service's operations, so central administration, regional
11	offices, security screening, et cetera. And I replaced the
12	head when he was absent.
13	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: Madam Henderson.
14	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: I joined the service
15	in 1992 as an intelligence officer and I have been
16	responsible for various investigations within the
17	organization in management and leadership roles. I was the
18	Director General of the Intelligence Assessment Branch and my
19	final position was the Assistant Director of Requirements. I
20	recently retired from the Service.
21	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY:report from
2122	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY:report from CSIS that details the mandate and the powers of CSIS.
22	CSIS that details the mandate and the powers of CSIS.

intelligence service of Canada. We have as a mandate to

collect information, to produce intelligence and to inform

the government as regards any national security threats that

are described in the CSIS Act.

We also have the mandate to take measures to reduce threats when it is possible to do so. The way we work is obviously we use our mandate as to acquire secrets and to be able to share these governments with the government, so we use different means of obtaining information.

We work with technical source information.

We recruit human sources and we work with partners in Canada and abroad. We have over 300 relations with intelligence agencies abroad so that we can acquire as much information as possible so as to have the best point of view as possible.

And all that work is done by CSIS professionals and that means that Canadians are safe every day in Canada and abroad.

I should maybe mention that we have a hybrid mandate in the sense that many countries have two intelligence agencies to do that work. Canada has one agency, CSIS, that operates here in Canada as well as throughout the world.

We have agents deployed in a permanent manner or temporary manner so that we can ensure we get the right intelligence and take the right actions to protect Canadians in Canada or abroad.

MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: And of course, I should have mentioned at the departure, but if one or the other of the witnesses wants to add to an answer, please don't hesitate. I should have mentioned that from the start.

So Mr. Vigneault, I will ask our clerk to pull up document CAN.DOC 18, please.

1	This is the institutional report in the
2	French version. And I would ask you to scroll down.
3	Thank you. Scroll down a little bit more.
4	Thank you.
5	This morning, we heard two representatives of
6	Global Affairs Canada who discussed the definition of foreign
7	interference as regards foreign influence. And we know that
8	in Article 2 of the CSIS Act the threats to Canada's security
9	are defined.
10	So I would like you to explain what this
11	notion of threat towards Canada is compared to the influence
12	the activities of influence from abroad.
13	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: If you allow me, I
14	will answer.
15	It is indicated here under the activities
16	influenced by foreign actors. That's the word that was used
17	in the definition. I will underline it dates from 1984, so
18	it is not recent that the service has the mandate of
19	investigating on this type of threat.
20	I would like to underline also that we have
21	to meet certain criteria, so it has to be clandestine. We're
22	trying to hide the involvement of a foreign state actor. It
23	has to involve a foreign power. And it has to be against
24	Canada's interests. It can also include threats to its
25	communities.
26	So it's important to identify these criteria
27	properly so that the service can identify the activity as
28	being we call it foreign interference now even if the Act

in the Act.

1	talks of influence. But on layman's terms, we talk of
2	foreign interference.
3	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: And Mrs. Tessier, you
4	say it includes threats such as coercion to people that are
5	on the Canadian territory.
6	Should I understand that, at that moment,
7	automatically it meets that criteria of being against
8	Canada's interests?
9	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Yes. The aim is to
10	protect Canadian citizens, Canadian residents and Canada's
11	interests.
12	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: Simply on this
13	notion of Canadian interests, can you explain more how this
14	idea of interest is understood by CSIS?
15	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Well, obviously, the
16	Act defines the threats, but if I take, for example, the
17	pandemic or if, for example, I look at the "Freedom Convoy"
18	and everything that happened around the impact on the
19	Canadian economy, of course, it concerns Canada's interests.
20	But it isn't strictly defined in the CSIS Act.
21	So the service evolves in its activities. We
22	could say it's espionage, it's maybe foreign interference,
23	and it's the way we manage it. But I would say that it's
24	often broader than what we find strictly defined in the Act.
25	But for sure, CSIS has to link it to a
26	threat, of course. But that's why when I talk of Canada's
27	interests, it might be a bit broader than the words we find

1	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Commissioner, if you
2	allow me to add to what Ms. Tessier mentioned, it's important
3	to understand CSIS activities, including in the notion of
4	Canada's interests in the context of intelligence priorities
5	for Canada.
6	The Canadian government, the Cabinet decides
7	of intelligence priorities and those priorities are given to
8	us through a department directive through Public Safety. And
9	as Ms. Tessier mentioned, even if national interests are not
10	defined in the Act, with the interpretation of the Act and
11	the interpretation of these departmental directives when it
12	comes to intelligence priorities, it gives us a context, a
13	very clear context, so that we can then implement
14	operationally the work and the ways we can manage the threat.
15	So it's important to understand this with the
16	full context to be able to understand how the Act operates.
17	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: And we understand
18	that foreign interference includes democratic processes and
19	institutions, but can you explain in general how CSIS works
20	to protect democratic institutions and processes in Canada?
21	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Absolutely.
22	When we look at foreign interference, the way
23	we see it is that we look at what the interests of a foreign
24	power interfering here in Canada. So once we understand the
25	interest, the intention and the capacity of the foreign state
26	trying to interfere in Canada, it gives us an idea of what
27	will be the vectors of interference.
28	The summaries that were produced earlier

127

1	demonstrate that some countries commit interference for
2	different reasons and other countries, such as, for example,
3	the PRC, commit interference in every way.
4	So the democratic institutions that are
5	broader than simply elections at the federal level, it
6	includes democratic institutions at every level of
7	government, so federal, provincial, territorial, so all the
8	governance of Indigenous affairs in Canada. Those are
9	vectors of foreign interference or ways for foreign powers to
10	interfere in our democratic system.
11	There's another important aspect of foreign
12	interference that wasn't discussed as much publicly over the
13	last few months, but it is foreign interference towards
14	individuals. It's often what we talk of when we talk of
15	transnational repression. So by meeting the criteria of the
16	CSIS Act, they are committing activities towards these
17	individuals to favour the interests of that foreign power.
18	So we can come back to those later during
19	your questions, but I think there is a lot of context here
20	and the best way for us to understand that is to understand
21	what are the interests of that foreign power and to see how
22	they will be using all the means they have to commit
23	interference in Canada.
24	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: So in the
25	institutional report and if we consult the Act, we can see
26	that also we see that CSIS has certain powers that can be
27	carried out with or without legal authorization, judicial

authorization. And I'd like to hear you about one of these

28

1	tools that exists for CSIS and these are the threat reduction
2	measures, threat reduction measures that are at Article 12.1
3	of the CSIS Act.
4	And I would like to ask the clerk to bring up
5	CAN.DOC 18.3, please.
6	So my question is general, but still in the
7	context of foreign interference.
8	I'd like you to explain what these threat
9	reduction measures are, and the document here is simply as a
10	visual aid. But I'd like to have a general explanation from
11	one of you.
12	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Yes, I will answer the
13	question.
14	As indicated in the document, since 2015 CSIS
15	has this tool, this mandate. And to differentiate it with
16	the main mandate of the service, that is, to collect
17	intelligence, to analyze and to distribute intelligence, it
18	is really measures to reduce the threat, to stop the treat,
19	if possible, but to reduce it.
20	And there's a lot of evolution. In 2019,
21	following a law from 2017, there were changes in the ${\it CSIS}$ ${\it Act}$
22	to put more parameters on the constraints, the measures that
23	we cannot undertake such as create injuries or detain
24	individuals, such things. And this explains when the service
25	needs a mandate, under which conditions it needs to get a
26	warrant so as to undertake these threat reduction measures.

So the aim was really to enable the service

to have this tool of fighting the threat without it going

1	strictly into the collection, analysis or exchange of
2	intelligence.
3	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: And when you say
4	that at some moments the measure has to be authorized in a
5	judicial manner, why is that warrant required in some
6	circumstances?
7	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Well, we always have
8	to respect the Charter.
9	If there are certain measures that require to
10	limit some individual's rights under the Charter, we need a
11	warrant from the Federal Court. And if it could violate one
12	of Canada's Acts.
13	But even without judicial authority so as to
14	undertake a measure, I'd like to underline here that we have
15	to have reasonable reasons, and those are the same reasons
16	for the service to go get a warrant under the article
17	under Article 12.
18	So it's still a high threshold to meet to
19	enable the service to undertake these threat reduction
20	measures.
21	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: And we see in
22	Annex J (sic) that on the screen the notion of
23	proportionality. And it also is in the institutional report,
24	the notion of risk is itemized. And it's associated to the
25	TRMs.
26	Can you explain to us the concept of
27	proportionality and risk reduction related to these measures?

MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Yes, absolutely.

1	So it has to be proportional the reduction
2	measure has to be proportional to the threat.
3	So first of all, the activities in other
4	words, the activities that we undertake must be able to
5	reduce the threat and we have to be able to assess it short
6	term, midterm and long term. And we want the measures to be
7	proportional. They mustn't be too broad and the Act also
8	asks us to work with other partners.
9	For example, if there's a criminal
10	investigation, then we can't hinder the investigation, an
11	ongoing criminal investigation, so we have to make sure that
12	no other government entity is taking measures that we could,
13	in fact, be weakening or compromising before we undertake our
14	own.
15	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: So you don't have any
16	police powers.
17	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: [No interpretation]
18	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: So the RCMP has police
19	powers. So if you can't answer my question, let me know,
20	even if it's me that's asking it, but just so that everybody
21	can understand.
22	When you talk about a measure, a TRM, or
23	threat reduction measure, can you give us an idea, not
24	necessarily a concrete example, but explain to us what are we
25	talking. Give us an example.
26	
20	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Yes, of course.
27	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Yes, of course. I can give you some examples. I am limited

So let's -- we can divide it into three

categories. So dissuasion is the first category. So this

involves disseminating information.

So a candidate in an election campaign, if we disclose classified information, we can disclose classified information on an individual to reduce the threat. When it comes to exploitation, then we work with a third party so they have the means to reduce the threat. So not a third party in government who can exchange information freely, but within the government.

So I'll give you an example. There has to be somebody outside the government. If there's an organization that -- this is hypothetical, but we have an association, for example, that organizes an event and they've invited conference speakers. And we have information that there are foreign interests at work that are trying to introduce an individual and fund him who's going to manipulate the conference for his own ends -- his or her own ends. And we will inform that association in that case so that they might change the program or cancel the engagement of the said speaker.

The third category is a bit more difficult to explain. But it's when the service uses its own means to reduce the measures.

So supposing there's a disinformation campaign and the service decides to reduce the message or countervail it. We have means at our disposal to do that just to give you an idea of what we can do in the face of

1	foreign interference.
2	And there are four pillars in the concept of
3	risk. There's an operational risk that the service will
4	assess on its own and then there's also legal or judicial
5	risks and so we work with the Justice Department.
6	There are reputational risks, reputation of
7	the government, for example. And so we'll work with Public
8	Safety.
9	And we also work in cooperation with the
10	Public Security Department and also the risk to our
11	international relationships.
12	And I'm trying to slow down and I'm aware
13	that I'm speaking very quickly.
14	So that and Global Affairs, who's the
15	prime interlocuter, and all depending of the level of the
16	risk, then we will seek out approvals for the measures.
17	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: And so these
18	approvals, do these measures have to be approved by higher
19	instances within the service?
20	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Yes. It has to be
21	approved by the Director and the Minister. For average
22	medium risk, it has to be has to be a senior official
23	within the service. And minor risk is just a first line
24	manager.
25	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: Let's look at
26	document 2919, please.
27	EXHIBIT No. CAN 2919:
28	Memo to the Minister: Update on

1	threat to democratic institutions
2	threat reduction measures - foreign
3	interference activities
4	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: It's a memorandum
5	from it's a memo from the director to the Minister.
6	I'll ask the clerk to scroll down.
7	So we understand, Mr. Vigneault, that this
8	document has been partially redacted. In general, can you
9	give us a bit of context as to the nature of this document?
10	When would this kind of memorandum be sent?
11	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Mr. Clerk, can you come
12	up to the top of the document, please?
13	So in this case, Madam Commissioner, as Madam
14	Tessier mentioned, when we do a risk assessment, when the
15	risk is high then the corresponding threat reduction measure
16	has to be approved at higher levels, so it's not sufficient
17	to just inform the Minister, but also to get his approval
18	before we proceed.
19	So in this case, if we look at this memo, it
20	says "for information". So without having read all of the
21	content of the memo, I can explain the process.
22	So I will inform the Minister that we are
23	contemplating taking a measure and we may not require his
24	authorization if the risk is not high, and this is the case,
25	and we present the details of the situation of the operation
26	to the Minister and we describe the threat and what the
27	countervailing measures will be.
28	We'll also outline the results and the risks

24

25

	In-Ch (MacKay)
1	to the four pillars, and so this is my way of informing the
2	Minister of what we are contemplating.
3	Once again, this measure is in compliance
4	with the Act and so we're not asking the Minister to
5	necessarily authorize, but we are informing the Minister of
6	what we are doing. And in this way, the Minister can
7	therefore discuss whatever issues arise with myself or my
8	colleagues. And that's why this information process exists.
9	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Can the Minister say, "I
10	don't agree"?
11	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yes, absolutely.
12	There is of course, our authority is a
13	delegated authority from the Minister, so the Minister does
14	retain the possibility of expressing his disagreement.
15	Now, it's never happened. Not since the last
16	seven years, anyway. But it is theoretically possible for
17	the Minister to disagree.
18	Generally, we try to avoid surprises, so we
19	do have conversations with the political office of the
20	Minister and the Public Safety personnel so that when the
21	memo lands, there is no surprise because everybody has been
22	more or less apprised of the situation and they are then

134

MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Nothing outside of the directive -- Ministerial directives.

power to direct you.

and everybody's always receptive to this kind of discussion.

COMMISSIONER HOGUE: So they don't have the

28 MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: So to summarize, the

1	TRM must be sent to the surveillance committee, the national
2	committee, and to the Minister. So in general, in the annual
3	report of the service that we send to the Minister, there is
4	a list of all the measures that were invoked during that
5	year.

6 MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: And all of these
7 measures are reviewed systematically.

8 MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: So we can remove 9 this document from the screen.

And I do want to leave a bit of time to my colleague, Mr. Cameron, so I'm going to ask you to quickly explain to us the role that plays CSIS in the intelligence community in Canada and also, as a corollary, what is the relationship between CSIS and the Prime Minister's National Security Advisor?

MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: So thank you for the question. We work extremely closely with what we would call the security and intelligence community in Canada and we have very close relationships with all of our partners. We work very hard to appreciate and understand the intelligence requirements of the government and, in that vein, we also work very hard to make sure that we're responding to those requirements so that we are appropriately collecting and disseminating the required information.

MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: ...little bit on the point, the relationship between the NSIA and CSIS, I've had the opportunity before I was appointed Director of working for five years as a secretary to the Cabinet in the area of

intelligence, so I worked in close cooperation with people

who have been the -- previously were the National Security

3 Advisor to the Prime Minister.

So there is a daily communication between the CSIS and the Prime Minister's Advisor and there's -- there are also daily communications between various members of our office. And at my level as Director I think I can say that I have many times a week conversations and weekly meetings with the NSIA and we talk very frequently, even late at night, early in the morning, weekends included because, of course, the national security space in Canada is a very complex one and so we maintain very close ties.

And is there anything else I should add?

MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: You want to talk

about your own experience?

MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Yeah, absolutely.

So I had the opportunity, actually, to work within PCO. I was the Chief of Staff to the National Security Intelligence Advisor, Daniel Jean, at the time.

It became very apparent of the importance of excellent communication between PCO and ourselves within the service just to start to educate on what the service was, who we were and what we could bring to the table to support the ongoing need to advise government in regards to helping them in their decision-making and also advise government in regards to the threat that we were seeing. From the service's perspective, our job is to sniff the environment and figure out where the threats are coming from and then to

1	be able to advise and inform government on those threats and
2	to continue to build those pictures, so it was fundamentally
3	important to increase that relationship and continue to build
4	that level of trust and appreciation between ourselves, PCO
5	and I would also add into that the rest of the national
6	security community.
7	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: So as to the way
8	CSIS is structured on the national level, there's a central
9	office in Ottawa and there are other offices elsewhere in the
10	country.
11	Can you explain to me the broad lines of this
12	structure and the relationship between the regional offices
13	and the head office?
14	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Yes. Well, I can
15	answer that question.
16	So in effect, there is three sub-directors.
17	I'll talk about the Operational Deputy Director, which is my
18	role.
19	So at the central office at headquarters, we
20	are managing operational programs. So we see what the
21	priorities of the government are in matters of intelligence
22	and we translate those into operational requirements. So
23	this is what's done at the head office level, and so head
24	office deals with cases. We also do analysis. We have
25	expert analysts that look at the broad picture, produce the
26	documentation that is then sent back to our client
27	departments.

So that is the role of the head office. And

1	also to priorize (sic) investigations and determine what the
2	priorities are.
3	Now, we have regional offices in all the
4	provinces except one province, none in the territories, but
5	nevertheless, we do have people that travel and that look
6	after the whole country. And we also have offices in other
7	countries abroad.
8	So we have Paris, Washington and London. We
9	do not divulge the existence of other offices.
10	And so we do have a global network and we
11	have a Deputy Director that's responsible for all of the
12	regional offices.
13	And we have the Directorate of Advanced Data
14	Analysis and we also have a centre for operational security,
15	risk assessment, threat assessment. That is under operations
16	management.
17	So we have analysis, operations, all of that
18	is under the aegis of the Director of Operations.
19	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: So in the
20	interview summary, we talk about the perspective of the head
21	office and the perspective of the regional office and the
22	perspective that the regional office can bring to the head
23	office.
24	Can you enlighten us as to or develop on
25	that?
26	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Well, in any agency

different perspectives. It's only natural. And of course,

138

regional offices are -- pardon me -- are experts on site, so -- and head office has a global vision because they deal with foreign intelligence services and so they have a broader picture and they see what's happening not only within Canada, but also abroad.

So the head office is concerned with strategy, whereas the regional offices are more concerned with technical approaches. So the regional offices do not make decisions as to the allotment of resources. They will decide how they're going to deal with a particular request or need which means are they going to use. That's a decision that is up to the regional office.

Of course, some regional offices think that their investigation is more important than some other regions, but I think it's very healthy to have a compilation of various perspectives because it gives us a richer picture and produces a richer discussion.

MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Perhaps I could just add one part to this. It's also very important to realize that our headquarters is also plugged into the government and appreciates what the priorities of the government are of the day, and so it's through headquarters and that liaison with making sure we're responding to the priorities of the government that we can also then send out the appropriate intelligence requirements to the regions. And that can also create a little bit of attention, but as Michelle noted, it's a healthy tension that is normal in an organization to different perspectives, but help to move the organization

27

28

1	forward and do appropriate collection.
2	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY:that CSIS
3	produces in the context of its activities, so I'm going to
4	ask you a question a general question on the kinds of
5	products, but I'll ask you to answer the following question.
6	How do you decide which products are going to
7	be distributed and who they're going to be given to and how
8	they will be
9	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Okay. So as I noted,
10	the service works also very closely with the PCO in order to
11	understand and appreciate the intelligence priorities of the
12	government. We play into that decision-making process.
13	Once we have an appreciation of what those
14	intelligence priorities are, we are able to send that tasking
15	out to the region into what the service can collect under its
16	mandate in regards to the priorities of the government. Once
17	that is done and the region is collecting the information, we
18	can review the information coming in to determine which
19	government department would see value in receiving that
20	reporting.
21	There are different types of reports that are
22	disseminated. One is just the basic intelligence report, raw
23	intelligence, which allows the user to determine how that
24	intelligence can support what they are doing. We also do a
25	stronger, but smaller, analytical piece where we will pull

There is good communication among the S&I

various pieces together to start to create the intelligence

picture and then we will produce in-depth assessments.

28

1	community and through the process of setting intelligence
2	priorities, the service also gets an appreciation of which
3	government department wants which type of information and we
4	will then appropriately disseminate that.
5	We also try to get feedback back from the
6	various departments to make sure that we're actually meeting
7	their intelligence requirements. That's an ongoing process
8	that we're working on improving constantly, but that feedback
9	fits very well into trying to make sure that we're hitting
10	the intelligence priorities of the government as well as
11	those departments.
12	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY:classification
13	of a document of an information can have an impact on the
14	distribution of the document in question?
14 15	distribution of the document in question? MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Yes. Yes, it can.
15	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Yes. Yes, it can.
15 16	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Yes. Yes, it can. We always when we do disseminate our
15 16 17	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Yes. Yes, it can. We always when we do disseminate our reports and our intelligence, we want to make sure that we've
15 16 17 18	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Yes. Yes, it can. We always when we do disseminate our reports and our intelligence, we want to make sure that we've got as much of the picture as we have and so we make we do
15 16 17 18 19	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Yes. Yes, it can. We always when we do disseminate our reports and our intelligence, we want to make sure that we've got as much of the picture as we have and so we make we do sorry. I'm going to just back up a minute a moment
15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Yes. Yes, it can. We always when we do disseminate our reports and our intelligence, we want to make sure that we've got as much of the picture as we have and so we make we do sorry. I'm going to just back up a minute a moment there.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Yes. Yes, it can. We always when we do disseminate our reports and our intelligence, we want to make sure that we've got as much of the picture as we have and so we make we do sorry. I'm going to just back up a minute a moment there. When we draft an analytical piece, we pull
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Yes. Yes, it can. We always when we do disseminate our reports and our intelligence, we want to make sure that we've got as much of the picture as we have and so we make we do sorry. I'm going to just back up a minute a moment there. When we draft an analytical piece, we pull all the pieces together of intelligence. Some is from a
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Yes. Yes, it can. We always when we do disseminate our reports and our intelligence, we want to make sure that we've got as much of the picture as we have and so we make we do sorry. I'm going to just back up a minute a moment there. When we draft an analytical piece, we pull all the pieces together of intelligence. Some is from a corroborated source, some may be from a news source, but we

Then what we do is we determine who needs to

see that report. In some cases, based on the sensitivity of

1	the information, how it's collected and the methodologies, we
2	need to protect those sources and so we will make what we
3	could call a bigot list of informations that can of
4	information or individuals that can actually see that
5	reporting and we will disseminate that reporting to those
6	particular individuals on a named distribution list.
7	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: When you're
8	disseminating information within the government-to-government
9	clients, do you have any expectations in terms of feedback
10	from the clients who receive this information? Does the
11	service have any expectations in terms of feedback?
12	Lorsque vous disséminez du renseignement au sein du
13	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Yes. We work very
14	hard with other government departments to get feedback.
15	We have, actually, in the last couple of
16	years created an ADM a much more communicative ADM team
17	that can actually discuss the various reports to make sure
18	that, one, we're not only getting feedback on the report, but
19	if we determine that there's information in there that is
20	actionable, which government department could action that
21	potentially under their mandate and how that could be done.
22	So there is very good cooperation amongst the
23	S&I community, the security and intelligence community, at
24	the ADM and DG and working levels. We have very good
25	communication on that front.
26	Feedback is fundamentally important, as it
27	makes sure that we are allocating our resources in the right

way. If we determine that there is a particular piece of

142

1	information that needs to get instant or very quick, urgent
2	action or attention, we will actually not just disseminate
3	that through an electronic means, but we will make sure we
4	brief that verbally and get the appropriate parties engaged
5	on that piece of information.
6	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Mr. MacKay, if I can
7	just add very quickly, feedback is also fundamental for
8	reason of making sure that the intelligence doesn't live on
9	its own. We're producing intelligence because we want to
10	help someone to take an action and to be better informed, and
11	so that feedback is critical for CSIS to make sure as my
12	colleague just mentioned, make sure that we're meeting those
13	requirements but, you know, inform as to customers will also
14	have information that when they pass that on to us, it
15	enriches the picture.
16	And when you look at the goal or the intent
17	of intelligence, which it is to inform and allow for actions
18	to be taken, it's when you have the best picture possible
19	that is, you know, hopefully you'll make the best possible
20	decisions. So that's why it's another reason why feedback
21	is critical.
22	MR. JEAN-PHILIPPE MacKAY: Thank you.
23	I will let my colleague, Mr. Cameron, take
24	over from me.
25	(SHORT PAUSE)
26	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY MR. GORDON CAMERON (cont'd):
27	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you, panelists.
28	I'd like to begin by directing a question

26

27

28

information.

1	that I think is specific to Mr. Vigheault because it has to
2	do with your decision as Director of the service over the
3	years of your term to decide to either engage or, as the case
4	might be, re-engage the public on the topic of foreign
5	interference because, in general, the operations of the
6	service aren't necessarily secret but we now see foreign
7	interference part of the public discussion. And I'd like to
8	have your perspective on the occasion or at least the era in
9	which you decided it was time to become public about.
10	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner,
11	that's a very important question, and I touched upon this in
12	my first appearance for Part B of the Inquiry.
13	And CSIS is an institution that has been
14	created by law to have secrets and to keep secrets, but that
15	doesn't mean that, you know, we are not part of we don't
16	have something that we need to tell Canadians and that the
17	transparency is essential in a democracy.
18	The threat environment has evolved
19	significantly over the last number of years. Learned
20	scholars and analysts of the national security have said
21	they've never seen such a complex threat environment, and
22	that includes the Cold War. And so when you look at this
23	environment, there is something in the in a democracy that
24	intelligence service can and should be engaging with

COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Just tell me when you said the last years ---

Canadians in terms of transparency of some of the

MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: I would say that ---1 **COMMISSIONER HOGUE:** --- what do you mean? 2 3 Are you talking about 20 years or are you talking about 2, 3, 4 years? 4 5 MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: So I would say that 6 there is a -- there are a couple of moments. 9/11 has been a 7 moment, a pivotal point in terms of international terrorism and the way that terrorist groups could use their means to 8 inflict casualties and terror, not only in foreign countries, 9 but also, in our own countries. And Canada has not been 10 immune to terrorism. So that was one moment. And the 11 terrorism has evolved over the last few years, five, seven, 12 13 eight years, where we also see not just a religiously 14 motivated extremism, but the ideologically motivated 15 extremism. So people who are looking at -- are motivated by genophobia, antisemitism, Islamophobia, to essentially use 16 violence and engage in active terror in our country, and we 17 have, unfortunately, too many recent cases in our country. 18 And the most recent cases have been Canadians -- Muslim 19 Canadians who have been killed in our country by IMV actors, 20 ideologically actors. So terrorism has evolved. 21 22 The other significant evolution has been the international order is changing. So we have Russia and the 23 PRC, People's Republic of China, who are challenging the 24 international order even more so in the last 5, 7, 10 years. 25 We see it through incursions. We see it, of course, in 26 Ukraine, where Russia is engaging in illegal invasion. We 27

see it in the South China Sea where the People's Republic of

145

China is redrawing international Maritime borders for their own benefits, despite very clear international law rulings on this. We see it in terms of how they are coercing a number of other countries. So great power politics is that, you know, we have not seen or not seen as much in the last number of -- last 20 years or so, but we see a resurgence of Russia, China, a number of other countries challenging the international order. And so that environment is getting more and more complex.

The last thing I would say in the threat environment, Madam Commissioner, to answer your question, is the evolution of technology. We see it through how technology is a force of good in many ways in terms of societal goods, economic prosperity. But, of course, like anything else, we have actors who are using the advancement of technology for their own purposes. So Canada now has to protect itself against threats from new weapons systems, from Russia over the Arctic, for example. We have to use, you know, what the benefits of social media and of Internet of Things and the ability of communications systems to be part of our society is also leverage, and in the specific case of foreign interference, for nefarious purposes here.

So this is the backdrop, Mr. Cameron, to the reason why in 2018 made the first public speech as director to engage Canadians and share some of our perspective of this threat environment. And in that speech in 2018 specifically mentioned foreign interference as one of the most significant threat Canada was facing. And over the years, we have

1	continued to engage publicly through our annual reports,
2	speeches, but also, by reallocating resources internally and
3	creating an engagement, a stakeholder engagement branch
4	within CSIS to go out and meet with non-traditional partners,
5	and very importantly, meet with diaspora communities because
6	they're, unfortunately, one of the most significant target of
7	foreign interference.
8	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you for that.
9	And, Mr. Vigneault, your organization produces an annual
10	<pre>public report; correct?</pre>
11	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yes.
12	MR. GORDON CAMERON: And one of the
13	documents, and this is just for the assistance of parties and
14	those following along, this is in the database as 17001, you
15	the service filed a cluster of your public reports for
16	2019, 2020, 2021 and some other reports. I just want to take
17	you briefly through the evolution of the Service's public
18	pronouncements on foreign interference. And I don't know if
19	you've got if, Court Officer, could you just scroll down a
20	bit and tell us which one you've got there? No? Okay.
21	Perhaps you could call up COM 54.
22	EXHIBIT No. COM 54:
23	CSIS Public Report 2019
24	MR. GORDON CAMERON: I mention that just
25	because it's the 2019 report or, sorry, the 2020 report
26	2019 report published in 2020 and it's by itself. It's not
27	in the cluster of documents at 17.01. COM 54. All right.

And if you could go to page 17 of that report? Now that --

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

scroll to the bottom, just so we can see if the page number -

148

2 - yeah, you see the -- go to 17 of the document, please.

Thank you. Okay. And back up.

So here we see in your 2019 public report the Service's attention to the topic here under the heading "Protecting Democratic Institutions". We have a couple of paragraphs on what ends up being a discussion of -- in terminology we might now refer to more directly as foreign interference. And this followed on -- this appearance in the Service's public report followed on your 2018 speech. And I take it this was part of the ark of alerting the public to this element of the threat?

MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Absolutely. We -- you see the Service trying to put more and more specific details in our annual reports. This one in 2020, what was an example of that progression. We also, since then, produced other reports in collaboration with our partners within the government to try to alert Canadians in an organized way about foreign interference. And so I believe it was in 2020 or 2021 we published a report called Foreign Interference in Democratic Institutions, which was very specifically tailored to the democratic processes. And we have also -- because as I mentioned, one of the main targets of foreign interference are Canadian diaspora, and so what we -- or diaspora in Canada. And so what we have done is produce a document called "Foreign Interference and You", specifically tailored to diaspora in Canada and publish in the seven languages to try to engage directly with people who would be the victims

1	of transnational repression and foreign interference.
2	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you. Well, you've
3	covered off a few of my coming questions, but just if I can
4	put this in an arc of progress over time, would I be correct
5	in observing that from your initial speech in 2018 through
6	the 2019 public report on to your 2020 public report and then
7	your publication in the summer of 2021 of this report we're
8	going to come to specific about foreign interference and then
9	onwards, the Service is becoming more detailed and more
10	expansive in describing to Canadians a threat of foreign
11	interference?
12	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Absolutely. This is
13	what we internally, and I've said it I think publicly a few
14	times, but this is what we call the sunshine policy on
15	foreign interference.
16	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Okay. Now on that
17	point, in particular about the Service's attention to the
18	impact of foreign interference on diaspora groups, you
19	mentioned the document. And, Court Operator, perhaps, again,
20	because it's easier to find it in COM 322 than buried in the
21	middle of 17.01. There is the report you just described, Mr.
22	Vigneault.
23	EXHIBIT No. COM 322:
24	Foreign Interference Threats to
25	Canada's Democratic Process
26	MR. GORDON CAMERON: And if you could just
27	again, you describe this as a topic specific report. I think
28	it's 17 or 20 pages, but it goes into the whole report is

1	focussed, as I understand from the title not just on foreign
2	interference, but specifically foreign interference in
3	relation to democratic processes.
4	So at this point, what is motivating the
5	Service to put this much of its resources into alerting the
6	public to this threat?
7	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: I would say it's two-
8	fold, Madam Commissioner. First, it's because, again, the
9	nature of the threat. We have seen, because of
10	globalization, the technology, the ability of foreign
11	interference to be to increase in speed, impact, and reach
12	within Canadian society. So that's one of the things, the
13	evolution of the threat.
14	But also very importantly, this is at the
15	time where the community, CSIS working with all of our
16	partners in collaboration, realizing that more needed to be
17	done, and this is contemporary to approaches like the
18	creation of the SITE Taskforce, the panel that the Government
19	created to supervise elections, learning from the experiences
20	that we saw in other jurisdictions where there was
21	interference in their electoral democratic processes, and
22	essentially CSIS, in this specific case, our partners at the
23	Communications Security Establishment also reproduced a
24	similar reporter in terms of the on the cyberworld,
25	interference in the cyberworld.
26	And this is very much, you know, an
27	individual contribution, but very much as part of the all of
28	government approach to try to engage on foreign interference

1	and better educate Canadians about foreign interference.
2	MR. GORDON CAMPBELL: Thank you.
3	And perhaps the Court Operator could scroll
4	down to page 8 of the document? Thank you.
5	Now, this the heading of this section is
6	"Canadian Public and Voters". Just have a quick look at
7	that, Mr. Vigneault.
8	And please, Madam Tessier and Ms. Henderson,
9	if you want to add here.
10	But in particular, you've mentioned, Mr.
11	Vigneault, that the Service was alert to the impact of
12	foreign interference, or as it might arise in this context,
13	more accurately called transnational repression with respect
14	to diaspora groups. And that ends up occupying a couple of
15	pages of this particular report. Can you look at that
16	section there
17	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yeah.
18	MR. GORDON CAMERON: and explain how the
19	Service views the interrelationship of foreign interference
20	as it manifests in transnational repression and the
21	importance of educating the public?
22	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yes. And this is a
23	very important point, Madam Commissioner. The mandate of
24	CSIS is very clear. So we have to produce intelligence and
25	have an impact writ large to protect all Canadians. And here
26	what we see in the context of foreign interference is we see
27	foreign countries trying to have a negative impact on

Canada's institutions, but also very specifically having an

4	2
	 _

1	impact and trying to control or influence the members of
2	diaspora in Canada.
3	So the home country, if I can put it this
4	way, trying to control what people are engaging in in terms
5	of their democratic activities, controlling what they're
6	saying, who they're engaging with, and in this specific case
7	in democratic institutions, also trying to influence,
8	covertly, so foreign interference, the way they may vote.
9	And so this is why it's important that, you
10	know, we see the work that we do and all of our partners do
11	to protect all Canadians. And we are very specifically aware
12	the way that, you know, diaspora communities in Canada are
13	being impacted.
14	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Okay. And if the Court
15	Officer could pull up CAN.SUM5?
16	We can get a bit more specific. This
17	document, if I've got the right number, will be the Country
18	Summary for the People's Republic of China. There is a page
19	of caveats.
20	And if we can scroll down to the first page
21	of substance?
22	I just because acronyms end up getting
23	used in this document, I'll just ask you to you've already
24	defined for us PRC. I think that's an initialism we're now
25	familiar with.
26	The third full paragraph makes reference to
27	the Chinese Communist Party and the CCP as it's called there,
28	and then in the last paragraph on this page, the United Front

1	Work Department.
2	So I'm going to ask you to flesh this out a
3	little bit, the role of those entities. But can you just
4	describe for us, if you look over can you scroll over to
5	the next page, please? Thank you.
6	Under "WHO" there's an entire indeed, the
7	whole section of this topical summary on the PRC as a country
8	being covered in this summary, this whole section is about
9	the Service's description of its interests in transnational
10	repression.
11	And so the question I have, the documents we
12	were looking at so far, your annual or public reports, your
13	report on foreign interference, were about foreign
14	interference and possibly transnational repression generally
15	speaking.
16	Can you tell us here in particular how the
17	Service views the issue of transnational repression as it
18	relates to the PRC, the People's Republic of China?
19	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, I
20	would take us back to one thing I said a few minutes ago,
21	which is, for us to better understand and have an impact on
22	foreign interference, we want to understand what are the
23	objectives and the interests of the foreign state who is
24	engaging in that activity.
25	In this specific case, the People's Republic
26	of China, the country is governed and is dominated by the
27	Chinese Communist Party. And the key element here is that
28	you can look to the prism of the actions of the Chinese

1	Communist Party, and therefore the People's Republic of
2	China, into one very specific issue, which is everything that
3	is organized by the Party and by the State is to preserve
4	l'emprise, to preserve the power of the Chinese Communist
5	Party and its purinity (sic) over time.

And so when you understand that and then you translate that into what is happening in Canada at the moment, this is why you will see in this document the reference to the Five Poisons. The Five Poisons are teams and issues that people who have objection to what is happening in China are raising. Issues like, you know, liberty of religion or thought with the Falun Gong, issues of protection of minority rights, the Uyghurs and the Tibetans, issues related to pro-democracy movements.

And so when you look at these issues, you know, so the people who are here in Canada, protected by the Charter, protected by our laws, are exercising their democratic rights to engage in a specific way and, you know, manifest their views, understanding where China's interest is, which is the preservation of the Chinese Communist Party's l'emprise. You can understand how anything that would be seen as a threat to this -- to the Chinese Communist Party is being dealt with very harshly.

And this is why, for example, we have seen over the last number of years in the PRC, five, six years, legislation, very, very transparent legislation that are directed at making sure that every person in China, or any entity in China, or abroad, are subjected to these laws and

have the obligation to support the Government, including
their Intelligence Service, the Ministry of State Security,
the MSS, in order to accomplish their task.

So that direct and implied threat, that if you are not supporting -- even if you're here in Canada, in Ottawa, or you're in the -- you're in Paris, or you're in Trois-Rivières, you will be subjected, you know. The arm of the PRC can touch you directly or indirectly in a way, but people understand, you know, they have this element of coercion on top of them.

That coercion translates into things that, you know, may be done to you in Canada, loss of opportunity, loss of access, denial of visas for to go back to see your family members back in the PRC, threats to you here, but also threats to your families, your loved ones back in China.

So that ecosystem, starting from the Party, translating into the actions of the State, and now they're reaching out anywhere around the world to try to control what is happening with the Chinese population is what this specific paragraph is about.

There are other elements of foreign interference we can touch upon, but specifically this paragraph, I think, is the ---

MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: So if I can just add a couple of things? First of all, foreign interference is not new. It's something that we've been looking at for a long time, I would say even before the 1990s. It's been around a long time.

What we have seen in the last few years is a real increase as the geopolitical environment has shifted and we have seen some of the nations become much more powerful in their own right and their desire to influence further beyond their borders. So we've been watching this.

There are many individuals who have come to Canada and are Canadian citizens that have fled those repressive regimes in order to come here, and now what we are seeing is they are being coerced, forced, repressed within our borders. And so the service is there to work with those communities as well, to collect intelligence and information, to help protect all Canadians.

And what we have seen over the past few years, as I said, is an increase in that effort to have that negative influence and impact and coerce those individuals who have come here to live in our -- under our values and freedoms in order to report and support their originating countries' beliefs. So it's something that we are very, very alive to.

MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you.

And I'll switch gears now and ask you just very briefly, Mr. Vigneault, because we have panels appear -- SITE panels and others that deal with the intelligence that comes out of your organization, but I just want you to just get us ready for tomorrow and those panels by describing your conception of the SITE Task Force and how CSIS relates to it.

MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: So I mentioned, Madam Commissioner, earlier that we have seen what has happened in

2

4

5

6

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

other	countri	es	since	2016,	2018	and	different	jurisdictions
where	we saw	for	eian -	interf	erence	in -	democratio	c processes

3 essentially have impacts. And so when we were getting ready

157

for the election in 2019, we're trying to understand what

would be the right lessons to draw from from what we knew

working with our intelligence partners around the world. And

7 so my colleague, Chief of Communication Security

8 Establishment, the National Security Intelligence Advisor at

9 the time and myself determined that we needed to find a way

10 to bring the information together to make sure that there was

11 a clearinghouse of the intelligence and the information that

would be able to have that in real time to make sure that we

did not have silos of information while the election was

under way.

And that was the genesis of the SITE Task

Force, was this recognition that we needed to do things

differently because the threat was different and the impact

on our elections, you know, was so important. And so that's

the genesis of the SITE Task Force.

And it's -- I'll let my colleagues from the Privy Council Office elaborate, but it's the same thought process that, you know, led to the creation of the panel as well, was the realization that the threat was different, the way it could have an impact on our electoral process was more direct, more imminent, and we needed to organize ourselves differently. And so that's why the SITE Task Force.

MR. GORDON CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

And we'll get ---

1	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: I have a question
2	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Sorry. Please.
3	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: for Mr. Vigneault.
4	I think it was you, Madam Henderson or
5	Madam Tessier, I will address you and somebody else can add
6	to what you're going to say.
7	An expertise, which is very important to you
8	within CSIS to collect information, to analyze it and inform
9	the government, those are the essential tasks or the reason
10	for your existence, is basically to inform the government, be
11	it in terms of SITE or other people within departments. They
12	don't necessary have the same experience as people within
13	CSIS.
14	We also know that there are often changes,
15	particularly within the government, with regard to who is in
16	what position.
17	Up to now, the experience that you have,
18	which is fairly broad, does that give you the impression that
19	there's a veritable dialogue or what is communicated by CSIS
20	is understood by those within government and vice versa? In
21	other words, do the two sides speak the same language when
22	you are communicating information, be it from SITE or be it
23	from people within the public service or political persons?
24	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: That's an absolutely
25	fundamental question, Madam Commissioner.
26	A few thoughts that I can share with you.
27	What we are experiencing now in 2024 I think we're in a
28	better position than we were in 2017, 2018. We've seen the

evolution of that understanding.

The growth is carried out not only within us, within CSIS and our other partners, but truly understanding the needs of the government, the language and all of that in order to be able to be more relevant with our information and also to ensure that the information arrives at the right time so we have had growth and I can say that there's been growth as well with our partners in the understanding of what is foreign interference.

The discussions that we had in 2019 are no longer the same discussions that we're having today so there's been that change. And that growth has taken place on both sides, I would say.

We understand better how our information is received and how it can be used, the limits of what we know, but also from our partners who understand better how to pay attention to what we say and make sure that they ask questions on the information that is shared. And also, one of the important things that we've seen with the lessons learned, if you will, the last two, three years, a change in governance as well so the right people are in the right positions and speaking with the right intelligence.

It can be -- seem quite simple to say that here, but in an environment where the demand outstrips the ability of organizations to find the right space with the right people to be able to discuss very delicate and complex matters such as foreign interference, it took a change in governance and the discussions are very tight.

28

1	We've had questions and it's a very dynamic
2	environment, and more and more the question is not
3	necessarily knowing actually seeing the difference between
4	whether the information is correct or not, but it's, rather,
5	a matter of saying what do we do with that information, what
6	are the actions that will be taken.
7	Some actions will be for us to take, to go
8	and obtain more information, more intelligence, but a
9	concrete example that I can give you as well which is in the
10	sphere of foreign interference and spy activities is work
11	done on the <i>Investment Act</i> in Canada.
12	If you see the evolution of what's known
13	publicly and the way that work is done internally, you can
14	see that information has a more important impact than it had
15	in the past because people speak to each other better. Once
16	again, we have the right governance and the way in which
17	national interests of Canada can be at risk are better
18	understood by everybody. Therefore, the actions that need to
19	be taken are more concrete.
20	Therefore, it's an evolution. I can say that
21	some of us have more white hair because of the work that had
22	to be done within that context, but the changes, I think, are
23	moving us in the right direction.
24	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER:change within the
25	service. Before 2019, all that was analysis had nothing
26	to do with us in operations. It was seen as something apart.

And when I became the Assistant Director for

Operations, we discussed but we said we need to have a better

way of integrating our knowledge as experts, including within
the service, and operations.

Before that, we used a lot of information officers who gave presentations or met with other departments of the government and now we've amalgamated analysis and operations together in order to better respond to the requirements in terms of intelligence, but also our analysts now, who are experts, who are really the face of the service because they have a strategic vision. They're brilliant. And the people in information are also brilliant, but they're focused on operations — but in order to try to better share their knowledge with clients, with the people who receive our information.

And when SITE was created -- I'm taking a step back here, but when SITE was created, it was also to look at the mandates of all of these agencies and see who's best placed to respond to the threat. Is it the RCMP, is it Global Affairs, is it CSIS n order to better understand the role of each player in terms of foreign interference -- or when it comes to foreign interference.

MR. GORDON CAMERON: Panelists, in the interest of time, I'm going to take you to two specific topics and try to be efficient by directing you to the documents so that you can... These are topics on which your in-camera evidence you've already spoken, so I'm going to take you to those sections.

But if we could first, Mr. Court Operator, pull up CAN 4728, just briefly.

1	EXHIBIT No. CAN 4728:
2	Foreign Interference in the 2019
3	Federal Campaign of Dong Han - CNSB
4	23/19
5	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Okay. Just a few
6	questions about this. And panelists, you spoke about this
7	document. This is a CSIS national security brief, with the
8	heading Foreign Interference In The 2019 Federal Campaign of
9	Dong Han.
10	And if you could now, Court Operator, pull up
11	WIT 48, where and if you can go to page 5 of that
12	document, or in particular, paragraph 15.
13	This document, Madam Commissioner, is the
14	public summary of the in-camera appearance of these same
15	three witnesses.
16	And panelists, at paragraph 15, you see your
17	discussion of this document, and particular, these
18	circumstances in which it was recalled. And so using so
19	that you don't have to repeat yourself and so that you are
20	guided by what you have already decided can be publicly said
21	about this in these words, can you give the Commissioner just
22	an overview of the history of this document and why it ended
23	up being discussed in the your in-camera evidence?
24	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Absolutely.
25	So Madam Commissioner, as we said, you know,
26	one of the intelligence requirements that we have was to
27	report to government about on intelligence related to
28	foreign interference, and so specifically, we have were

1	running intelligence operations and we are collecting
2	information and working with partners to have the best
3	possible understanding.
4	This report was a classified report based on
5	different pieces of information that the Service had
6	collected over time, and it was meant to inform the
7	government that we had detected a number of things happening
8	in the riding of Don Valley North, and we wanted to inform
9	the government of those of that information.
10	And so as my colleague explained earlier, so
11	sometimes we have the intelligence reports, so raw
12	information. We take the information and piece by piece we
13	share with partners. In this case, a national security brief
14	is a document that is more of a compilation, an analysis of,
15	in this case, a specific topic, interference in the specific
16	riding, Don Valley North, and that was communicated to the
17	government.
18	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Okay. And for the
19	benefit of parties, the paragraphs 15, 16, 17 of this
20	summary, public summary of the in-camera testimony gives the
21	details of that incident. So let me just ask you a few
22	overview questions about that, Mr. Vigneault.
23	Generally speaking, what is the impact or
24	what happens when a intelligence assessment like this is
25	recalled?
26	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yeah. So recall in
27	this case is can be for different reasons: We have come
28	across a mistake in the report; could be that, you know, we

1	have provided information that was too specific that, you
2	know, may point to identification of a source. So there are
3	different reasons why you would recall a report, and
4	sometimes, you know, it's the report is recalled and
5	reissued with corrections, with changes made.
6	In this specific instance, when I testified
7	in-camera, as was mentioned in this summary, I could not
8	recall the reason why this report was recalled. I again
9	yesterday conferred with my former chief of staff, who is the
10	individual who had asked, you know, when I came back from
11	discussing, had asked to have the document recalled, he,
12	himself did not remember the reasons why.
13	What I am very comfortable to say, though, is
14	that in my career I have never been asked to censor
15	intelligence, to change intelligence for reasons that would
16	be exterior to CSIS operations. And so I am very
17	comfortable, as I have said in my in-camera testimony, and
18	reported here in the unclassified document, that there was no
19	nefarious, or it was not because it was a sensitive issue at
20	play. It was because if it would have been something like
21	that I would have clearly remembered because it had never
22	happened in my career, and
23	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Yeah. And obviously
24	had it been something particularly controversial, the
25	Director would have shared that with me so that I instruct
26	our employees and explain what the concerns were. And I have
27	no memory of that incident whatsoever.

MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you. Then just

1	6	ᄃ
_	v	J

two quick mechanical questions. What actually happens when 1 you recall a report? What is the effect of that on the 2 3 people who got it in the first place? MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: So when they recall a 4 report, we will send an email out to the individuals that 5 6 receive the report and ask them to delete and destroy any copies that they have of that document, that that is no 7 longer a document. Within the Service, often the analysts 8 that wrote the report may still retain a copy within their 9 database, but nobody has access to that report. 10 That said, all the underlying information 11 that was used to draft the report remains in the Service's 12 13 databases. 14 MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you. That's -that was the second question, and that -- that's helpful 15 16 there. COMMISSIONER HOGUE: I have one question. 17 MR. GORDON CAMERON: Please. 18 19 COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Is it something that 20 happens regularly, recalling a report, or it's unusual? MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: It's not unusual, but 21 22 it's not regular, sort of in between. It's -- you will recall a report, for example, because it was disseminated 23 maybe too broadly and we want to reduce the dissemination, or 24 we'll recall a report, as the Director said, because we may 25 have misclassified a piece of information in the report, so 26 we'll recall it too. Or we'll recall it because we received 27 a new piece of information that completely changes it. 28

1	So reports can be recalled for various
2	reasons, but it's not regular, but it's also not unheard of.
3	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you. And then one
4	last topic.
5	If the court officer could call up CAN 3128,
6	3-1-2-8. And if you could just scroll down a little bit.
7	EXHIBIT No. CAN 3128:
8	Email: RE: CNSB RSESN 22/19 - 2019 10
9	29 - CSIS National Security Brief
10	(CNSB) / Rapport du SCRS sur les
11	enjeux de sécurité nationale (RSESN)
12	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Panelists, you're
13	familiar, I think, with this document.
14	Scroll down a little bit further, please.
15	Thank you.
16	First of all, if I think I'll direct these
17	questions to you, Ms. Henderson, but whoever has the right
18	information should answer. Can you tell us, or perhaps
19	remind us, who Mr. King well, what position he occupied at
20	CSE and what role he was in when he sent this email?
21	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: So Mr. King was the
22	Chair of the SITE Task Force at this time in the 2019
23	election.
24	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Right. And he makes
25	several points in this email considering what he considers to
26	have been delayed delivery of intelligence, given what he, in
27	his email, describes as the severity of the alleged activity.
28	And he later refers to a massively problematic statement in

1 the intelligence.

And perhaps you can have reference, if it assists you, to paragraphs 19 and following of your *in-camera* evidence so that you can be guided by exactly what you've decided you can say publicly about this. But the question is can you help us understand what Mr. King is talking about here and the Service's perspective on it?

MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: So my first point that I am going to make is I had spoken earlier about foreign interference being the long-term investigations that we have engaged on in the Service. So when we're talking about SITE and SITE being set up, SITE was managing issues that happened during the writ period, but our investigations have begun long before the writ period, and so any information that we would have collected on certain foreign interference activities prior to that point would have been shared with our regular stakeholders. And I spoke about the S&I community members.

So we would have shared any information that we collected in an investigation that spoke of foreign interference with our regular partners. That would include CSE, Foreign Affairs, Public Safety, RCMP, et cetera.

So what happened in this particular instance is that, based on a previous investigation, our analysts in the service had begun drafting a report. I think we're looking at an issue of timing here.

So when that report was then finalized and drafted and came out right after the 2019 election, there was

1	a line in that report that talked about and I'm just going
2	to find it here.
3	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Find your discussion of
4	it in the
5	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: Yes.
6	MR. GORDON CAMERON: transcript.
7	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: So there was the line
8	in the report that said that the actor has already had an
9	impact on the 2019 federal election and will remain a foreign
10	interference threat after the election.
11	So that is the report that was brought to the
12	attention of the SITE Task Force after the 2019 election.
13	And so when Mr. King read that report, he was very concerned
14	that there was not enough information shared during SITE on
15	that issue.
16	When we took a look back at the report and
17	the assessment, we felt internally that that was a bit of a
18	leap too far. The threat actor would have had an impact on
19	that particular timeframe and that particular issue, but that
20	would not have impacted the integrity of the 2019 election.
21	It was just a little bit of a too strong of an assessment.
22	So the information in the report still stood.
23	It was the analytical assessment at the end that we had an
24	internal discussion and determined that no, the language is a
25	bit strong and so we rewrote that particular piece and
26	resubmitted the report.
27	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you, Madam Chair.
28	Those are my questions for this panel.

1	6	a
	О	9

1	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
2	Cross-examination. I think the first one is
3	just let me look at my chart. It is counsel for Michael
4	Chong.
5	MR. GORDON CAMERON: I believe we were
6	scheduled for a break at 20 to 4:00. I wonder if we could
7	break now and cross afterwards.
8	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Yes, because it was
9	supposed to the break was supposed to be at 3:40.
10	MR. GORDON CAMERON: I believe so.
11	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Yes, we can break and
12	we'll come back at can we say we'll come back at 4:15?
13	Thank you.
14	THE REGISTRAR: Order please.
15	This hearing is in recess until 4:15.
16	Upon recessing at 4:00 p.m.
17	Upon resuming at 4:16 p.m.
18	THE REGISTRAR: Order please.
19	This sitting of the Foreign Interference
20	Commission is back in session.
21	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER, Resumed:
22	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT, Resumed:
23	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON, Resumed:
24	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: So the first one is
25	counsel for Michael Chong.
26	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GIB van ERT:
27	MR. GIB van ERT: Good afternoon, panel.
28	I'll start by picking up where Mr. Cameron left off. He took

1	you through the efforts that the service has made in recent
2	years to call the public's attention generally to the risk of
3	foreign interference, particularly around elections and
4	democratic processes.
5	The impression that I had even before hearing
6	Mr. Cameron, but especially after hearing him, is that this
7	has been a preoccupation of the service's for some time now,
8	several years. Is that fair?
9	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: I think as we have
10	commented, Madam Commissioner, since 1984, even before 1984,
11	foreign interference has been an issue of importance for CSIS
12	and we have been working on this issue. My predecessors
13	our predecessors have been working on this issue.
14	One thing that is important, I think, to
15	mention is with globalization, with technology, with great
16	power politics, with new as my colleague said, with more
17	countries wanting to assert their interests, including to the
18	use of foreign interference, we have seen the intensity and
19	the impact of foreign interference in the last years to
20	increase and that's why
21	MR. GIB van ERT: I'm speaking specifically
22	about
23	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: there have been
24	what has led to our ongoing efforts.
25	MR. GIB van ERT: Yes. Well, I think maybe I
26	didn't ask the question well or maybe you've missed the
27	point.

But what you I thought had agreed to Mr.

1	Cameron already is that the service's particular interest in
2	dealing with foreign interference as it relates to electoral
3	processes has increased in recent years. You mentioned 2016
4	in the U.S., 2018 in the United Kingdom.
5	So I had took that to mean that this has
6	become a major preoccupation of the service in recent years,
7	not '84. Recently. Am I wrong?
8	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: I would just say, Madam
9	Commissioner, that, you know, the focus of the has
10	increased in CSIS and the specificity around the democratic
11	processes, including elections, since 2016.
12	MR. GIB van ERT: Yes. All right. I think
13	we're on the same page there.
14	What the public has been able to see so far
15	through this process, and it's necessarily very limited,
16	paints a picture, I'm going to suggest to you, Director
17	and I'm looking at you in particular as the face of the
18	service of you and no doubt your agency generally trying
19	in recent years to sound the alarm about this risk to our
20	elections and to our democratic institutions. You personally
21	meeting with senior politicians, with senior public servants,
22	with relevant agencies in advance of the 2019 election, in
23	the course of the election, and then again in 2021.
24	I'll just ask the Court Operator to put up
25	MMC20, please.

--- EXHIBIT No. MMC 20:

26

MR. GIB van ERT: This is a document that I 1 think will illustrate the point I'm trying to make, Director. 2 So I'll give you a moment to look at that document, but what 3 I understand it to be is a list that was prepared of CSIS 4 briefings and intelligence around elections in recent years. 5 6 Are you with me? 7 MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yes, I am. MR. GIB van ERT: Thank you. And what I see 8 in this document is, just focusing on 2019 for the moment --9 and if you scroll up a bit, please? Or scroll down, rather. 10 Thank you. We'll stop there. 11 Twenty-nineteen (2019) goes over the page, 12 13 but I'm just going to summarize for you what I'm seeing here, 14 and you tell me if it accords with your recollection. You briefed Director -- Minister Gould seven 15 times ahead of the 2019 General Election. You briefed the 16 NSIA on the 1st of August 2018 on that same topic. You 17 briefed the full Cabinet on the 30th of October. You briefed 18 19 a DM meeting on election readiness on the 7th of November. You briefed the NSIA, the Public Safety Deputy Minister, and 20 the CSE Chief on the 8th of January. And you've directed --21 22 sorry, you briefed the Panel of Five five times in advance of 2019. 23 I know that's a lot on the screen there, but 24 this is why I'm saying that I get the picture that you are 25 raising these issues with the decision makers all around 26 town. Is that fair? 27

MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: I think, Madam

Cr-Ex (van	Ert

Commissioner, that list of topics speaks to two issues. Yes,

173

- that CSIS was increasing its engagement and working with the 2 3 partners about understanding foreign interference and the impact it was having, but it's also a reflection of the 4
- number of other partners who are interested in these issues 5
- 6 and were asking us for our advice, and our intelligence, and
- 7 our assessments.

- So I think it's both CSIS increasing, but 8 9 also the number of other partners who were increasing in their demands and their engagement on this topic. So I think 10 both are important to point out. 11
- MR. GIB van ERT: We heard evidence from the 12 Office of the Commissioner of Canada Elections that the 13 14 Saturday before polling day in 2019, you had an emergency 15 briefing with that body. Do you recall that?
- MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: I do not recall that 16 specific meeting, Madam Commissioner. 17
- MR. GIB van ERT: All right. And then in 18 19 2021, this same document.
- 20 If you go over the page, please? Thank you.
- We start getting into briefings in 2021. I 21 22 won't go through them all, but again, you briefed the Panel of Five four times, you briefed Minister Blair, the Deputy 23 Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister, all ahead of the 2021 24
- 25 Election.
- 26 My point is this. It seems to me that you were trying, on behalf of the agency, to ensure that decision 27 makers, senior politicians, senior public servants, 28

ENGLISH INTERPRETATION			ION	1	74		TES	SSI	IER/V	IGNI	EAULT/HEI Cr-Ex(va		
un	derstood	that	there	was	a	risk	and	a	need	to	counter	it	.,

1 particularly in the run up and during those two elections. 2 3 Do you agree with that? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, 4 I'll go back to the answer I gave previously. I think it's 5 6 fair to say that absolutely CSIS was increasing the sharing of information and engagement on foreign interference, and in 7 parallel, our partners were also increasing their demands on 8 9 us, and those two dynamics I think have to be understood together. 10 MR. GIB van ERT: Let's go to the witness 11 statement, WIT 41, please. 12 13 --- EXHIBIT No. WIT 41: 14 D. Vigneault, M. Tessier and C. 15 Henderson Public Summary of Classified Interview 16 MR. GIB van ERT: And if you'll start at 17 paragraph -- page 12, rather, of that document? Down the 18 19 page, please. Yes. Yes. The paragraph that begins -- I think we need to go up a little bit further. Sorry. 20 21 we are. No, a little further still. There we are. 22 The paragraph that begins Ms. Tessier, I'll just read it: 23

"Ms. Tessier noted that CSIS had
wanted to conduct such briefings..."
We're talking about defensive briefings of
MPs. Do you recall this, Madam Tessier?

MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: I do.

1	MR. GIB van ERT: Thank you. So you:
2	"noted that CSIS had wanted to
3	conduct such briefings even before
4	the 43 rd elections"
5	You wanted to do that, but you didn't do so?
6	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: We began our
7	briefings. And what I want to highlight is that the Service
8	has always recognized the importance, the integrity of the
9	democratic institutions. And it's the importance of allowing
10	for free and fair elections. So anything to do with
11	interviewing, meeting elected officials, CSIS employees know
12	that that is a sensitive issue, that the Service doesn't want
13	to be seen as somehow, itself, interfering in any election.
L4	So there's always been a lot of discussion in
15	terms of the Service's approach, and it's evolved over the
16	years. Certainly interest in foreign interference,
L7	communicating on foreign interference, but frankly increasing
18	our methodologies regarding the investigation, particularly
19	as it affects elections.
20	And so there was a lot of discussion, but I
21	can say that the intent was always to reach out to as many
22	elected officials at all levels as we could.
23	MR. GIB van ERT: Ms. Tessier, you have given
24	evidence that you wanted to conduct such briefings before the
25	$43^{\rm rd}$ Election. The question I asked you was very straight
26	forward. You wanted to, but you didn't; right?
27	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: We did conduct some.

We didn't conduct as many as we would have liked, but we did

conduct some. 1 MR. GIB van ERT: All right. Why didn't you 2 conduct as many as you would have liked? 3 MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Well there were 4 discussions. Some of it is timing. Some of it is with the 5 writ dropping, some of it is timing, some of it is 6 7 availabilities. But also there were discussions. I was not involved in those discussions, in terms of what -- who should 8 be met, what is the appropriate methodology of meeting with 9 the purpose ---10 MR. GIB van ERT: Did you ask the Government 11 -- did the Service ask the Government whether it could 12 13 conduct such briefings? Did you ask permission and were you 14 told no? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: So, Madam Commissioner, 15 I think -- I'm trying to remember if it's -- whether it is in 16 the public domain, but there was the National Security 17 Committee Intelligence -- NSICOP Committee of 18 19 Parliamentarians had been reflecting on the need to produce -- to do so briefings to the -- all elected officials. And so 20 there's been discussions at play. We prepared briefings, and 21 22 those discussions are ongoing, and we'll see if such briefings are taking place soon. 23 MR. GIB van ERT: I'm going to try again. 24 Would you have needed the Government's permission to conduct 25 26 defensive briefings of MPs? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, 27

there's -- as my colleague, Ms. Tessier, mentioned, what we

1	did is we used our authorities to do, you know, those
2	briefings to a number of elected officials.
3	What was also being discussed was to have,
4	you know, an organized approach to the House of Commons, you
5	know, where we would have all Members of Parliament briefed,
6	yes by CSIS, but also by other parties, like the
7	Communications Security Establishment, the Royal Canadian
8	Mounted Police Sergeant-at-Arms to talk about issues related
9	to foreign interference.
10	And so this is what I refer to when those
11	plans are being discussed as we speak still.
12	MR. GIB van ERT: Madam Commissioner, I'm
13	going to ask the question again, and this time I'm hoping the
14	Director will answer it.
15	Would you have required permission from the
16	Government to conduct these defensive briefings?
17	MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: Excuse me. I hate to
18	interrupt my friend. Before we go on and on with this cross-
19	examination on a statement, I think there are some parameters
20	around this on under Rule 59. And certainly it's
21	appropriate to ask some questions about this, but we're going
22	over and over the same question. I think the witness has
23	answered the question. If there's any force in this rule,
24	then we ought to move on to something else.
25	MR. GIB van ERT: Commissioner,
26	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: My understanding is
27	you're not trying to contradict the witness with

MR. GIB van ERT: Not at all.

1	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: his previous
2	summary.
3	MR. GIB van ERT: Thank you. That's quite
4	right. He's adopted this evidence as his own today and I
5	just I don't believe the question has been answered. I'm
6	not trying to be repetitive; I'm just trying to get the
7	answer.
8	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Repeat the
9	MR. GIB van ERT: Yes, thank you.
10	The question is, would you have needed
11	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: As short as possible.
12	MR. GIB van ERT: Would you have needed the
13	Government's permission to conduct defensive briefings of
14	MPs?
15	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: So we do not need the
16	Government's permission, Madam Commissioner, for CSIS to
17	conduct these briefings, you know, on our own, but of course
18	we in order to convene the House of Commons and to
18 19	we in order to convene the House of Commons and to organize briefings of all Parliamentarians in an organized
19	organize briefings of all Parliamentarians in an organized
19 20	organize briefings of all Parliamentarians in an organized way with our partners, we could not do that on our own. It
19 20 21	organize briefings of all Parliamentarians in an organized way with our partners, we could not do that on our own. It requires coordination and it requires authority. I'm not
19 20 21 22	organize briefings of all Parliamentarians in an organized way with our partners, we could not do that on our own. It requires coordination and it requires authority. I'm not sure if it's, you know, just the government, if it's the
19 20 21 22 23	organize briefings of all Parliamentarians in an organized way with our partners, we could not do that on our own. It requires coordination and it requires authority. I'm not sure if it's, you know, just the government, if it's the House of Commons, you know, the House is sovereign in its own
19 20 21 22 23 24	organize briefings of all Parliamentarians in an organized way with our partners, we could not do that on our own. It requires coordination and it requires authority. I'm not sure if it's, you know, just the government, if it's the House of Commons, you know, the House is sovereign in its own right, so those plans to be briefing the entire House of
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	organize briefings of all Parliamentarians in an organized way with our partners, we could not do that on our own. It requires coordination and it requires authority. I'm not sure if it's, you know, just the government, if it's the House of Commons, you know, the House is sovereign in its own right, so those plans to be briefing the entire House of Commons, and potentially, eventually also, the Senate are

requires more players, including potentially, yeah, the 1 government, but also, the House of Commons, and this has not 2 3 yet happened. So it's probably the best answer I could provide to the question. 4 MR. GORDON CAMERON: All right. You've now 5 6 said that you don't need permission, thank you, but you did need to coordinate ---7 MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: But I'm.... 8 9 Commissioner, for the record, this is not, I think, what the record identifies. 10 MR. GIB van ERT: I'll go on. 11 COMMISSIONER HOGUE: I think he answered this 12 13 time. 14 MR. GIB van ERT: Yes, he did answer and I have a follow up. 15 Which is you didn't need permission, thank 16 you for that, but you did indicate you would need help 17 coordinating it. Did you ask for that help, and were you 18 19 told no? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, 20 this -- I -- I said that, you know, CSIS could not on its own 21 22 brief the entire House of Commons. That is what I have just mentioned. I have said that we have been part of discussions 23 with other parties of the government, the government, the 24 Privy Council Office, other partners. That's what my 25 testimony and my answer to previous question. 26 MR. GIB van ERT: I'll try one last time. 27

Did you ask the government for help coordinating those

1	meetings, and were you told no?
2	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, I
3	have said
4	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: I think you've got the
5	answer.
6	MR. GIB van ERT: All right. Let's go to
7	page 13, please. Yes. One moment. So scroll down a little
8	further, please. I'm sorry, go back up, please. There we
9	are.
10	Mr. Vigneault, the paragraph that reads:
11	"Mr. Vigneault indicated that the P5
12	had been created to address these
13	challenges during the writ period,
14	[and] also noted that it could not
15	intervene on [foreign interference]
16	incidents that did not meet its
17	threshold for action"
18	I want to ask you about the P5's threshold
19	for action. Can you tell the Commissioner, please, what the
20	P5's threshold for action was?
21	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Just give me one
22	second.
23	MR. GIB van ERT: Of course.
24	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: So Madam Commissioner,
25	I think you're going to have witnesses who are coming from
26	the Panel who will speak specifically about the Panel, but
27	so I'll defer to them on the on more specific.
28	But the my understanding of the threshold

is that this is something that would have an impact on the
integrity of the election. And so what I have testified to
and what we have said is that you could have at the same time
foreign interference activities during election, and at the

same time you can say that -- conclude that the interference

6 did not interfere with the integrity of the election.

And I think this is what this notion of it -of this is here, is that we, CSIS, and other partners of the
security intelligence community, would, including during the
writ period, bring forward information that would be related
to foreign interference. Some of it, you know, will be
absolutely of concern to the Panel because, you know, they
have to assess, you know, how that it will impact or not the
integrity of the election, but other pieces of this would not
be elements that, you know, would meet that threshold that -the integrity of the election.

And so that's why I think it's important, and again I'm speaking to the perspective of CSIS of what we're bringing forward, I think the Panel members will be able to explain how they interpreted their own threshold with that information. But that is the spirit in which I have testified to *in-camera*.

MR. GIB van ERT: Thank you.

If we go to Witness Statement Number 48, please. And if you'll go to paragraph 19, please. Thank you.

Mr. Cameron was showing you this earlier.

Go, in particular, to -- so the middle of

1	this paragraph 19. It says:
2	"The report initially assessed it
3	likely that the actor 'has already
4	had an impact on the 2019 federal
5	election"
6	So it's that phrase, "impact on the
7	election".
8	And then if you look at paragraph 20 here,
9	Ms. Henderson speaks, and she indicates that:
LO	"while the actor could potentially
L1	have had an impact on democratic
12	processes, their actions had not
13	compromised the integrity of the 2019
L4	election."
L5	Right? And my question for you is this:
L6	Ms. Henderson, are you referring to the integrity of the
L7	election as a whole, or the integrity of any particular
L8	riding election in one of the 338 ridings that make up the
19	general election?
20	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: The integrity of the
21	election as a whole.
22	MR. GIB van ERT: As a whole. Thank you.
23	And similarly, if you go to paragraph 29,
24	please, of this same statement. Mr. Vigneault, this is
25	attributed to you. It indicates that you:
26	"assessed that, while there were
27	FI activities during the [two]
28	elections, [these]incidents did

1	not impact the integrity of either
2	election."
3	And again, I take that to mean, but please
4	tell me, the election as a whole. Are you referring to the
5	election as a whole having integrity here, or are you
6	referring to the 338 individual elections that make it up?
7	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: So Madame Commissioner,
8	this statement of course is a is the unclassified version
9	of my full statement $in\text{-}camera$ where we provided the details.
10	It is the integrity of the election as a whole, but I think
11	it's also important to say that, it goes back to my statement
12	I just made a minute ago, that, you know, we have detected
13	and reported on some foreign interference activities during
14	those elections. However, the I am very comfortable with
15	the decision the Panel reached that they did not impact the
16	integrity. And I say that, you know, having been privy to a
17	lot of the information, maybe not all of the information from
18	the Panel, but I think these two statements are really
19	important to understand in the context of the Commission of
20	Inquiry, that yes, foreign interference takes is taking
21	place, has taken place during these elections; however, based
22	on at least what I know, and I concur with the Panel
23	conclusion, this did not amount to impact the integrity of
24	the election.
25	MR. GIB van ERT: As a whole.
26	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: As a whole, and I
27	understand the nuances that counsel is bringing forward here,
28	Commissioner, and I think some of the classified evidence you

1	received, you and Commission Counsel before, speaks to the
2	nuances of this and I think, you know, the classified record
3	will provide a full picture of the of what we knew then.
4	MR. GIB van ERT: Yes, so the classified
5	record may tell us things about the integrity of the Don
6	Valley North proceedings in 2019 or the Richmond
7	Steveston-Richmond East proceedings in 2021. The integrity
8	of those matters is not necessarily what you're speaking to.
9	You're talking about the integrity of these two elections as
10	a whole. Have I got that right?
11	MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: The witnesses can't
12	speak to the classified record.
13	MR. GIB van ERT: All right. I'll accept
14	that. Thank you.
15	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: And your time is
16	expired.
17	MR. GIB van ERT: Well, I wonder if I might
18	have another five minutes?
19	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Because you already 1
20	gave you already two more minutes. So I permit you to ask a
21	last question. We are very tight today in terms of the
22	schedule.
23	MR. GIB van ERT: All right.
24	If you'll turn, in that case, to Canada
25	Document 2359.
26	EXHIBIT No. CAN 2359:
27	SITE TF - After Action Report (2021
28	Federal Election)

1	MR. GIB van ERT: If you go to the next page,
2	please.
3	This is, as you can see, panelists, the 2021
4	after action report of the SITE.
5	And if you go to the middle of the page,
6	please, right about there.
7	Summary of Key Observations. So this is the
8	SITE's observations, not yours, I appreciate that. They read
9	as follows:
10	"The People's Republic of
11	Chinasought to clandestinely and
12	deceptively influence Canada's 2021
13	federal election. This Fl was
14	pragmatic in naturefocused
15	primarily on supporting individuals
16	viewed to be either 'pro-PRC' or
17	'neutral' on issues of interest to
18	the PRC government and
19	[the](CCP)."
20	And going on:
21	"SITE TF also observed
22	online/media activities aimed at
23	discouraging Canadians, particularly
24	of Chinese heritage, from supporting
25	the Conservative Party of
26	Canadaparty leader Erin O'Toole,
27	and particularly former Steveston-
28	Richmond East candidate Kenny Chiu

1	[in the 44th election]. While we do
2	not have clear evidence that this
3	online activity was a PRC-directed Fl
4	campaign, we have observed indicators
5	of potential coordination between
6	various Canada-based [China] language
7	news outlets between various Canada-
8	based China language news outlets as
9	well as PRC and CCP news outlets."
10	My question for you is this. In response to
11	the testimony that Mr. O'Toole gave yesterday, there has been
12	some adverse commentary to the effect that and I'm
13	paraphrasing that maybe he's just a sore loser and he
14	should look in the mirror to see why he lost rather than
15	looking to the Commissioner and this Inquiry to understand
16	what happened.
17	And what I want to ask you, panelists, is do
18	you accept these conclusions of the SITE that there was a
19	little more going on than just a failure of Mr. O'Toole's
20	politics, there was some foreign interference in these
21	proceedings that affected in some way or another our
22	proceedings in those elections?
23	Do you agree with me on that.
24	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, I
25	think it's very important as you can imagine, a summary of
26	these key observations would have been crafted extremely
27	precisely with all the nuances, so I am I recognize this
28	information and I am comfortable with the conclusions that

1	this document speaks to.
2	I think I would not have any specific comment
3	about political matters, as you can imagine, but I think it's
4	important to see to read this very precisely and see what
5	it says and what it doesn't say.
6	The last thing I would comment on is the
7	online media activities. One of the most significant
8	evolutions I have mentioned when I said technology has
9	evolved and has created new dynamic for foreign interference,
10	I think this is one of the areas that, you know, Canada, CSIS
11	for sure, but also all of our other partners around the
12	world, are struggling with to make sure we understand and
13	we're able to detect but also to attribute these activities.
14	And I think this is an area that will
15	continue to be of high interest, but I think these words have
16	been crafted very carefully and for the Commission record,
17	you know, I support those conclusions. But I would not want
18	to go further than those specific words.
19	MR. GIB van ERT: You support those
20	conclusions.
21	Thank you, panelists. Thank you very much.
22	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
23	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Thank you.
24	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Conservative Party, I
25	think it's on Zoom.
26	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Madam Commissioner, can
27	everybody hear me and see me?
28	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Can you speak louder or

1	maybe raise the volume?
2	MR. NANDO de LUCA: I don't know how to do
3	that.
4	Can you hear me now? I'll speak up.
5	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Yes, okay. But speak
6	louder, please.
7	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. NANDO de LUCA:
8	MR. NANDO de LUCA: I will. Thank you.
9	Mr. Vigneault, as set out in your
10	institutional report, pursuant to section 12 of the CSIS Act
11	CSIS is statutorily mandated or bound to collect,
12	investigate, analyze and retain information and intelligence
13	that may constitute a threat to the security of Canada. Is
14	that correct?
15	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: It's Michelle Tessier
16	responding.
17	Yes, that's correct.
18	MR. NANDO de LUCA: And information and
19	intelligence about foreign interference in Canadian elections
20	qualifies as being a threat to Canada's security; correct?
21	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: That's correct.
22	MR. NANDO de LUCA: And CSIS takes this
23	threat of foreign interference very seriously; correct?
24	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: Absolutely, yes.
25	That's correct.
26	MR. NANDO de LUCA: And am I also correct
27	that under section 12 of the CSIS Act not only is CSIS
28	statutorily mandated to collect and gather information and

1	intelligence constituting a potential security threat, but it
2	is also duty bound to report and to advise the Government of
3	Canada in relation to all such collected intelligence?
4	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: We don't necessarily
5	have to report all collected intelligence, but yes, our
6	mandate is to report and advise government.
7	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Okay. And the
8	Government of Canada as used in section 12, to your
9	understanding, includes the Prime Minister and the PMO?
10	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: It could, yes,
11	absolutely, as the government recipients of our intelligence.
12	MR. NANDO de LUCA: And the Government of
13	Canada also includes all the Ministers of Cabinet and the
14	Privy Council Office?
15	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: It may or may not.
15 16	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: It may or may not. They may be recipients of some briefing, but not necessarily
16	They may be recipients of some briefing, but not necessarily
16 17	They may be recipients of some briefing, but not necessarily of all intelligence of CSIS.
16 17 18	They may be recipients of some briefing, but not necessarily of all intelligence of CSIS. MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, if
16 17 18 19	They may be recipients of some briefing, but not necessarily of all intelligence of CSIS. MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, if I could add to this point, our colleague misunderstood and
16 17 18 19 20	They may be recipients of some briefing, but not necessarily of all intelligence of CSIS. MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, if I could add to this point, our colleague misunderstood and talked about the dissemination of the product based on
16 17 18 19 20 21	They may be recipients of some briefing, but not necessarily of all intelligence of CSIS. MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, if I could add to this point, our colleague misunderstood and talked about the dissemination of the product based on intelligence requirements. So the notion of what product
16 17 18 19 20 21	They may be recipients of some briefing, but not necessarily of all intelligence of CSIS. MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, if I could add to this point, our colleague misunderstood and talked about the dissemination of the product based on intelligence requirements. So the notion of what product goes to whom, when, the volume of information and so on is a
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	They may be recipients of some briefing, but not necessarily of all intelligence of CSIS. MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, if I could add to this point, our colleague misunderstood and talked about the dissemination of the product based on intelligence requirements. So the notion of what product goes to whom, when, the volume of information and so on is a fairly complicated or not necessarily complicated, but you
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	They may be recipients of some briefing, but not necessarily of all intelligence of CSIS. MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, if I could add to this point, our colleague misunderstood and talked about the dissemination of the product based on intelligence requirements. So the notion of what product goes to whom, when, the volume of information and so on is a fairly complicated — or not necessarily complicated, but you know, requires, you know, some explanation.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	They may be recipients of some briefing, but not necessarily of all intelligence of CSIS. MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, if I could add to this point, our colleague misunderstood and talked about the dissemination of the product based on intelligence requirements. So the notion of what product goes to whom, when, the volume of information and so on is a fairly complicated or not necessarily complicated, but you know, requires, you know, some explanation. So I just want to make sure that we are not

1	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Okay. For the purposes
2	of these questions, I'm just trying to get an understanding
3	as generally speaking, at least, as to who CSIS in
4	particular understands comes within the ambit of Government
5	of Canada as used in section 12 with respect to their
6	mandate. And I think the answers that have been provided are
7	helpful and there's nothing inaccurate in that respect.
8	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yes. The people with
9	clearances, with the need to know who hare part of the
10	federal government, including Ministers, including political
11	staff, you know, again with clearance and need to know, that
12	is the ecosystem of people who may receive information,
13	intelligence from CSIS and others. And again, the nuance of
14	who gets what on what topic requires some so if it's
15	relevant for the Commission, we can speak to that, but again,
16	I just don't want a blanket explanation to cover everything.
17	MR. NANDO de LUCA: I'm going to try to get
18	to that, if you'll just be patient.
19	So am I correct in my understanding or would
20	you agree that the Government of Canada since 2019 has been
21	headed by Prime Minister Trudeau, who is the leader of the
22	Liberal Party?
23	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yes, I would agree.
24	MR. NANDO de LUCA: And the Liberal Party
25	and the Prime Minister Trudeau have been in power since 2015?
26	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: That's an accurate
27	statement, yes.
28	MR. NANDO de LUCA: And all of the

1	Ministers appointed since 2015 have been drawn from the
2	Liberal Party caucus. Is that correct, to your
3	understanding?
4	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yes, that's my
5	understanding.
6	MR. NANDO de LUCA: And in compliance with
7	your duty to report and advise the Government of Canada, is
8	it the case that different offices and members of the
9	Government of Canada have different security clearances in
10	terms of the types of details of information that they are
11	entitled or permitted to receive?
12	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: As I mentioned, Madam
13	Commissioner, we have, depending on position, you know, at
14	the political level, you know, if you're heading a
15	department, if you're on specific Cabinet committees, if
16	there is a specific reason why you would need to have, there
17	is a variation of the clearances or the access that people
18	will have.
19	Ministers are not requiring security
20	clearances. Political staff and all officials require
21	security clearances.
22	So again, there is an explanation that is
23	it's not everybody who has access to the same information.
24	It's not everybody who should be receiving the same
25	information. And this is not just governed by CSIS, but it's
26	also governed by other agencies producing intelligence and by
27	a Privy Council office who works to manage Cabinet affairs.

MR. NANDO de LUCA: Can I ask, would I be

1	a	2

1	correct in assuming that in terms of information and
2	intelligence relating to foreign interference in elections,
3	the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Safety have the
4	highest security and intelligence clearances?
5	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: I would say on that
6	notion, Madam, I'm not at liberty to discuss, you know, who
7	gets access to what, but you know, it is fair to say that the
8	Minister of Public Safety and the Prime Minister have access
9	to all relevant information from CSIS and, to my
10	understanding, other agencies.
11	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Is there any security
12	level of information or intelligence that the Prime Minister
13	or the Minister of Public Safety is not entitled or permitted
14	to receive?
15	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Not to my knowledge,
15 16	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Not to my knowledge, Madam Commissioner.
16	Madam Commissioner.
16 17	Madam Commissioner. MR. NANDO de LUCA: Do you consider that
16 17 18	Madam Commissioner. MR. NANDO de LUCA: Do you consider that the leaders or members of the opposition parties in the House
16 17 18 19	Madam Commissioner. MR. NANDO de LUCA: Do you consider that the leaders or members of the opposition parties in the House of Commons come within the definition of Government of Canada
16 17 18 19 20	Madam Commissioner. MR. NANDO de LUCA: Do you consider that the leaders or members of the opposition parties in the House of Commons come within the definition of Government of Canada as used in section 12 to which CSIS is bound to report
16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Do you consider that the leaders or members of the opposition parties in the House of Commons come within the definition of Government of Canada as used in section 12 to which CSIS is bound to report intelligence?
16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Do you consider that the leaders or members of the opposition parties in the House of Commons come within the definition of Government of Canada as used in section 12 to which CSIS is bound to report intelligence? MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: I'm not sure where this
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Do you consider that the leaders or members of the opposition parties in the House of Commons come within the definition of Government of Canada as used in section 12 to which CSIS is bound to report intelligence? MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: I'm not sure where this gets us. Are we not getting into legal considerations about
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Do you consider that the leaders or members of the opposition parties in the House of Commons come within the definition of Government of Canada as used in section 12 to which CSIS is bound to report intelligence? MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: I'm not sure where this gets us. Are we not getting into legal considerations about who has what authorities that go beyond the remit of this
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Do you consider that the leaders or members of the opposition parties in the House of Commons come within the definition of Government of Canada as used in section 12 to which CSIS is bound to report intelligence? MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: I'm not sure where this gets us. Are we not getting into legal considerations about who has what authorities that go beyond the remit of this Commission?

1	information, who was it communicated to and who wasn't it
2	communicated to. And so I'd like to know in terms of what
3	where CSIS considers itself bound to deliver information.
4	We've gotten some clarity as to who's
5	included in the list. This question attempts to elicit
6	whether or not they consider members of the opposition
7	parties as part of the Government of Canada as that term is
8	used in section 12.
9	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: I understand your
10	explanation as meaning that you're not looking for an
11	interpretation of the provision, but you're looking for the
12	way this provision is applied by CSIS?
13	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Correct.
14	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Thank you, Madam
15	Commissioner. My understanding is members of Cabinet,
16	members of the government, so elected officials, have access
17	to information in relation to them being member of the Privy
18	Council Office the Privy Council.
19	And so if you're a member not a member of
20	the Government, if you're not a member if you're not been
21	before a Privy Councillor, then you would not be having
22	access to intelligence. And section 19 of the CSIS Act would
23	preclude us from being able to distribute that intelligence.
24	I've testified previously to some of the
25	changes that, you know, the Government is contemplating
26	looking, is to broaden the list of the people who could
27	receive information. But to counsel's question, we would not
28	be considering leaders of members of the opposition to be

1	individuals under section 19 to whom we could share
2	intelligence with.
3	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Okay. Thank you. You'll
4	recall that my colleague who went before me put to you a list
5	of briefings that CSIS had provided to different agencies.
6	Included in those were briefings to the to Cabinet and to,
7	you know, the Prime Minister or the PMO.
8	I have a general question. Would those
9	briefings in particular have included the dissemination of
10	classified information? Without getting into what that
11	classified information was.
12	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, I
13	think it's fair to say that when CSIS would be briefing
14	including those briefings on the list that counsel refers to,
15	overwhelmingly they will be talking about classified
16	intelligence.
17	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Thank you. On May 26th,
18	2023 and September 18, 2023, CSIS officials met with former
19	Conservative Party Leader Erin O'Toole, who was the Leader of
20	the Conservative Party during the 2021 Election and 2021
21	Election Conservative Party candidate Kenny Chiu
22	respectively. And we have reports of those briefings in the
23	record. Are you familiar, generally, with those briefings?
24	I can give you the document numbers, if you'd like.
25	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, I
26	just want to make sure that because we have met with
27	individuals for a number of different reasons, but we also
28	have met with Mr. O'Toole, Mr. Chiu under the terms of the

1	Threat Reductions Measures. So if counsel could clarify?
2	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Sure.
3	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Are they are these
4	the two sections you're talking about?
5	MR. NANDO de LUCA: So I'll do better. It's
6	CAN.DOC 22 and CAN.DOC 24. These are the summaries that we
7	have received in a public setting, or for the purposes of
8	this Commission. Can I have those called up, please?
9	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 22:
10	Commission request for summary
11	information on briefing to Erin
12	O'Toole
13	EXHIBIT No. CAN.DOC 24:
14	Commission request for summary
15	information on briefing to Kenny Chiu
16	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Mr. de Luca, I give you
17	another two minutes to finish your line of questions.
18	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Sure. This will be the
19	last line. This will be the last line.
20	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: So yes, Mr Madam
21	Commissioner. I believe that this the May 26 is refers
22	to the Threat Reductions Measures briefing that was provided
23	to Mr. O'Toole.
24	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Okay. And similarly,
25	with respect to Chiu, sir, is your answer the same?
26	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Is it I don't see
27	the document at the moment, but is it contemporary to so

18 September. Yes, I believe it is the case. I will make

25

26

27

28

	CI-Ex (de Luca)
1	that assumption, depending on the next questions you have for
2	me,
3	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Okay.
4	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: but yeah.
5	MR. NANDO de LUCA: They're very general.
6	Would the intelligence that was shared in this format, and as
7	is reflected here with both Mr. O'Toole and Mr. Chiu, have
8	been gathered in the lead up to and during the 2021 Federal
9	Election?
10	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, I
11	just my colleague just pointed out that indeed these
12	the meeting with Mr. Chiu on September 18 was under the guise
13	of Threat Reduction Measures. So as my colleague, Mme
L4	Tessier explained earlier, that's the process by which we can
15	use classified information.
16	So the information, I was not I did not
17	provide the briefing myself, but my understanding is that
18	briefing would have included information, yes including
19	related to the Federal Election 2021, but other relevant
20	information
21	MR. NANDO de LUCA: I see.
22	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: that including -
23	- because it was a TRM, including classified information.

196

MR. NANDO de LUCA: Okay. So to the extent that there was information with respect to the 2021 period, why was it being provided to both Mr. O'Toole and Mr. Chiu only in 2023?

MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: So, Madam Commissioner,

1	we have as has been mentioned, you know, we have
2	limitations on what we can and how we can apply Threat
3	Reduction Measures when we also talked about testified
4	about the fact that there's been an evolution of how we have
5	approached foreign interference matters in the country.
6	And so at this point in 2023, discussions
7	internally, and also to receiving a direction from the
8	Minister to share all information with all Parliamentarians,
9	we prepared those Threat Reduction Measures and then briefed
10	Mr. Chiu and Mr. O'Toole with all the information we had at
11	our disposal.
12	So it was in the context of that Ministerial
13	Directive that these Threat Reduction Measures were
14	undertook.
15	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Okay. And
16	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
17	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Okay. That's fine.
18	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Mr. de Luca, I think now
19	it's over, because there's others
20	MR. NANDO de LUCA: Thank you, Madam
21	Commissioner.
22	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: So the next one is
23	counsel for Jenny Kwan.
24	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY:
25	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Good afternoon. For the
26	record, my name is Sujit Choudhry. I'm counsel to MP Jenny
27	Kwan.

So I have a few questions for the panel about

1	the PRC and the United Front, and its use of proxies. And so
2	that, of course, as you know, was a core message that was
3	delivered to the various MPs who received CSIS briefings in
4	May of 2023.
5	And what I'd like to ask you about are some
6	questions specific to the $43^{\rm rd}$ and $44^{\rm th}$ General Elections in
7	Canada based on some of the evidence that's been produced for
8	the Commission about the use of proxies by the PRC in Canada,
9	and in particular, flows of funding to those proxies.
10	And so Commissioner, as you know, we've had a
11	lot of production in the last 24 hours, and so with your
12	leave, there's a couple of documents that I've already
13	alerted the Commission counsel to that are Government of
14	Canada documents or witness summaries that I hope I could put
15	to the panel.
16	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Go ahead.
17	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Thank you.
18	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: If there's a problem,
19	I'll let you know.
20	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Thank you.
21	So the first one is CAN.SUM10. And so this
22	is a summary document that's been provided by the Government.
23	I assume the panel has seen this or is familiar with it?
24	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yes, we are.
25	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: So could I please ask
26	you to scroll down, Mr. Registrar, to page 2? So there's
27	five points here. And so I'd like to take you to a couple of
28	the points. so the first point says:

1	"Prior to and during the 43rd General
2	Election of Canada in 2019 [] a
3	group of known and suspected [PRC]-
4	related threat actors in Canada,
5	including PRC officials, worked in
6	loose coordination with one another
7	to covertly advance PRC interests
8	through Canadian democratic
9	institutions."
10	Is that statement correct, in your view?
11	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: That is a correct
12	statement, Madam Commissioner. And as we have testified to
13	earlier, it speaks to the fact that we have been
14	investigating foreign interference for many, many years, and
15	that statement is based on the fact that we had that
16	understanding of the threat.
17	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Thank you. So for
18	limitations of time, I just would like to take you to point
19	five of this.
20	And could we please scroll up? Thank you.
21	Just hard for me to see over the podium. Thank you.
22	So I just want to read point five out for the
23	record. It says:
24	"Additionally, intelligence
25	assessments suggest that some of
25 26	assessments suggest that some of these threat actors received

1	two transfer of funds approximating
2	\$250,000 from PRC officials in
3	Canada, possibly for FI-related
4	purposes, through [but] most likely
5	not in an attempt to covertly fund
6	the 11 candidates [that were referred
7	to earlier in this document]. These
8	were transferred via multiple
9	individuals to obfuscate their
10	origins: via an influential community
11	leader, to the staff member of a 2019
12	Federal Election candidate, and then
13	to an Ontario [Member of Provincial
14	Parliament]. The transfer(s)
15	[repeatedly] took place in late 2018
16	- early 2019."
17	Is this statement correct?
18	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: That is a correct
19	statement,
20	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Yeah.
21	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner.
22	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: So panel, as you know,
23	there have been media reports that have been widely commented
24	upon about a slush fund allegedly operated by the Chinese
25	Consulate in Toronto. Are you able to tell us in this
26	setting, and if you can't, please advise us, whether this
27	document refers to said slush fund?
28	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: So Madam Commissioner,

as you know, we are not at liberty to discuss classified information, but I think what -- there's a couple of very important points to make in relation to this question. The first one is one of the very negative impact of leaks of classified information is the fact that people may interpret partial information, may have access to only information, may provide an assessment of such information that may not be accurate. And so that's why -- that's one of the many reasons, over and above the fact that we need to protect our people and our sources, and when there leaks, you know, they are put in danger.

So we have to be very careful. I will not be commenting on the information in those leaks. However, at the request of the Commission, the Government of Canada has produced a summary of related very important intelligence, and I think these words have been -- as I said earlier, have been carefully chosen to make sure that they are providing you, Madam Commissioner, and Canadians the most accurate possible depiction of what we know, while protecting classified information.

But we also need to make sure that we read this, these words, in their context and not overinterpret or not draw conclusions that are not drawn here. And that's the caution that I want to make sure. And so these words, again, have been chosen very carefully and it is an important aspect of the transparence of the Commission, Madam Commissioner, that this information now is in the public domain. And so these are important words of caveat and context I think are

1	relevant at this point.
2	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Madam Commissioner, I'd
3	like to move on.
4	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Yes.
5	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: I think the panel's
6	answered this question.
7	I'd like to take you, sir, to the panel, to
8	another document. And this is the witness summary of the CSE
9	<pre>public it's the public summary of the classified in-camera</pre>
LO	examinations quite a mouthful of the CSE panel of Ms.
11	Tayyeb and Mr. Rogers, and it's WIT 33. And this was entered
12	as an exhibit today.
13	And Mr. Registrar, could you please take us
L4	to paragraph 15? And I think, with the leave of the
15	Commissioner, I don't think the panel necessarily have seen
16	this document.
17	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: No.
18	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: So I think I'd like to
19	give them a minute to, please, if they could, read paragraphs
20	15 and 16. And if it's possible to reduce the size of it so
21	others can read this as well. Thank you very much.
22	I see Mr. Vigneault is ready; I'm going to
23	give his colleagues just a minute.
24	(SHORT PAUSE)
25	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: So if I may, I have a
26	couple of questions about this evidence. The first is it
27	seems that the former the first document that I asked you
28	to comment on was in relation to the 43rd election, but you

1	can confirm that what Ms. Tayyeb seems to be referring to is
2	the 44th General Election. Is that right?
3	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: It's not clear, other
4	than saying, "was obtained shortly after the 2021 election."
5	So I'm certainly not in a position to
6	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Okay, fair enough.
7	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: I think I know what
8	this refers to, and yes, it is the
9	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Okay. And so at the
10	bottom of paragraph 16 there's a reference to the
11	distribution of funds described in the intelligence report.
12	And so a question, if you're able to answer in this setting;
13	is this distribution of funds that's referenced here the same
14	distribution of funds referenced in the first document that I
15	showed you, or is it a separate distribution of funds?
	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: So Madam Commissioner,
16	in. bit is violated.
16 17	as you can imagine, we are not at liberty to discuss the
17	as you can imagine, we are not at liberty to discuss the
17 18	as you can imagine, we are not at liberty to discuss the specifics, but I think these documents, you know, again,
17 18 19	as you can imagine, we are not at liberty to discuss the specifics, but I think these documents, you know, again, should be read for what they say, be careful to
17 18 19 20	as you can imagine, we are not at liberty to discuss the specifics, but I think these documents, you know, again, should be read for what they say, be careful to overinterpret, you know, what is not being said here. But,
17 18 19 20 21	as you can imagine, we are not at liberty to discuss the specifics, but I think these documents, you know, again, should be read for what they say, be careful to overinterpret, you know, what is not being said here. But, yeah, that's the limit of what I can say.
17 18 19 20 21 22	as you can imagine, we are not at liberty to discuss the specifics, but I think these documents, you know, again, should be read for what they say, be careful to overinterpret, you know, what is not being said here. But, yeah, that's the limit of what I can say. COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Cannot go further than
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	as you can imagine, we are not at liberty to discuss the specifics, but I think these documents, you know, again, should be read for what they say, be careful to overinterpret, you know, what is not being said here. But, yeah, that's the limit of what I can say. COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Cannot go further than that, so
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	as you can imagine, we are not at liberty to discuss the specifics, but I think these documents, you know, again, should be read for what they say, be careful to overinterpret, you know, what is not being said here. But, yeah, that's the limit of what I can say. COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Cannot go further than that, so MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: That's fine.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	as you can imagine, we are not at liberty to discuss the specifics, but I think these documents, you know, again, should be read for what they say, be careful to overinterpret, you know, what is not being said here. But, yeah, that's the limit of what I can say. COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Cannot go further than that, so MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: That's fine. Madam Commissioner, how much time do I have

1	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Okay, good. So I'd like
2	to take you to a different theme, and so here
3	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: I'm going to give you
4	three, but it's two minutes.
5	MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Two minutes. I'll take
6	whatever you give.
7	So could I please could you please put up
8	CAN.SUM.3?
9	And this is about Foreign Interference
10	Activities in Greater Vancouver. If we could just go down to
11	the second page, and then I'd like to take you to point 3.
12	And so yesterday, Commission Counsel
13	Rodriguez put to my client, MP Kwan, this particular
14	document; and, in particular, point 3 was put to her. And if
15	I could read it out for the record, it says:
16	"Intelligence reports indicate that
17	these officials coordinated the
18	exclusion of particular political
19	candidates, perceived as 'anti-
20	China', from attending local
21	community events related to the
22	election. This was accomplished via
23	PRC proxy agents, hiding the direct
24	involvement of these PRC officials."
25	So my question to you is that this statement
26	was made in relation to the $43^{\rm rd}$ General Election; do you
27	believe this statement to be true for the $44^{\rm th}$ General
28	Election as well?

or in (onounity)
MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, I
would not want to mislead the Commission. I'm not ready to
speak to specifically that aspect for General Election 44,
but I am totally comfortable with that depiction for 43.
MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: What perhaps I can add
is this is a typical modus operandi of the PRC. I can't
speak to the election, but it is a typical modus operandi.
MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: So if I could maybe,
perhaps sum up, there'd be no reason to doubt that they would
continue with this $modus\ operandi$, having used it in the $43^{\rm rd}$
General Election, going forward?
MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: We have no information
that they've changed that particular method of operating.
MR. SUJIT CHOUDHRY: Thank you very much.
COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
Next one is counsel for the Sikh Coalition,
Mr. Singh.
(SHORT PAUSE)
MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Thank you, Commissioner.
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRABJOT SINGH:
MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Again, for the record,
it's Prabjot Singh, counsel for the Sikh Coalition.
Thank you to the panellists today. I'm going
to try my best to move expeditiously as possible, referring
your attention to some documents that are going to prompt

And I understand that we're navigating some difficult terrain and there's a likelihood that there may be

some follow-up questions.

26

27

1	some questions you're not able to answer in this setting, and
2	that's totally fine. If you can indicate, and that will
3	Madam Commissioner and Commission counsel to take note of
4	those questions and consider if any follow-up is required in
5	camera afterwards.
6	So Mr. Operator, if we can bring up CAN
7	019304?
8	EXHIBIT No. CAN 19304:
9	Meeting between CSIS and the OCCE
10	2021-11-02
11	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And Mr. Vigneault, I'm
12	going to direct my questions to yourself, but if anybody else
13	wants to answer amongst yourself, that's fine.
14	My understanding is that these are notes from
15	a meeting between CSIS and the Office of the Commissioner of
16	Elections Canada in 2021. And one of the statements here is
17	that the two main state actors most involved in the last
18	election were China and India. Mr. Vigneault, is that your
19	understanding today, that India has been one of the primary
20	perpetrators of foreign interference in Canadian elections
21	recently?
22	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, I
23	think it's fair to say that, you know, the behaviour of India
24	has been of concern the last couple of elections, and I think
25	this document can speak to that. So I think it's an accurate
26	depiction.
27	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And another note in here
28	says that India puts "effort into individual campaigns."

1	As you understand it, is it fair to say that Indian foreign
2	interference targets a number of high-priority individual
3	races, rather than the general election, to influence
4	outcomes in favour of candidates considered favourable to
5	Indian policy interests?
6	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Commissioner, I'll
7	elevate my comments to maybe be able to provide an answer. I
8	think it is absolutely fair to say the purpose of foreign
9	interference is to maximize the interests of the foreign
10	party, and so this is absolutely a tactic that has been used
11	to undermine candidates or individuals who may not be in
12	favour of your position and promote people who might be in
13	favour of your position. So in this context I can make that
14	statement.
15	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And in general terms,
16	efforts by any foreign state to undermine or influence
17	Canadian elections, even if it's one single electoral riding,
10	danadran erecerens, even ir ie s ene singre erecerar riding,
18	would constitute foreign interference and a national security
19	
	would constitute foreign interference and a national security
19	would constitute foreign interference and a national security threat; is that fair?
19 20	<pre>would constitute foreign interference and a national security threat; is that fair? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Well, I think, you</pre>
19 20 21	would constitute foreign interference and a national security threat; is that fair? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Well, I think, you know, as my colleagues have described, foreign interference,
19 20 21 22	would constitute foreign interference and a national security threat; is that fair? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Well, I think, you know, as my colleagues have described, foreign interference, you know, takes many different faces in our country;
19 20 21 22 23	would constitute foreign interference and a national security threat; is that fair? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Well, I think, you know, as my colleagues have described, foreign interference, you know, takes many different faces in our country; interference directed at democratic processes is one. And so
19 20 21 22 23 24	would constitute foreign interference and a national security threat; is that fair? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Well, I think, you know, as my colleagues have described, foreign interference, you know, takes many different faces in our country; interference directed at democratic processes is one. And so any action maligned action from a foreign state against
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	would constitute foreign interference and a national security threat; is that fair? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Well, I think, you know, as my colleagues have described, foreign interference, you know, takes many different faces in our country; interference directed at democratic processes is one. And so any action maligned action from a foreign state against Canadian is foreign interference and is something that we, of

1	threat.
2	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: We would be
3	investigating the behaviour. So if the behaviour falls
4	within the definition of the CSIS Act of foreign
5	interference, absolutely.
6	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Thank you.
7	Mr. Court Operator, if you can bring up
8	CAN 003771, and if we could go to page number 2.
9	EXHIBIT No. CAN 3771:
10	Ministerial Briefing : Foreign
11	Interference - 2021-12-13
12	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: I believe this is a
13	notes prepared by the Service for a ministerial briefing.
14	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Could you just please
15	go back up to the page so that we can Okay.
16	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And on page 2, there's a
17	note that:
18	"Indian officialsused Canadian
19	citizens as proxies to conduct
20	[foreign interference] activities,
21	including against democratic
22	institutions."
23	Does that reflect your understanding that
24	India does employ proxies and proxy moves to target
25	politicians in elections, including through the use of funds
26	to specific campaigns?
27	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, I
28	would say that, you know, I I'm I concur with the

1	statement as it is written on that document.
2	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And in addition to
3	targeting elections or campaigns specifically, proxies are
4	also used to intimidate and coerce diaspora groups, and
5	potentially amplify disinformation in electoral campaigns.
6	Is that fair?
7	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yes, it is fair to say,
8	Madam Speaker Speaker Commissioner, well, you may be
9	speaker as well, I don't know what's the future. But
10	Madam Commissioner, that the that proxies are engaging in
11	the coercive activities. My colleague described a number of
12	activities in the past, and this is why we take foreign
13	interference so seriously because of the threatening nature
14	often of foreign interference activities in Canada.
15	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And I have a number of
15 16	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And I have a number of questions that I suspect that you may not be able to answer
16	questions that I suspect that you may not be able to answer
16 17	questions that I suspect that you may not be able to answer in a public setting such as this, but CSIS has identified and
16 17 18	questions that I suspect that you may not be able to answer in a public setting such as this, but CSIS has identified and monitored some of these proxy networks with direct
16 17 18 19	questions that I suspect that you may not be able to answer in a public setting such as this, but CSIS has identified and monitored some of these proxy networks with direct connections to Indian consulates over a period spanning the
16 17 18 19 20	questions that I suspect that you may not be able to answer in a public setting such as this, but CSIS has identified and monitored some of these proxy networks with direct connections to Indian consulates over a period spanning the past two federal elections. Is that fair to say?
16 17 18 19 20 21	questions that I suspect that you may not be able to answer in a public setting such as this, but CSIS has identified and monitored some of these proxy networks with direct connections to Indian consulates over a period spanning the past two federal elections. Is that fair to say? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, if
16 17 18 19 20 21	questions that I suspect that you may not be able to answer in a public setting such as this, but CSIS has identified and monitored some of these proxy networks with direct connections to Indian consulates over a period spanning the past two federal elections. Is that fair to say? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, if counsel wants to point me to a document, I'd be happy to
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	questions that I suspect that you may not be able to answer in a public setting such as this, but CSIS has identified and monitored some of these proxy networks with direct connections to Indian consulates over a period spanning the past two federal elections. Is that fair to say? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, if counsel wants to point me to a document, I'd be happy to speak to it, but as a general comment I am going to refrain
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	questions that I suspect that you may not be able to answer in a public setting such as this, but CSIS has identified and monitored some of these proxy networks with direct connections to Indian consulates over a period spanning the past two federal elections. Is that fair to say? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, if counsel wants to point me to a document, I'd be happy to speak to it, but as a general comment I am going to refrain from commenting.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	questions that I suspect that you may not be able to answer in a public setting such as this, but CSIS has identified and monitored some of these proxy networks with direct connections to Indian consulates over a period spanning the past two federal elections. Is that fair to say? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, if counsel wants to point me to a document, I'd be happy to speak to it, but as a general comment I am going to refrain from commenting. COMMISSIONER HOGUE: So the question is

1	to the 2019 election were specifically connected to two
2	diplomats named Amar Jit Singh and Parag Jain, who are based
3	out of the Vancouver and Ottawa Consulates. Is that correct?
4	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: This is the same thing?
5	So
6	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And in July of 2017,
7	there was a public initiative launched by Indian diaspora
8	groups, led by members of the Canada India Foundation, with
9	the objective of targeting federal ridings in the 2019
10	elections, where current Sikh candidates were deemed to be
11	inimical or contrary or detrimental to Indian interests.
12	This initiative was also found to be connected to that
13	network and connected to the consulate. Is that fair to say?
14	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: So the question is
15	written down.
16	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And that same year, is it
17	true that CSIS wanted to use threat reduction powers to
18	dismantle these networks that were engaging in foreign
19	interference?
20	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Question is written
21	down.
22	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And given the likely
23	significant risks involved in this kind of threat reduction
24	measure, as the three of you have given testimony earlier in
25	terms of the risk factors that are assessed and what kind of
26	protocols are okay is necessary, CSIS consulted PMO and
27	other bodies, including Global Affairs Canada, before

engaging in those threat reduction measures, and later chose

1	not to proceed with those measures. Is that correct?
2	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Question is written
3	down. The witness is looking at me, so I understand
4	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And as a result of that
5	decision not to proceed with those measures, CSIS did not
6	inform targeted politicians, journalists, or the impacted
7	communities about the risk, and those networks continued
8	unhindered, presumably throughout both electoral periods, at
9	least, if not further, until today. Is that correct?
10	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Question is also written

12 MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Are you able to tell us

13 in general terms, and you did touch on this earlier, so maybe

14 you can touch on this briefly, when would foreign

15 interference activity reach the threshold where threat

16 reduction measures would be considered by CSIS? I would

imagine it would be quite a significant threshold to take

that kind of action?

down.

earlier, CSIS needs to, is required by law to consult other government departments prior to embarking on a threat reduction mandate, and to ensure there are no other tools available in an investigation. So without being able to respond to that specific case, I can say that it's not necessarily the first go-to because by law we have to have reasonable grounds to believe that the threat exists, that a measure has to be proportional to the actual threat. We have to think that there would be an impact, we have to assess

1	that impact, but we, by law, must consider other measures
2	first. So it is not necessarily the first go-to.
3	But because of the restrictions in the CSIS
4	Act currently in terms of being able to share classified
5	information. It is a tool that has been used increasingly in
6	order to share classified information when we feel that at
7	that particular moment that is the best tool to use.
8	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And Ms. Tessier, I think
9	you may have mentioned this earlier. There is those four
10	risk factors that CSIS would kind of evaluate: operational
11	risks, I think it was legal risks, and the potential of
12	international relations and the impacts there. And so based
13	on those factors, it is possible for other offices or
14	departments to discourage or influence the threat reduction
15	measures based on those parameters; correct?
16	MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: We most certainly
17	consult with them. The ultimate decision belongs to CSIS,
18	and if it's a high risk, the minister the Director and the
19	Minister must approve it. But we will most certainly consult
20	with them. We obviously don't want to harm their activities,
21	but ultimately the decision rests with CSIS.
22	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And within the factors
23	that are considered and that would likely be considered by
24	those partners who are advising CSIS, partisan interests or
25	policy interests, obviously if we're looking at international
26	relations, that would be a significant factor that would be
27	considered. Fair?

MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: We are not the ones

25

are two-fold?

	Cr-Ex(Singh)
1	who prepare a foreign policy risk assessment, that is done by
2	our colleagues at Global Affairs Canada.
3	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Understood.
4	And Mr. Operator, if you can bring up
5	CAN 019456. And that'll be near the top of page 3, after you
6	can show the panel the first page of the document.
7	EXHIBIT No. CAN 19456:
8	Speaking Points for EC Brief
9	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: My understanding is that
10	this is a an intelligence briefing to Elections Canada on
11	the work of SITE and the various threat actors engaging in
12	foreign interference. So at the top of page 3, for the
13	record, it says that:
14	"Indian officialscontinue to
15	conduct [foreign interference]
16	activities in Canada, both directly
17	and throughCanadian proxies,
18	primarily against Canadian
19	<pre>politician[s]democratic processes,</pre>
20	anddiaspora [communities]."
21	And then it goes into some detail about the
22	objectives of Indian foreign interference.
23	Mr. Vigneault, is it your understanding that

213

MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: So just give me a sec.

MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Sure. The question is,

is whether it's your understanding that India has two

the objectives of Indian foreign interference, specifically,

28

1	objectives for its foreign interference operations?
2	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: So Madam Commissioner,
3	I would say that the in our assessment the two objectives
4	of India are to promote pro India narrative, pro India
5	dynamic here in Canada, but also to undermine the threat
6	perceived by the notion of creating a separate independent
7	Khalistan.
8	I think it's important to, and this document
9	speak to that, there are very clear politically protected or
10	Charter protected, you know, elements of people here in
11	Canada of the Sikh community who are espousing Khalistan
12	an independent Khalistan. Unfortunately, there is also
13	it's important I think to note, a very small group of people
14	who are engaging in threat related activity, including
15	financing, and supporting terrorism. And so what we see is
16	the your the second objective of India, as counsel is
17	referring to, is the blending of these two things.
18	So something that is absolutely unacceptable,
19	which would be, you know, supporting terrorism, but it's
20	blending this with the rest of activities that are absolutely
21	not only legal but acceptable in Canada, which is having
22	political views and using legal means to push these political
23	views.
24	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Mr. Operator, if we can
25	bring up CAN.SUM 7. This was recently uploaded to the party
26	database I believe late last night.

of the intelligence holdings prepared by CSIS, with the

And Mr. Vigneault, this is a topical summary

1	natural caveats that are noted in the documents; correct?
2	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yes.
3	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And so as you just
4	indicated, in your understanding of India's threat
5	perception, is it your understanding that India perceives
6	anyone engaged in advocacy for a separate six state Khalistan
7	as a so-called extremist threat without differentiating
8	between those engaging in lawful advocacy, as well as those
9	who believe in the pursuit of armed struggle. Is that
10	correct? India doesn't distinguish between the two?
11	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: I think, Madam
12	Commissioner, I generally agree with this, but the
13	distinction I would make is that from our perspective is I
L4	would not be using armed struggle. I would say, you know,
15	using terrorist means. But the general depiction on the
16	document, I think, is a really good description of how we and
17	our colleagues are perceiving the Indians' rationale for
18	interference.
19	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And so conceivably, even
20	those simply critical of Indian policy or critical of human
21	rights violations could also fall under that umbrella of a
22	threat to Indian interests? Is that correct?
23	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Again, Madam
24	Commissioner, I think it's well depicted in this document. I
25	think it is fair to say that India will lump into same
26	category of activities that, you know, would be potentially
27	absolutely illegitimate here in Canada, inappropriate here in

Canada, with other means. So I would stick to that kind of

28

1	depiction if it's
2	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Yeah, so India and their
3	foreign interference activities, which may include
4	disinformation, uses the framework and framing of extremism
5	to target lawful activists, as well as those that you marked
6	from the CSIS perspective are considered violent extremists.
7	Has CSIS
8	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, at
9	this point, I think, you know, the document is quite clear
10	about that and I would
11	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: You
12	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: I'm getting to my next
13	question, if that's okay.
14	CSIS has not undertaken any threat reduction
15	measures to address the disinformation towards members of the
16	community engaging in lawful advocacy? Is that correct?
17	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: The question is written
18	down.
19	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And in general terms,
20	what impact
21	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: It's going to be your
22	last
23	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: This is my final
24	question. In general terms, what impact do you think this
25	kind of disinformation and framing of lawful activism has on
26	a vulnerable community targeted with disinformation that

builds on pre-existing racist stereotypes about the nature of

extremism and terrorism. And without getting into broader

1	social implications, if we're focusing on Sikh Members of
2	Parliament, elected officials or candidates, who are targeted
3	with this brush of extremism, we're looking at a considerable
4	impact on media narratives, which makes re-election or
5	initial election quite difficult. Is that fair to say?
6	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, I
7	think it's fair to say that the as we testified to
8	earlier, that foreign interference writ large, and
9	specifically disinformation, is absolutely a question of
10	concern in Canada. The disinformation part is one aspect
11	that is growing in its complexity. And how we, as an
12	intelligence service in a democratic society, can engage with
13	proper communications and then monitoring of social media,
14	there are a number of limits that are absolutely fair in a
15	democratic system.
16	And I make that point to say that this is one
17	of the areas disinformation and in the context of
18	interference that is growing and that we need to find better
19	ways, just not CSIS, but our partners, to address, because it
20	is having more and more of an impact.
21	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Thank you.
22	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
23	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Thank you, Commissioner.
24	Those are all my questions.
25	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Mr. Sirois for the RCDA.
26	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS:
27	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: [No interpretation]

To start, just a general question. Are you

1	aware of foreign interference or influence activity in our
2	electoral processes conducted by the Russian intelligence
3	services in Canada during the $43^{\rm rd}$ or $44^{\rm th}$ General Elections?
4	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: I will
5	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: I think that's in the
6	summary.
7	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, we
8	have provided a summary. I would refer counsel to that
9	summary, which is the best depiction that we can provide in
10	this context.
11	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Do we have the number,
12	Mr. Sirois?
13	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Oh, I'm good. I just
14	wanted
15	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: You're good?
16	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Well I wanted to know
17	if there was any other clarification except from the summary
18	but
19	I would like to pull COM0000156, please.
20	EXHIBIT No. COM 156:
21	NSICOP Annual Report 2020
22	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: This is the 2020
23	Annual Report from the National Security and Intelligence
24	Committee of Parliamentarians, NSICOP.
25	At paragraph 55, page 34, please.
26	Under the heading "Foreign interference", we
27	see it reads:
28	"The Russian Federation also

1	continues to exploit [] diaspora and
2	compatriot organizations in Canada."
3	Is this statement true?
4	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, I
5	have not had a chance to read the entire context, so I will
6	make a general statement, because I'm not sure what precedes
7	this paragraph. But I would say that it's fair to mention
8	that Russian Federation is engaging in a level of foreign
9	interference in our country, as was mentioned in our in
10	the Government's report.
11	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Do you have any reason
12	to doubt the statement?
13	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: I do not doubt the
14	statement, Madam Commissioner. I just don't have the rest of
15	the context. But I am familiar in general with the work of
16	NSICOP and I think, you know, this is I have no reason to
17	doubt it. But just to be fair to
18	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: I think it's a fair
19	comment from the witness.
20	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: I'd like to pull now
21	CAN005824. And I'll apologize if some documents were not
22	indicated in advance. We received some documents quite late
23	this morning and yesterday. So had to adapt in consequence.
24	EXHIBIT No. CAN 5824:
25	Special Report on the Government of
26	Canada's Framework and Activities to
27	Defend its Systems and Networks from
28	Cyber Attack

1	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: At the bottom of page
2	this is, first, a SITE TF update on the Panel of Five, as
3	we can see from the top of the document, on September 15,
4	2021.
5	If we can go at page 4? The bottom of page
6	4?
7	We can see:
8	"Russia has focused [foreign
9	interference] activities on
10	discrediting democratic institutions
11	and processes, with an ultimate goal
12	of destabilizing or delegitimizing
13	democratic states."
14	We see this is a CSIS assessment. Do you
15	have any reason to doubt its truthfulness?
16	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner,
17	this is I totally concur with that statement. This has
18	been one of the significant aspects of the Russian Federation
19	activities, is not necessarily to go at interfering in all of
20	the specific elements of democratic process, but generally
21	speaking, to undermine democratic states. And we see that
22	across the board in the activity of the Russian Federation.
23	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: So this was a concern
24	of CSIS during the 2021 Election? In the final week of the
25	election?
26	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: This was absolutely the
27	final week, but I can say that this is a concern that we
28	shared before, we continue to share to this day.

1	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Thank you. Finally,
2	the last document I'll show you is JKW a bunch of zeros 7.
3	And this is 2022 Special Report on the Government of Canada
4	Framework and Activities to Defend its Systems and Networks
5	from Cyber Attacks. Again, it's from the NSICOP.
6	EXHIBIT No. JKW 7:
7	Special Report on the Government of
8	Canada's Framework and Activities to
9	Defend its Systems and Networks from
10	Cyber Attack
11	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: And I would like to go
12	at page 36 once the document loads. Thank you. At the top
13	here, paragraph 56. Can we go up a little bit? Yes.
14	So yes, at paragraph 56, it says:
15	"Russia is a highly sophisticated
16	cyber threat actor. Russia engages
17	in malicious cyber threat activity,
18	including cyber espionage and foreign
19	interference, to support a wide range
20	of strategic intelligence priorities.
21	[Including the] identification of
22	divisive events and trends in rival
23	states to conduct influence campaigns
24	and undermine liberal democratic
25	norms and values."
26	That last part is the third bullet point, by
27	the way.
28	This statement is true as well, to the best

1	of your knowledge?
2	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yes, Madam
3	Commissioner. And this goes back to a previous answer
4	provided to your question when you were asking me about when
5	did the threat environment change over time. And this is one
6	of the aspects of this, is Russia, and other states, but
7	Russia specifically, is trying to undermine the world, the
8	international rules based order to create an environment that
9	is more susceptible to benefit their own interests. And so
10	by doing so in order to do so, they're trying to undermine
11	democracies around the world, and that's why they are not as
12	interested as picking specific individuals or parties to win,
13	but undermine the democratic processes to what how people see
14	democracy as opposed to a democratic regime as we have in
15	Russia. This is one of the most significant elements that we
16	see that speaks to the change in threat environment over the
17	last number of years that we are to we have to deal with.
18	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: And is do you think
19	that Russia is doing all of this by accident, the three
20	statements that we just observed?
21	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: As I mentioned, I think
22	there is a very deliberate intent in how Russia executes
23	these actions.
24	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: So Russia, we can say
25	that Russia has
26	has an intent to interfere in our
27	democratic institutions; correct?
28	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Russia does intend on

1	interiering with our democratic institutions. It does so in
2	a different way than some other actors that we discussed
3	earlier. Their objective is mainly to divide societies and
4	create dissension as well as to reduce the attraction for
5	democracies in the west and throughout the world.
6	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Can we qualify this
7	intention? Is it a major intention, a minor intention?
8	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: I'd say that it's
9	from the activities that we've observed, not only in Canada
10	but elsewhere, that this is part of a well-thought-out plan
11	with different actors that are well coordinated, so I think
12	that we can say it's a concerted effort on the part of
13	Russia.
14	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: And so these documents
15	that Russian has a definite interest in causing foreign
16	interference, so is there a contradiction in saying that
17	Russia doesn't have the the question is difficult to
18	understand.
19	M. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner,
20	could you point me to a specific document so that I can
21	comment the question?
22	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: And I agree.
23	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Thank you, Madam
24	Commissioner.
25	So I'll refer to my notes.
26	It's probably in the summary that was
27	produced by the Commission.
28	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: This will be your last

28

1	question.
2	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Madam Commissioner,
3	can I ask it wasn't my intention to go here, but in the
4	context can I ask the witness to refer to this excerpt?
5	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: I understand, but
6	everybody has important questions and you have already gone
7	over your time, so choose what you want to do. Do you want
8	to refer to the document or do you want to ask your question?
9	It'll be one or the other.
LO	MR. MATTHEW FERGUSON: With respect, my
11	colleague Madam Commissioner, my colleague has not gone
12	over time.
13	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Well, I see that his
L4	cross-examination shouldn't have gone past 1732.
15	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Well, I would like two
16	extra minutes.
17	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Pose the question that
18	you have and we'll see where it leads. There are concerns
19	that we have to work with.
20	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Yes, I'm well aware of
21	that.
22	So we wanted a summary of the testimony as
23	it's written in paragraph 45.
24	It's document 0000045.
25	Paragraph 45, please.
26	EXHIBIT No. WIT 45:

Public Interview Summary: Mr. Lyall

King, Ms. Tara Denham, Ms. Gallit

1	Dobner, Mr. Eric Gordon, CSIS
2	Representative
3	(SHORT PAUSE)
4	MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: I believe Mr. King is
5	going to be here tomorrow.
6	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Well, seeing as we
7	don't have a lot of time, maybe we'll just I'll go
8	directly to my question and we won't bother with the
9	document, the summary.
10	So the question my next question has to do
11	with so we've concluded that Russia has a serious interest
12	in conducting foreign interference, so that is not in
13	dispute. We conclude that Russia's carried out significant
14	interference in 2019 and 2021; yes or no?
4	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, the
15	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULI. Madam Commissionel, the
15 16	testimony that I've given, that's not what it says. What our
16	testimony that I've given, that's not what it says. What our
16 17	testimony that I've given, that's not what it says. What our documents demonstrated, as I mentioned to our colleague
16 17 18	testimony that I've given, that's not what it says. What our documents demonstrated, as I mentioned to our colleague earlier, is that some clear means were used for to engage
16 17 18 19	testimony that I've given, that's not what it says. What our documents demonstrated, as I mentioned to our colleague earlier, is that some clear means were used for to engage in foreign interference, but we were able to establish that
16 17 18 19 20	testimony that I've given, that's not what it says. What our documents demonstrated, as I mentioned to our colleague earlier, is that some clear means were used for to engage in foreign interference, but we were able to establish that it was a base attack against democratic institutions rather
16 17 18 19 20 21	testimony that I've given, that's not what it says. What our documents demonstrated, as I mentioned to our colleague earlier, is that some clear means were used for to engage in foreign interference, but we were able to establish that it was a base attack against democratic institutions rather than any kind of focused action to bias electoral results.
16 17 18 19 20 21	testimony that I've given, that's not what it says. What our documents demonstrated, as I mentioned to our colleague earlier, is that some clear means were used for to engage in foreign interference, but we were able to establish that it was a base attack against democratic institutions rather than any kind of focused action to bias electoral results. MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: And those activities
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	testimony that I've given, that's not what it says. What our documents demonstrated, as I mentioned to our colleague earlier, is that some clear means were used for to engage in foreign interference, but we were able to establish that it was a base attack against democratic institutions rather than any kind of focused action to bias electoral results. MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: And those activities did not stop during the election of 2019, 2021.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	testimony that I've given, that's not what it says. What our documents demonstrated, as I mentioned to our colleague earlier, is that some clear means were used for to engage in foreign interference, but we were able to establish that it was a base attack against democratic institutions rather than any kind of focused action to bias electoral results. MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: And those activities did not stop during the election of 2019, 2021. MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner,
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	testimony that I've given, that's not what it says. What our documents demonstrated, as I mentioned to our colleague earlier, is that some clear means were used for to engage in foreign interference, but we were able to establish that it was a base attack against democratic institutions rather than any kind of focused action to bias electoral results. MR. GUILLAUME STROIS: And those activities did not stop during the election of 2019, 2021. MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, certain documents have been submitted that determine what we

1	So there's a clear interest and an organized
2	approach on the part of Russia to attack democratic
3	processes, and this is true in Canada. And we but in the
4	documents, we've actually specified how these were carried
5	out.
6	The Commissioner says the Director has
7	sorry.
8	What the documents say is that during the
9	election process, we didn't see any focused activity on the
10	part of Russia probably because that we probably didn't have
11	enough information because, as we said, Russia seeks to
12	divide society, so if those elections didn't create an
13	opportunity for them to sew discontent and discord, then it
14	doesn't mean that we're not concerned with their activities.
15	It's just that they weren't particularly active.
16	[No interpretation]
17	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: I just
18	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: [No interpretation]
19	MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: I was just going to
20	add one small point, and I think we say it quite well in the
21	summary, that Russia has a significant capability to augment
22	its interference and disinformation campaign should it chose
23	choose to do so. So while we may not have seen as much to
24	undermine the 43rd and 44th elections, should it choose, it
25	has the capability to engage in much greater interference in
26	the future.
27	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Counsel for Human Rights
28	Coalition.

1	CROSS-EXAMINATION MS. HANNAH TAYLOR:
2	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Good evening, everyone.
3	Mr. Vigneault, the panel's witness summary
4	notes that you explained that the process to determine
5	Canada's intelligence priorities is coordinated by the Privy
6	Council Office. You agree it's coordinated by the Privy
7	Council Office?
8	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: It's coordinated by the
9	Privy Council Office and but the priorities are issued by
10	the Cabinet.
11	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Also, Mr. Vigneault,
12	earlier you mentioned that CSIS has to produce intelligence
13	to protect all Canadians. Is investigating transnational
14	repression an intelligence priority of CSIS?
15	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner, the
16	I believe the intelligence parties, there's a plan to
17	I'm not sure if they've been made public yet, but I believe
18	there might be a plan to do so. Yes, we can say that, you
19	know, we're investigating foreign interference. In the case
20	of CSIS specifically, it includes transnational repression.
21	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Thank you. With counsel
22	for Mr. Chong and the Conservative Party, you discussed
23	provided providing briefings to those in government
24	vulnerable to potential foreign interference activity. Does
25	CSIS believe it's important to brief members of targeted
26	diaspora who are vulnerable to potential foreign interference
27	activity, including that which is related to elections?
28	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Madam Commissioner,

1	what we've said earlier about transnational repression,
2	there's something very important is that often, as my
3	colleague said, these are people who came to Canada to escape
4	conditions from other countries, and the fact they might be
5	subject to these tactics and actions here in Canada is
6	obviously unacceptable and that's why, you know, our mandate
7	is clear when investigating that. We have been increasing
8	our engagement with diaspora community over the years. As I
9	testified earlier, we have reallocated resources internally
10	to create a stakeholder engagement with the sole purpose of
11	engaging with communities. Our annual report of last year
12	and the upcoming one that will be tabled in Parliament very
13	soon by the Minister of Public Safety will speak at some
14	length of what how we have engaged with diaspora
15	community.

The last thing I would say, Madam

Commissioner, is going back to -- there are limitations of what we can say to people who engage outside government, as was discussed. Section 19 is precluding us from that. And the government as -- with us has engaged in consultations with Canadians, including specifically diaspora groups, to understand, you know, changes to the CSIS Act that would make us more relevant to engage in those discussions with diaspora communities.

MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: And so thinking within CSIS's limitations pursuant to the Act, would those efforts to engage with stakeholders -- let me rephrase, maybe. Within the limits of the Act, you believe that it's important

considered important?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

t	0	brief	indi	vi	dual	memb	oers	of	tar	geted	di	aspor	ra	commu	unities
i	f	they	face	а	threa	at?	Woul	.d	that	withi	Ln	your	li	mits	be

229

MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: This is where, Madam Commissioner, that it's getting difficult when we are going to very specifics, so if we talk of individual, you know, like, individual specific threat, it becomes complicated because that would mean revealing classified information if it's so specific. So we tend to engage at organization level. If we are aware of any activity, and this is something that we have to be very clear, we have any intelligence or indication that someone might be under threat, we are immediately engaging law enforcement to make sure that, you know, they raise -- an action can be taken to protect individual. But this is one of the area -- counsel is speaking to one of the area that I think is part of the next phase of engagement with diaspora communities, and the next phase of discussion with Canadians on foreign interference is how can we be more specific, more engaged to have better impact to counter foreign interference.

MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Thank you. Commissioner, with your leave, I'm hoping to read paragraph 11 from the incamera examination summary of a branch within the CSIS ADR Directorate to the panel to get their opinion on what's mentioned in the paragraph. This document, it's not on our list, as it was made available last night. And, of course, I'll make it clear, with your leave.

COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Go ahead.

1	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Thank you. As and we
2	don't need to pull it up just because I think pursuant to
3	those rules to the Commission's rules, we should not be
4	pulling it up. But I'll make it clear to the panel, as this
5	summary is not yours, it and it has not been adopted it
6	has not been adopted into evidence, and it's not evidence
7	before the Commission. For the benefit of the Commission,
8	I'm talking about WIT 43, but again, I ask that it not be
9	pulled up.
10	Witnesses are not identified by name in the
11	summary. And just to provide a little bit of context to the
12	paragraph I'll read to you, immediately preceding that
13	paragraph, the summary makes reference or
14	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: I think it will be
15	better to put the document on the screen.
16	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Is that okay? Okay.
17	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Yes.
18	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Excellent. Thank you.
19	If we could, it's WIT 43 with 5 0s in the
20	middle, I believe. Okay. And we'd be going down to
21	paragraph 11. And we'll note just above in paragraph 10 the
22	last sentence, we're referring to the PRC, so it's
23	preferenced we're referring to the PRC. And I'll read out,
24	"Diaspora communities can be pressured
25	to vote in accordance with its
26	preference using sticks and carrots.
27	Witness two said that many members of
28	this diaspora community are afraid that

the PRC will know who they voted for 1 and do not dare vote against the 2 3 country's express preferences. Witness two believes that the PRC's ultimate 4 objective is to condition the response 5 6 of the diaspora community, so that they vote in a certain way without having to 7 be told to. The United Front Work is 8 that of work that is concern for CSIS 9 is when it is clandestine, deceptive 10 and threatening." (As read) 11 Do you agree with this observation, and if 12 so, to the extent that you can tell us, how does CSIS combat 13 14 this? MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: So, Madam Commissioner, 15 I do agree with this statement, and I would say that the 16 reference to the United Front Work is critical to understand 17 how PRC is engaging in foreign interference activities. 18 19 United Front Work is part -- is encapsulating a number of different parts of the Chinese Communist Party and of the 20 government of the PRC. Its budget is now larger than the 21 22 entire Ministry of Foreign Affairs. And their sole purpose is to work abroad to condition people and to be able to 23 exercise in a -- amongst other things, foreign interference 24 in those countries. Xi Jinping, president -- the leader of 25 China is considering United Front Work Department as one of 26 its magic weapons because it has the ability to condition so 27

much and to push the interest of the PRC abroad in a very

1 effective way.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

And so CSIS, as part of its intelligence work, will undertake a number of intelligence operations using all tools at our disposal to understand who are the actors, what are their modus operandi, and be able to inform government, and in some occasions, take threat reduction measures to diminish the threat activity of the United Front Work, but also, of other actors involved in those activities in Canada.

MS. MICHELLE TESSIER: If I can add, CSIS is very concerned about impacts on the diaspora communities, and is also very cognizant that certain individuals have a fear of the intelligence service. Some may have arrived here from countries that the intelligence service does not work in a democracy, and they may not feel comfortable coming to CSIS, and CSIS knows that, which is one of the reasons that, as the Director testified to earlier today, so much public communication is being done, and this inquiry being an example of that, in terms of communicating that CSIS does want to hear from the communities. And as the Director mentioned, we will work with -- we work with our law enforcement partners and have successfully done so in countering certain threats to the extent that we can. So we absolutely are very concerned about any threat to the diaspora communities and are welcoming for the cooperation.

MS. CHERIE HENDERSON: So I would just add onto that that it's fundamentally important for the Service, and therefore, for the rest of Canada and the diaspora

24

25

26

27

28

1	communities for us to be begin to build trust within the
2	diaspora communities, so that they will actually talk to us
3	as well and tell us what they are experiencing, and that
4	helps to strengthen the overall awareness of exactly what's
5	going on within our country. It's fundamental to us as
6	Canadians and all Canadians that we have this ongoing
7	conversation and we can start to inform everybody, so that
8	they recognize what they're seeing and that we can start to
9	build better structures to protect against it.
10	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Thank you very much,
11	everyone.
12	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
13	AG?
14	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BARNEY BRUCKER:
15	MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: I just wanted to perhaps
16	clear something up. In the various topical summaries that
17	have been introduced as CAN SUM 1 to 14 at the outset of your
18	testimony today contain a page of caveats, and I just wanted
19	to confirm that those caveats are not CSIS caveats. They're
20	caveats that have been developed and arrived at in
21	consultation and they are the government's caveats; is that
22	correct?

Conservative Party brought you to the -- I guess the

measures of this type may rely on past information,

summaries of the threat reduction measure briefings of Mr.

O'Toole and Mr. Chiu. Am I correct that threat reduction

MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: That's accurate.

MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: Mr. De Luca for the

27

28

mitigate the threat?

described, yes.

1	information gathered over time to help inform the person
2	who's being briefed of the nature of the threat?
3	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yes, the information
4	would include all information that is relevant. The
5	Ministerial directive was first issued, is the one that we
6	operated under for the briefing Minister for Mr. O'Toole and,
7	subsequently, there were clarification added to the direction
8	so that the briefing would be more tailored to be more
9	relevant, to include more of the relevant information as
10	opposed to all information that may be not confirmed, not
11	information that we would normally on. So there was an
12	evolution, I think it's important to mention, between the
13	first TRM discussion with Mr. O'Toole and subsequent to
14	subsequent one with Mr. Chiu.
15	MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: Sure. But my question
16	is, even in the briefing of Mr. O'Toole, which we understand
17	took place in May of 2023, would include or let me ask you
18	if it would include information that existed back in 2021 and
19	information that was obtained subsequent to that right up to
20	the time of the briefing.
21	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: That's accurate.
22	MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: And would it be fair to
23	say that the purpose of those briefings or as a threat
24	reduction measure would be to help educate one on a potential
25	threat to the person and on measures that might be taken to

MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Very accurately

1	MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: Okay. Early on in your
2	testimony, Mr. Cameron and Mr. MacKay took you through
3	various initiatives and measures that the service was
4	conducting. And is it fair that those initiatives and
5	measures that you describe, and there were quite a few of
6	them, are consistent with the intelligence priorities set by
7	Cabinet which are then flow to you through direction by
8	the Minister of Public Safety?
9	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: Yes, that's the case.
10	MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: Those are my questions.
11	Thank you.
12	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
13	So we have a last witness and I see that he's
14	in the room so we won't break. We'll just change the
15	witnesses.
16	Thank you very much.
17	MR. DAVID VIGNEAULT: [No interpretation]
18	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Sorry. I was looking at
19	the time.
20	(SHORT PAUSE)
21	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Good evening, Mr.
22	Basler.
23	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Madam Commissioner,
24	Gordon Cameron for Commission counsel. We have Bo Basler
25	here to speak as a representative of the CSIS regional
26	offices. Could I have the witness sworn or affirmed, please?
27	THE REGISTRAR: Could you please state your
28	name and spell your last name for the record?

1	MR. BO BASLER: It's Bo Basler, B-a-s-l-e-r.
2	MR. BO BASLER, Sworn:
3	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY MR. GORDON CAMERON:
4	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Good afternoon, Mr.
5	Basler. You might recollect that on February 20th the
6	Commission had an interview with you and two of your
7	colleagues whose identity has been anonymized, but have been
8	noted to have been other Directors General of other regions
9	working in CSIS.
10	Have you reviewed this summary to confirm
11	that insofar as information can be disclosed publicly, it is
12	an accurate summary of that interview?
13	MR. BO BASLER: It is, and I have, yes.
14	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thanks.
15	And insofar as it summarizes your input and
16	in respect of your recollection of the input of others at the
17	interview, do you adopt this summary as part of your evidence
18	before the Commission?
19	MR. BO BASLER: I do.
20	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you.
21	And for the record, that document is WIT 36.
22	EXHIBIT No. WIT 36:
23	CSIS Regions Officials Public Summary
24	of Classified Interview
25	MR. GORDON CAMERON: And also, Mr. Basler,
26	you might recollect that you this time on not on a panel, but
27	appearing just yourself, had an examination in camera by the
28	Commission. And have you had a chance to review the summary

1	of that in camera session that was prepared for public
2	disclosure?
3	MR. BO BASLER: I have, yes.
4	MR. GORDON CAMERON: And insofar as
5	information can be disclosed publicly, is it an accurate
6	summary of that in camera evidence?
7	MR. BO BASLER: It is, yes.
8	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you.
9	And you adopt that public summary of your in
10	camera evidence as part of your evidence today?
11	MR. BO BASLER: I do.
12	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Perhaps you could begin
13	by because we are short of time we don't need to go all
14	the way back to high school. If you could just give us a
15	quick account of your experience with the service and, in
16	particular, your experience with the regions and where you
17	are now.
18	MR. BO BASLER: I certainly can. I'll do it
19	in reverse order. I think that's probably the easiest.
20	So currently, I am the CSIS Counter Foreign
21	Interference Coordinator, so I'm based here in Ottawa in our
22	headquarters. It's a position I assumed and was created in
23	March of 2023, so last year.
24	Prior to that, I was the Director General of
25	British Columbia Region. I was in that role for almost three
26	years.
27	And prior to that, I was the Deputy Director
28	General of Operations in the service's Prairie Region.

1	I have been with the service since 2001 in a
2	variety of capacities spanning three different regional
3	offices and headquarters.
4	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you.
5	Now, we had some information when the CSIS
6	headquarters panel was here about the different roles of
7	headquarters and the regions, but we have you now as a former
8	Director General of one of the regions and now with an
9	overview of the situation from headquarters. Can you tell us
10	your perspective on the role that the primary role that
11	the regional offices of CSIS serve in the organization?
12	MR. BO BASLER: I think the best way to
13	describe the regional function is it's regions are focused
14	on collection of intelligence. It spans all mandates of the
15	service, but it's really the regions that deploy the tools
16	that are at the forefront of collecting that intelligence to
17	be able to send it back into our headquarters branch and our
18	central units to be able to do the analysis and
19	dissemination. But the regions, it's really the collection
20	and they control not only the collection but how we go about
21	the collection of the intelligence as well.
22	MR. GORDON CAMERON: All right. Now, on that
23	point, presumably the regional offices need to figure out
24	what to collect, what their priorities should be, where to
25	devote their resources
26	MR. BO BASLER: Correct.
27	MR. GORDON CAMERON: and whatnot.
28	Can you talk to me about the extent to which

1	regions give input to headquarters about what should be
2	collected, the extent to which headquarters gives input to
3	regions? How does that map get generated?
4	MR. BO BASLER: Sure. There's an ongoing
5	conversation daily depending on the level, weekly, monthly
6	between regional offices and our headquarter branches in
7	regards to the priorities that any given region is collecting
8	upon, so the overall intelligence priorities, I think it was
9	mentioned earlier, are established by the government,
10	approved by Cabinet. The service takes those and creates the
11	internal intelligence requirements that we can collect upon
12	under our mandate, and then the regions focus on what they
13	have the capacity to collect. So sometimes the collection
14	may be driven by capacity; it may be driven by the local
15	threat environment. The threat environment in one region of
16	the country may be a little different than another region of
17	the country.
18	So those conversations are ongoing between
19	regional offices and Headquarters on what any individual
20	region or unit should be prioritizing on. And it may be
21	as I noted, it may just be focused on what a region has
22	access to, or if a threat is presenting greater in one part
23	of the country than it is in another, that region, in
24	consultation with the Headquarters' branches, will prioritize
25	their collection activities in that particular region.
26	MR. GORDON CAMERON: That's very helpful.
27	Now, if you could talk about what happens
28	with the product. So the regions go out, they do whatever

1	they do to collect information, sources and surveillance, or
2	whatever techniques they have. They bring it into the
3	office, write it down. Take it from there to Headquarters.
4	MR. BO BASLER: Sure. After the collection
5	activity happens, it's produced into what would be, I think,
6	probably best termed as an internal intelligence report. So
7	if it's it doesn't matter if it's collected from, you
8	know, one of our communications analysts, one of our
9	intelligence officers or surveillance teams, they create the
10	report, they put it into the internal database, and direct it
11	towards our Headquarters' units, or another region if it's
12	applicable to activity that may be happening there.
13	So the intelligence gets collected, it gets
14	put into a digestible format; a report, if you will, into the
15	system, and then that's notified to our Headquarters'
16	counterparts, who are taking and consuming that intelligence
17	that's coming in from every different regional office across
18	the country.
19	So it's collected, kind of assessed at a
20	local level. So what a local assessment is done with it,
21	and then it's sent to our Headquarters' branches.
22	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Okay. Now, we're here
23	to think of this from exactly the perspective you just gave
24	it, the collection by the regions and send it to
25	Headquarters, but just to help with the sort of narrative arc
26	of there. It gets to Headquarters, all these pieces of
27	intelligence collected by the regions. Maybe just give us a
28	quick description of what happens when it gets to

Headquarters. 1 MR. BO BASLER: Sure. It's our Headquarters' 2 3 branches, there's a couple of different functions that they're responsible for, but in this context it's taking in 4 the intelligence, be it from the regional domestic offices, 5 from our international stations, our partners around the 6 7 world, our domestic partners, taking in all the different pieces of intelligence, assessing it, conducting the 8 analysis, be it on kind of a more tactical, focused analysis 9 or a more comprehensive analysis of a situation, taking 10 intelligence from everywhere. 11 They're also responsible for the 12 dissemination function. So taking, assessing that 13 14 information that's coming in from the regions or partners and 15 determining if it should go out to other government departments; and if so, which ones, or conducting the 16 analysis and then determining those analytical products, 17 where they should be distributed to. So it's that taking it 18 19 in and processing, analyzing, and dissemination function. MR. GORDON CAMERON: Okay. Now, were you 20 watching the Headquarters' panel when it was up? 21 22 MR. BO BASLER: I was, yes. MR. GORDON CAMERON: Okay. Well, then we can 23 be a little more compact, then. I just want you to give the 24 perspective, from a Regional Director General, of the dynamic 25 between the regions that are collecting the intelligence and 26 sending it off to Headquarters, Headquarters analyzes it. 27 And we heard some evidence from the Headquarters' witnesses, 28

BASLER

1	about the discussion that then goes on between the region, or
2	the regions, and Headquarters about what elements of the
3	intelligence that's sent to Headquarters ends up getting
4	actioned by Headquarters and disseminated to government.
5	MR. BO BASLER: Yes, it's important to note
6	in that context that all the intelligence, once it's
7	collected, it's actioned in some way. It may not be
8	disseminated immediately upon receipt out to another
9	government department, but it forms, and will always form,
10	part of our intelligence holdings.
11	So every piece of intelligence is important
12	to be able to understand a threat writ large. So it's always
13	important to the information going in. But Headquarters, the
14	branches and Headquarters are reviewing it, are assessing it
15	for its uniqueness, its pertinence to the intelligence
16	requirements of other government departments, or to senior
17	decision-makers. So they are evaluating it against the
18	holdings we have collected over the years, but also the other
19	intelligence coming in on that particular topic, and really
20	making that decision of to whom it should go out to.
21	As you had just noted, that is an ongoing
22	discussion on what the priorities are and what the collection

As you had just noted, that is an ongoing discussion on what the priorities are and what the collection priorities are, and how that information that gets collected, how it's being used. So regions, although they don't own the dissemination function, they certainly have an ongoing conversation with our Headquarters' branches, in terms of ensuring that what is being collected is the right type of information to be able to get it out to the rest of

27

28

1	government. That's why we exist; that's our raison d'être to
2	collect, to do that analysis and to inform, to advise
3	government.
4	So that conversation at a local level, like,
5	at a desk a unit level, between analysts and officers and
6	Headquarters and those in the region, that's an ongoing
7	conversation on a regular basis.
8	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Okay, thank you.
9	Just one last topic I wanted to raise with
10	you, just because there is information in the interview
11	summary about this, but just because it's been discussed
12	already today, I just want to get your perspective on it.
13	Are there occasions when the regions get
14	called upon to do, for example, briefings to candidates or
15	elected members, defensive or protective briefings with
16	respect to foreign interference? Don't need to talk about
17	any specific example, but is that one of the tasks that falls
18	to the regions on occasion? And if so, when is that the
19	case?
20	MR. BO BASLER: On occasion. If there were
21	to be a defensive briefing to an MP, generally speaking, the
22	majority of the times it would be a regional officer that
23	would go out and do that. Not exclusively; sometimes,
24	depending on the situation, may bring a subject matter expert
25	from Headquarters, but by and large the vast majority of the

times the interaction and engagement with individuals, be

they MPs or any other Canadian across the country, that's

done by our regional personnel. So it really is the regions

1	that are that face with local populations across the country.
2	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Thank you.
3	Now, Madam Commissioner, we have been
4	fortunate with this witness to have been able to develop a
5	witness a public summary of the witness interview, and a
6	public summary of the in-camera appearance of Mr. Basler that
7	are quite comprehensive, and they've been provided to the
8	parties. I think the best thing to do with the time
9	available to the Commission is to hand the microphone over to
10	the parties for cross-examination.
11	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
12	So the first one will be counsel for Jenny
13	Kwan, and I'm going to insist on the time. We have no choice
14	because we have a hard stop at 7:00.
15	MS. MANI KAKKAR: Thank you, Madam
16	Commissioner.
16 17	Commissioner CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. MANI KAKKAR:
17	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. MANI KAKKAR:
17 18	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. MANI KAKKAR: MS. MANI KAKKAR: My name is Mani Kakkar,
17 18 19	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. MANI KAKKAR: MS. MANI KAKKAR: My name is Mani Kakkar, counsel for Jenny Kwan.
17 18 19 20	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. MANI KAKKAR: MS. MANI KAKKAR: My name is Mani Kakkar, counsel for Jenny Kwan. I have some questions for you, Mr. Basler,
17 18 19 20 21	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. MANI KAKKAR: MS. MANI KAKKAR: My name is Mani Kakkar, counsel for Jenny Kwan. I have some questions for you, Mr. Basler, and I will respect the time, because I understand it's late
17 18 19 20 21 22	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. MANI KAKKAR: MS. MANI KAKKAR: My name is Mani Kakkar, counsel for Jenny Kwan. I have some questions for you, Mr. Basler, and I will respect the time, because I understand it's late for everyone. Actually, this follows very neatly from what
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. MANI KAKKAR: MS. MANI KAKKAR: My name is Mani Kakkar, counsel for Jenny Kwan. I have some questions for you, Mr. Basler, and I will respect the time, because I understand it's late for everyone. Actually, this follows very neatly from what Mr. Cameron just last talked about, which is the briefings.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. MANI KAKKAR: MS. MANI KAKKAR: My name is Mani Kakkar, counsel for Jenny Kwan. I have some questions for you, Mr. Basler, and I will respect the time, because I understand it's late for everyone. Actually, this follows very neatly from what Mr. Cameron just last talked about, which is the briefings. In the summary you talk about two different
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	MS. MANI KAKKAR: My name is Mani Kakkar, counsel for Jenny Kwan. I have some questions for you, Mr. Basler, and I will respect the time, because I understand it's late for everyone. Actually, this follows very neatly from what Mr. Cameron just last talked about, which is the briefings. In the summary you talk about two different kinds of briefings, defensive or protective security

1	just for a brief moment. Threat reduction measures and
2	can include a wide range of activity, of which a briefing
3	that includes classified information, or a series of
4	briefings are just one but one type of a threat reduction
5	measure. So I just don't want to leave the impression that
6	that is the only kind of threat reduction measurements that's
7	undertaken by the Service or by the Service in this space.
8	So there are we over a number of years now
9	have been engaging with elected officials at all levels of
10	government, federal, provincial, municipal, territorial,
11	Indigenous governments, their staff to do defensive
12	briefings. So these are engagement with those individuals or
13	their offices to increase their awareness of the foreign
14	interference threat. So it really is an awareness building.
15	It is not those briefings do not contain
16	specific classified information on individual threats to the
17	person we're engaging with, they're really designed and aimed
18	at increasing the resilience of the individual and of their
19	staff to that particular threat. So they're informed. We
20	discuss the individual like the overall threat of foreign
21	interference that they may face because of their position as
22	an elected official, but it's not specific necessarily to
23	them as an individual. We don't discuss kind of individual
24	threats.
25	A threat reduction measure that may contain
26	classified information which is designed to provide certain
27	specific classified pieces of classified information to the
28	elected official in order to inform them of the specific

1	threat and give them enough tools to reduce that threat.
2	So I think it's been mentioned earlier today
3	that the threat reduction measures undertaken by the Service,
4	they have to fit a number of criteria, one of which we have
5	to have reasonable grounds to believe that the threat exists,
6	as defined in the CSIS Act, but we also have to have
7	reasonable grounds as to believe that what we're undertaking,
8	so in these cases the provision of classified information
9	specific to the individual, allows them to take those
10	measures to reduce the threat.
11	So it's it really is those ones are
12	there's a nuance, but they're different in that they're
13	honestly focussed on helping the individual reduce the
14	specific threat as presented to them.
15	Does that
16	MS. MANI KAKKAR: That answers my question
17	and then some, so I appreciate that. And you mentioned that
18	your briefings are general in nature.
19	And I would ask that we pull Document JKW 69.
20	EXHIBIT No. JKW 69:
21	CSIS pamphlet provided to Jenny Kwan
22	during the 44th election
23	MS. MANI KAKKAR: And Commissioner, I ask for
24	your indulgence in this matter. I provided this document ID
25	to the Commission quite late in the day, given some of the
26	our documents we received from the Commission. This is a
27	CSIS document. It is a pamphlet or brochure that was
28	provided during a briefing to an MP.

1	And I just want to ask you, Mr. Basler, if
2	you're comfortable, that this is an example of the kind of
3	document that you would provide during one of the defensive
4	or protective briefings that you had mentioned?
5	And to the extent possible, it would be good
6	to rotate the document so it's a little bit more legible.
7	MR. BO BASLER: Can we go one more?
8	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: It's not easy to read,
9	this one.
10	MR. BO BASLER: Can we just scroll down to
11	the bottom of the oh, sorry. I just yeah. That was
12	what I wanted to be able to look at was the classification
13	level. So this is an unclassified document.
14	Yes, this would be the type of document that
15	we may leave behind on a defensive security briefing. When
16	we discuss the overall strategic threat of foreign
17	interference to be able to increase that resiliency, this
18	would be the type of document that yes.
19	MS. MANI KAKKAR: Thank you, Ms. Basler. And
20	when would you say that the regional offices began providing
21	these sorts of briefings?
22	MR. BO BASLER: To my best recollection, I
23	would think somewhere probably around 2018 or 2019. We have
24	been doing it for a number of years, a number within reason,
25	but as the foreign interference threat changed and we saw
26	somewhat of a difference in the way the threat was being
27	realised, we took action to be able to engage with individual
28	parliamentarians who were at higher levels of risk. So

1	that's been done for at least four or five years now.
2	MS. MANI KAKKAR: So you say four or five
3	parliamentarians in or around 2018 or 2019?
4	MR. BO BASLER: No. Sorry, four or five
5	years we've been doing it.
6	MS. MANI KAKKAR: Four or five
7	MR. BO BASLER: Yes.
8	MS. MANI KAKKAR: Okay.
9	MR. BO BASLER: Yeah.
10	MS. MANI KAKKAR: But it's a meaningful
11	difference.
12	MR. BO BASLER: Yeah.
13	MS. MANI KAKKAR: And would you be able to
14	estimate how many parliamentarians have gotten such a
15	briefing?
16	MR. BO BASLER: The last numbers, and I ask
17	that I not be quoted on a hard number on this, but the last
18	numbers I believe I saw were in excess of 65 or 70
19	parliamentarians have been briefed.
20	MS. MANI KAKKAR: In this general way.
21	MR. BO BASLER: Yes.
22	MS. MANI KAKKAR: And do you have any insight
23	into who made that decision or why or when?
24	MR. BO BASLER: To brief parliamentarians?
25	MS. MANI KAKKAR: To brief parliamentarians.
26	MR. BO BASLER: I don't have insights into
27	the individual decision. I feel it most likely was not a
28	decision by an individual person, but the recognition of the

1	threat and the threat environment in which we were living in
2	at the time that this started, and this might be a useful
3	tool for the organisation to deploy to help build that
4	resilience. But I don't I didn't attend the meeting where
5	the concept was approved for example.
6	MS. MANI KAKKAR: And have you gotten
7	feedback from those that you have provided those briefings to
8	as to their effectiveness?
9	MR. BO BASLER: We have received some
10	feedback, yes. We don't always get feedback, but we have
11	we've received it directly where individuals have said they
12	appreciate it. It has increased their awareness and their
13	understanding of the threat. We have also kind of heard
14	feedback, not necessarily direct to us, but that some
15	individuals have found them to be less useful, overly
16	general. I think that is completely understandable.
17	There is varying degrees, if you look at the
18	number of parliamentarians at the federal level. There are
19	going to be varying degrees of understanding of this threat.
20	So it's a when we're taking a somewhat of a unified
21	approach, a standard approach to each of these briefings,
22	it's going to be new to some individuals and not new to
23	another individuals.
24	MS. MANI KAKKAR: In the period that you have
25	been providing these briefings, both as a result of the
26	feedback, and you mentioned in your witness summary, the
27	evolution, for example, of the PRC strategy on foreign

interference, have you made changes to the kind of briefings

you provide to members of parliament? 1 MR. BO BASLER: The briefings -- I believe 2 the best way to phrase this is, is they represent our 3 understanding of the threat as the threat is being realised 4 at the time of the briefing. That understanding changes 5 6 every year. As we learn how individual threat actors are behaving, it changes our understanding, it changes our 7 approach, and therefore, it will inform and change the 8 9 briefing. So yes, the information that we're providing 10 in 2024, and I don't have the content of what was briefed if 11 one was done say last month and what was done in 2019 to do a 12 13 side-by-side comparison, but the -- I would assume the 14 difference, there would be a significant difference or a 15 difference in between the two because our understanding of the threat is different. 16 MS. MANI KAKKAR: I'm mindful of my time, so 17 I'll ask just one last question. Actually, I may try to 18 19 squeeze in two, but let's see. So when you provide these briefings, you --20 it seems to leave information for those candidates or those 21 22 members of parliament to be able to contact you if they discover any possible foreign interference. Have you found 23 that there has been an increase in the number of potential 24 foreign interference complaints your office has received? 25 MR. BO BASLER: Yeah, not -- yes, there are 26 more engagements. I'm not sure if I'd refer to them as 27 foreign interference complaints because it's -- I think 28

1	that's something that's it's a construct that lives in the
2	policing world a little more than this than our world.
3	When we go out and engage with Canadians across the country,
4	MPs included, it is very much designed to be able to build
5	the resilience but also open that line of communication.
6	So there are a number of individuals across
7	the country, MPs, that have continued that conversation with
8	the Service after that initial briefing, and we will continue
9	to engage them on their specific situations as part of the
10	relationships. But these briefings, that is one of the
11	functions of them is to open that door in line of two-way
12	communication individually.
13	MS. MANI KAKKAR: Okay. So that
14	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
15	MS. MANI KAKKAR: was more for me than
16	for you, but thank you so much for your answer.
17	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
18	Counsel for Michael Chong?
19	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GIB van ERT:
20	MR. GIB van ERT: Mr. Basler, I want to ask
21	you about some statements in the document WIT36.
22	If the Court Operator would put that on the
23	screen? And if you'll go to page 7 at the bottom, please?
24	There we are. Yeah. Exactly.
25	Just under the heading "PRC", Mr. Basler.
26	I'll read this to you so we all have it, but you're
27	contrasting the PRC strategies and level of influence, I
28	think it's fair to say, in 2019 in this country versus 2021.

1	And what you said is well, what the statement says is:
2	"Mr. Basler explained that in 2019,
3	candidates the PRC disliked received
4	little to no coverage in Chinese-
5	language news media, and would not be
6	invited to Chinese-Canadian community
7	events."
8	I'll just pause there. I was dumbstruck by
9	that. And I just want to make sure that I've understood you
10	correctly. Are is it the Service's view, in your
11	experience, that in 2019, again, the PRC, a foreign country
12	across the ocean, thousands of kilometres away, has such
13	influence in Chinese-language news media in this country,
14	again, five years ago now, that it could persuade media in
15	our country, Chinese-language media, a small segment perhaps,
16	but nevertheless, media in our country, to not cover people
17	who the PRC disliked? Is that what you're saying here, sir?
18	MR. BO BASLER: I think we need to
19	disentangle the broad statements from the specific
20	statements. So yes, absolutely it is our understanding that
21	there are levers that the People's Republic of China will
22	use, including influence over media outlets, some here, some
23	international, that Canadians access that aren't based here
24	in Canada. So the news media is not just restricted to that
25	which is produced here in Canada. So there are different
26	avenues or different means by which Canadians consume the
27	media. But using influence over those media outlets
28	absolutely is understood to be one of the techniques that's

BASLER

used. 1 That statement, though, is not a blanket 2 statement. It was part of a discussion which was a little 3 bit larger and a little bit more nuanced and included more 4 classified specifics as examples. 5 6 But yes, as a general statement, not a 7 blanket statement, that's accurate. MR. GIB van ERT: Thank you. That's very 8 helpful and I do take your point. I think if the idea were 9 limited to the notion that news media outside the country ---10 MR. BO BASLER: M'hm. 11 MR. GIB van ERT: --- might be influenced ---12 MR. BO BASLER: Yeah. 13 14 MR. GIB van ERT: --- by China, especially if they were coming from China, we might be a little less 15 surprised. I'd be a little less dumbfounded. 16 MR. BO BASLER: Fair. 17 MR. GIB van ERT: But your -- I think what 18 19 you said is, yes, it's outside the country, but it's also even within the country? 20 21 MR. BO BASLER: There absolutely is attempts 22 to make influence over Canada-based Chinese-language media outlets. Yes. 23 MR. GIB van ERT: Yes, attempts. But what I 24 thought you were saying here, and correct me if I've 25 26 misunderstood, is that there's successful ---MR. BO BASLER: Some. 27 28 MR. GIB van ERT: --- attempts in 2019?

1	MR. BO BASLER: Yes.
2	MR. GIB van ERT: Yeah. Thank you. And
3	likewise, PRC, again in 2019, had such influence that certain
4	candidates that were unpopular with the PRC would be
5	disinvited to events happening in our country?
6	MR. BO BASLER: Yes.
7	MR. GIB van ERT: All right. That I find
8	that staggering. And I thank you for bringing that to our
9	attention in this public forum.
10	Then you go on about 2021. Well, let me
11	finish reading the paragraph. You say: "The PRC's strategy"
12	We're talking about 2019 here:
13	"was to make these candidates
14	unappealing by rendering them
15	unknown"
16	MR. BO BASLER: M'hm.
17	MR. GIB van ERT:
18	"while heavily promoting the PRC's
19	favoured candidates."
20	And then you come on to 2021 and you say
21	that:
22	"By 2021, the [] strategy had
23	evolved, from passive shunning to
24	active reputational attacks."
25	And you give the example of Kenny Chiu, who
26	you note was labelled as racist or anti-Chinese.
27	So again, I just want to understand better.
28	If you can add anything to it, and I understand you were

BASLER

speaking in a different forum and you may not feel able to 1 add anything to it, in which case fine, please say so. But 2 again, I think this will open a lot of people's eyes and I do 3 invite you, if you are able, to explain that move to active 4 reputational attacks in this country? 5 6 MR. BO BASLER: Yeah. I think what I can say 7 is highlighting some of the I'd say negative space in between the two. So there was what appeared, at least in my region, 8 that there was a change in tactic in between the two 9 10 elections. Why there was a change in tactic, that is not 11 highlighted here. There can be a multitude of different 12 13 reasons, which may change it, including the fact that in 14 2019, there was not a pandemic and in 2021 there was; right? 15 So the ability to use the same levers and tools that may have been at a state's disposal in 2019 may not be as effective in 16 2021. 17 So while we saw a change in tactic, I'm not 18 19 willing or not in the position in this venue to go further into the details of why that may have been, besides a 20 statement that they are different and there is reasons behind 21 22 that, maybe. 23 MR. GIB van ERT: Thank you. And you mentioned your region at the time. And was that British 24 25 Columbia at the time for 2021? 26 MR. BO BASLER: Correct. MR. GIB van ERT: Right. So the region where 27

Mr. Chiu's riding was? Steveston-Richmond East?

1	MR. BO BASLER: Correct.
2	MR. GIB van ERT: Right. In this paragraph,
3	again, I don't want to read too much into it.
4	MR. BO BASLER: M'hm.
5	MR. GIB van ERT: I will tell you what I
6	think I'm reading into it, and you'll correct me if I've gone
7	too far.
8	You're describing observations in a shift in
9	strategy from and a shift in influence from 2019 to 2021.
10	Was your agency, if you're free to say, detecting the 2019
11	strategy in 2019? Or is it something that you look upon now
12	and can see, but didn't see at the time?
13	MR. BO BASLER: So I think, again, I'm going
14	to step back and disentangle some a couple of things.
15	First, we speak about the strategy or we
16	speak about the activities that we witnessed or that we saw
17	that our intelligence led us to believe we're undertaking.
18	That's not coupled with the influence; right? So it's not
19	what is detailed in the summary is the intelligence on the
20	activities undertaken, not the scope of influence of those
21	activities. So there's no commentary on how effective they
22	may or may not have been. So I just want to draw that
23	distinction. There's not that conclusion in this.
24	We are continually collecting intelligence
25	that is focused in the present and in the past, and with an
26	eye towards the future.
27	So our understanding of what we saw in 2019
28	would be informed by what we were collecting at the time. It

1	may also, when we collect something in 2019 and compare it
2	with something that we collected in 2014, we may understand
3	the relevance of that piece of intelligence that was
4	collected in 2014.
5	So something collected many years earlier may
6	all of a sudden inform us and become pertinent to our
7	understanding of 2019. The same thing looking forward. So
8	when we're collecting in 2019, it may be informing what we
9	might see and give us an opportunity to crystal ball, for
10	example, what may be coming in future elections. But it's
11	not purely restricted to our understanding of 2019 threat as
12	it was being realized is based only on the collection of
13	2019. It's the collection of stuff much earlier and much
14	later. We may get something a year from now which informs
15	our understanding of what happened in 2019.
16	MR. GIB van ERT: Thank you. My
17	MR. BO BASLER: It's a very common
18	occurrence.
19	MR. GIB van ERT: Thank you. My last
20	question.
21	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Yes, because your time
22	is over
23	MR. GIB van ERT: Thank you.
24	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: SO
25	MR. GIB van ERT: My last question is, are
26	you aware of any efforts that either the Service made or
27	other agencies, departments of the government made to advise
28	Chinese language candidates from any party of these sorts of

1	influences and activities that you were detecting, so that
2	they could arm themselves in advance of the 2021 election,
3	for instance?
4	MR. BO BASLER: Yeah, I think the best answer
5	I can give to that is that is, you know, a big part of why we
6	were engaging with the defensive security briefings, was to
7	increase that resilience and understanding to this threat.
8	MR. GIB van ERT: Thank you. You've been
9	very helpful.
10	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
11	So next one is Human Rights Coalition.
12	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. HANNAH TAYLOR:
13	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Hello, Mr. Basler. I
14	would like to refer you to a document submitted by the Human
15	Rights Coalition. It's a report prepared by Human Rights
16	Action Group and Secure Canada. It can be found at HRC 6.
17	And if the Court Reporter could please pull it up and turn to
18	page 129.
19	EXHIBIT No. HRC 6:
20	Combatting Transnational Repression
21	and Foreign Interference in Canada: A
22	Paper by Secure Canada and Human
23	Rights Action Group
24	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: And then I believe
25	make sure this is right. No, 129, and then on the sorry,
26	at 129 of the document, not the PDF, please. Okay. And
27	right there. So thank you very much.
28	On the right-hand column, the second

1	paragraph, starts with "Freedom House". I'll just read it
2	out to you.
3	"Freedom House states that while CSIS
4	and the RCMP maintain ways for
5	reporting national security
6	information, these are not specific to
7	transnational repression, and as most
8	reports are deemed not to be national
9	security related, they're not followed
10	up with by law enforcement." (As read)
11	In the context of election interference, and,
12	of course, I know you can speak to CSIS, RCMP, what are your
13	thoughts on this finding by Freedom House?
14	MR. BO BASLER: To have a full understanding
15	of their findings, I would kind of need to be able to read
16	everything that went into their findings. But kind of on a
17	general level, so not to deal with this is as finding on
18	transnational repression, so in terms of foreign interference
19	in the electoral space, we did one of the documents that
20	we've produced, I believe it might have been brought up when
21	the headquarters panel was in, we did produce that in, if I'm
22	not mistaken, six or seven different languages, so not just
23	in the two official languages, but foreign interference knew
24	we produced it in a number of languages, so that it could be
25	distributed and understood by non-native English or French
26	speakers. So that was a way to try and open up the door and
27	create that kind of two-way dialogue with communities across

the country and give them that avenue to be able to reach

27

28

speak to though.

1	back into the Service, if it's the Service or the RCMP, if
2	need be. That was our document
3	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Okay. Perhaps we'll move
4	to CSIS's public reporting or complaints mechanism more
5	specifically.
6	MR. BO BASLER: Sure.
7	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: To the extent you're
8	aware, did CSIS receive reports from diaspora members
9	regarding potential election interference in the 2019 and
10	2021 elections?
11	MR. BO BASLER: I am not aware personally,
12	but I was not in positions to be able to be aware of what was
13	coming into our tip line so.
14	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Do members of the public
15	in your opinion tend to know that they can contact you or
16	contact CSIS with complaints?
17	MR. BO BASLER: I believe so. We are as
18	accessible as we try and be accessible. Back when people
19	used phone books, we were in phone books. Nowadays, you
20	know, we have our website. We are engaging across the
21	country. Our regional offices are engaging across the
22	country. Our academic outreach stakeholder engagement units
23	is engaging with community groups across the country. So the
24	trying to raise the awareness to ensure that Canadians
25	have that ability to reach up, pick up the phone, send us an

email, do the tip line, whatever it may be. So a fair amount

of outreach does happen. Its efficacy, I don't think I can

1	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Speaking to, I suppose
2	you talked about appearing in phone books, now online, over
3	the phone, information about the tip line and how it can be
4	accessed, is that advertised in language other than English
5	and French, to your awareness?
6	MR. BO BASLER: I'm not a hundred per cent
7	sure. I wouldn't be able to give a definitive answer one way
8	or another on that.
9	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Okay.
10	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Your time is over.
11	MS. HANNAH TAYLOR: Yes, I'm afraid. Thank
12	you.
13	MR. BO BASLER: Thank you.
14	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
15	So next one is Mr. Sirois for RCDA.
16	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS:
17	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Merci. Guillaume
18	Sirois for the RCDA. Are you aware of any foreign
19	interference or influence activity in our electoral processes
20	conducted by the Russian Intelligence Services in Canada
21	during the $43^{\rm rd}$ and $44^{\rm th}$ general elections?
22	MR. BO BASLER: I would draw on I don't
23	have the authority to pull up on the screen or ask, but in
24	our country summary on Russia, we detailed that we didn't see
25	a significance of Russian attempts at interference in those
26	elections.
27	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: But in your witness
28	summary, there's no mention about Russia; is that right?

1	MR. BO BASLER: I do not believe there is any
2	mention in the witness summary, no.
3	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Is that because
4	MR. BO BASLER: So I meant the country
5	summary
6	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Right.
7	MR. BO BASLER: that we produced, but,
8	no, I don't believe in my witness summary that there's
9	mention of Russia.
10	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: And is it because
11	Russia was not a concern or is it because there was no
12	questions further questions asked about the topical
13	summaries during the interviews and in-camera hearings about
14	Russia?
15	MR. BO BASLER: Right. So the both the
15 16	MR. BO BASLER: Right. So the both the topical summaries, the publicly releasable versions of the
	_
16	topical summaries, the publicly releasable versions of the
16 17	topical summaries, the publicly releasable versions of the in-camera hearings and the publicly releasable versions of
16 17 18	topical summaries, the publicly releasable versions of the in-camera hearings and the publicly releasable versions of the interviews, all three are information which can be
16 17 18 19	topical summaries, the publicly releasable versions of the in-camera hearings and the publicly releasable versions of the interviews, all three are information which can be released and discussed publicly. The information which
16 17 18 19 20	topical summaries, the publicly releasable versions of the in-camera hearings and the publicly releasable versions of the interviews, all three are information which can be released and discussed publicly. The information which cannot be released for national security grounds is not found
16 17 18 19 20 21	topical summaries, the publicly releasable versions of the in-camera hearings and the publicly releasable versions of the interviews, all three are information which can be released and discussed publicly. The information which cannot be released for national security grounds is not found in those documents. So the reason I give that explanation is
16 17 18 19 20 21	topical summaries, the publicly releasable versions of the in-camera hearings and the publicly releasable versions of the interviews, all three are information which can be released and discussed publicly. The information which cannot be released for national security grounds is not found in those documents. So the reason I give that explanation is so it's not the absence of a conversation in a public
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	topical summaries, the publicly releasable versions of the in-camera hearings and the publicly releasable versions of the interviews, all three are information which can be released and discussed publicly. The information which cannot be released for national security grounds is not found in those documents. So the reason I give that explanation is so it's not the absence of a conversation in a public document doesn't mean a conversation did or did not occur.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	topical summaries, the publicly releasable versions of the in-camera hearings and the publicly releasable versions of the interviews, all three are information which can be released and discussed publicly. The information which cannot be released for national security grounds is not found in those documents. So the reason I give that explanation is so it's not the absence of a conversation in a public document doesn't mean a conversation did or did not occur. It's what can be publicly released in the documents.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	topical summaries, the publicly releasable versions of the in-camera hearings and the publicly releasable versions of the interviews, all three are information which can be released and discussed publicly. The information which cannot be released for national security grounds is not found in those documents. So the reason I give that explanation is so it's not the absence of a conversation in a public document doesn't mean a conversation did or did not occur. It's what can be publicly released in the documents. MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Okay. But your

1	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: What is your question,
2	I'm sorry?
3	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: I want to know if the
4	witness discussed with the Commission about Russian
5	interference prior to his testimony today. I want to know
6	more about Russian interference in the last two elections in
7	the context of the topical summary that was submitted.
8	MR. GORDON CAMERON: Madam Commissioner, I
9	think this is a point where the witness has done as well as
10	counsel could have done to state the dilemma he's in, that a
11	great deal of effort's been put into saying what can be said
12	publicly
13	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: I'll move on.
14	MR. GORDON CAMERON: and what can't.
15	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Thank you. Did CSIS
16	witness any rise in what we know as IMVE, being ideologically
17	motivated violent extremism in the days or weeks leading up
18	to the 2021 election?
19	MR. BO BASLER: I'm not a so the IMVE
20	investigation is under the remit of our counter-terrorism
21	branch. I am not an expert in that area, so I can't say if
22	in the weeks leading up so the very small timeframe of the
23	weeks leading up to the election that there was an increase
24	in IMVE related threat activity. I'm not in a position to be
25	able to say that. It is, broadly speaking, it is a threat
26	that has been increasing over the years, absolutely.
27	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Okay. But you cannot
28	talk about any increase during the election period,

1	specifically?
2	MR. BO BASLER: I can't, no; I'm sorry.
3	MR. GUILLAUME SIROIS: Thank you. No further
4	questions.
5	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
6	Sikh Coalition.
7	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Thank you, Commissioner.
8	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRABJOT SINGH:
9	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: If Mr. Court Operator can
10	bring up Mr. Basler's witness summary, page 7.
11	And Mr. Basler, if you could remind me, you
12	were the Director General of CSIS's B.C. regional office.
13	Can you remind me of what time period that was in?
14	MR. BO BASLER: I was. I arrived in the
15	summer of 2021, and then began this position in 2023 on a
16	temporary basis, and then transitioned to a
17	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Oh, so you're now the
18	Counter Foreign Interference Coordinator; correct?
19	MR. BO BASLER: That is correct.
20	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And so from that vantage
21	point, and I would imagine the Service has some institutional
22	memory as well, would you agree with me that Indian foreign
23	interference activity in Canada, whether that's transnational
24	repression or electoral interference, has increased from say
25	2017 until now, and including the last two electoral periods?
26	MR. BO BASLER: I'm actually not, I think,
27	well positioned to put a baseline level in one year versus
28	another year. It certainly is a threat that has been on the

1	radar, yes, and is a threat that has been obviously of
2	importance to the Service and to the government, but I I'm
3	not I don't think I'm positioned to be able to say there
4	was a certain level of activity in 2017 and then in 2019 and
5	then 2021. I can't I can't graph it like that for you;
6	I'm sorry.
7	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Right. Yeah, that's
8	fair. And so referring to page 7 of your witness summary, it
9	is fair to say, however, that India is only second to the PRC
10	in terms of the level of foreign interference in Canada.
11	Fair?
12	MR. BO BASLER: Is that on page 7? Sorry.
13	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Yeah, in the middle of
14	page 7, Foreign Interference Involved In FI:
15	"The witness indicated that in India,
16	while a clear second to PRC in terms
17	of the level of a foreign
18	interference threat" (As read)
19	MR. BO BASLER: Yeah.
20	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Is that a fair statement?
21	MR. BO BASLER: That's a fair statement.
22	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And I want to draw your
23	attention to that last sentence in that paragraph that, "All
24	interviewees", that's yourself and two of your CSIS
25	colleagues:
26	"agreed that foreign interference
27	by India was corrosive to Canadian
28	democratic processes and to regional

1	community cohesion." (As read)
2	Could I ask you to expand on the latter part?
3	What did you mean about being corrosive to regional community
4	cohesion?
5	MR. BO BASLER: So I think the one of the
6	documents that you have accessed to is the country summary
7	for India that was primarily produced by the Service in
8	consultation with other government departments. In that
9	particular document, we discuss the fact that the Government
10	of India undertakes has different driving forces behind
11	why it undertakes foreign interference activities. One of
12	those is to counter what it perceives as threats to its own
13	internal stability.
14	And as soon as any country, India included,
15	but as soon as any country does those kinds of activities
16	focussed on a particular element of Canadian society, so in
17	this case what it perceives as threats, which is individuals
18	or groups that are advocating for an independent Sikh
19	homeland, that is corrosive to Canadian society. So that's
20	the context in there, and it's corrosive to community
21	cohesion as well.
22	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: So sorry, just to
23	clarify. So India's targeted activity that targets Sikh
24	advocates for a Sikh homeland and the results of that
25	targeting is what leads to the breakdown in community
26	cohesion?
27	MR. BO BASLER: I think the way to best
28	characterise that is it certainly is a factor, absolutely,

1 yes. MR. PRABJOT SINGH: And so a lot of observers 2 of India's ruling party, the VJP, talk about how Indian 3 officials seek to polarise politics along sectarian and 4 ethnic and identity lines. So when you talk about being 5 corrosive to community cohesion, is that polarisation within 6 7 diaspora communities something that you're referring to as a byproduct of India's foreign interference? 8 MR. BO BASLER: My understanding that this 9 part of the Inquiry is focussed on the electoral space as 10 opposed to simply that -- the cohesion matters. So I think 11 the -- I'll draw back to the country summary as produced 12 13 because that document really reflects the understanding that 14 the Service has, again in consultation with other government departments, on their activities focussed on those elections. 15 And that's really what has been produced and about as far as 16 I'm going to be able to discuss in the confines of this 17 Inquiry. 18 19 MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Madam Commissioner, I see that my time is ---20 21 COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Your time is over. MR. PRABJOT SINGH: --- over. I'm trying to 22 follow up -- my last follow up just to clarify a little bit? 23 COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Ask your question, but -24 25 26 MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Sure. COMMISSIONER HOGUE: --- I'll see whether I 27 28 permit it or not.

1	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Okay. Sure.
2	I am just trying to understand like so
3	we're talking about electoral interference, and within that
4	context this community cohesion has been referenced, and I'm
5	just trying to are you not able to expand upon what those
6	impacts are on the ground in Canada?
7	MR. BO BASLER: Am I free to
8	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: You can answer.
9	MR. BO BASLER: Thank you.
10	The referencing was not done by the Service.
11	So again, I draw back to the country summary in terms of the
12	publicly releasable information that we have relative to the
13	Government of India's attempts at interference in the
14	electoral processes.
15	MR. PRABJOT SINGH: Thank you, Commissioner.
16	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
17	AG?
18	MR. BARNEY BRUCKER: It's late. No
19	questions.
20	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Re-examination?
21	MR. GORDON CAMERON: No re-examination.
22	Thank you.
23	COMMISSIONER HOGUE: Thank you.
24	So we'll resume tomorrow morning at 9:30.
25	THE REGISTRAR: Order, please.
26	This sitting of the Foreign Interference
27	Commission has adjourned until tomorrow at 9:30 a.m.
28	Upon adjourning at 6:47 p.m.

1	
2	CERTIFICATION
3	
4	I, Sandrine Marineau-Lupien, a certified court reporter,
5	hereby certify the foregoing pages to be an accurate
6	transcription of my notes/records to the best of my skill and
7	ability, and I so swear.
8	
9	Je, Sandrine Marineau-Lupien, une sténographe officielle,
10	certifie que les pages ci-hautes sont une transcription
11	conforme de mes notes/enregistrements au meilleur de mes
12	capacités, et je le jure.
13	
14	Jeff upo
15	Sandrine Marineau-Lupien
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	