Exchange of Emails between Democracy Watch and Privy Council Office (PCO) re: DWatch's *ATIA* Request (Filed August 28, 2025) for Details About Enforcement of Prime Minister Mark Carney's Two Self-Imposed Ethics Screens from March 14, 2025 to July 10, 2025

(in reverse chronological order as of November 11, 2026)

To: Moore, Kathryn <Kathryn.Moore@pco-bcp.gc.ca> , David.Neilson@pco-bcp.gc.ca <David.Neilson@pco-bcp.gc.ca> , Jonathan.Lemieux@pco-bcp.gc.ca <Jonathan.Lemieux@pco-bcp.gc.ca>
From: <info@democracywatch.ca>
02 Sep, 26 12:36:17 PM
Re: Scope Clarification for A-2025-00421 and A-2025-00516

Dear Ms. Moore and all,

I am following again specifically with regard to my *ATIA* request #A-2025-00516. As I am sure you know, the PCO sent a letter in May to the House Ethics Committee concerning how many times Prime Minister Carney's Ethics-Commissioner-approved ethics screen had been "invoked" since the screen came into force in July 2025, as reported on June 23rd by the *Toronto Star* in this article:

https://www.thestar.com/politics/federal/mark-carney-sidelined-from-at-least-17-government-deliberations-because-of-corp orate-conflicts/article_e69b9a88-9bdc-4268-8d73-a8c1f70d395f.html

As a result, it is simply impossible that some of the records I requested have not been fully processed by now. Please send those fully processed records to me now, and please send all future records to me as soon as they are fully processed.

In other words, stop blatantly violating the *ATIA*.

Duff

On Wed, 24 Jun 2026 18:00:46 -0400 info@democracywatch.ca wrote:

Thank you Ms. Moore for your email, and the clarification which I approve of for both of my *ATIA* requests. I look forward to receiving both sets of records soon.

Sincerely,
Duff Conacher, Co-founder
Democracy Watch
P.O. Box 821, Stn. B
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5P9

Tel: 613-241-5179
Fax: 613-241-4758
Email: info@democracywatch.ca
Internet: http://democracywatch.ca
Twitter: @DemocracyWatchr
Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/DdemocracyWatch

On Wed, 24 Jun 2026 19:38:11 +0000 "Moore, Kathryn" wrote:

Good afternoon,

Thanks for taking my call this morning. I am writing to recap the additional clarifications discussed for your two Access to Information requests on the PM ethics screen (**A-2025-00421** & **A-2025-00516**).

As per our discussion, as the selection of only one record is not feasible, the following options were presented as an alternative to narrow the scope of your requests and reduce remaining processing time (again, with apologies for the delay thus far):

1. Limit responsive records to final versions only, or in the event that no final version exists, the most recent draft only.
2. Exclude records that are likely to be fully withheld as a Cabinet Confidence.
3. Exclude emails as not relevant, only process their attachments if responsive to point #1.

For further clarity, regarding point #2, records that likely contain only portions of Cabinet Confidences will continue to be processed as responsive to ensure you receive as complete a response as possible. Regarding point #3, this change in scope will mean the severing out of emails as not relevant and processing their attachments if they meet criteria from point #1, or their full exclusion from scope when they do not have relevant attachments.

If you could kindly confirm acknowledgement, it would be greatly appreciated. Unless you have concerns with the above, we will add these 3 points to each request text and work to provide responses to your requests as soon as possible.

Thank you,
Katie Moore

Deputy Director, Access to Information and Privacy
Privy Council Office / Government of Canada
Kathryn.Moore@pco-bcp.gc.ca / Tel: 613-844-6219

Directrice adjointe, accès à l'information et protection des renseignements personnels

Bureau du Conseil Privé / Gouvernement du Canada
Kathryn.Moore@pco-bcp.gc.ca / Tél: 613-844-6219

To: Lemieux, Jonathan <Jonathan.Lemieux@pco-bcp.gc.ca>
From: <info@democracywatch.ca>
Cc: Moore, Kathryn <Kathryn.Moore@pco-bcp.gc.ca> , ATIP request / demande AIPRP (PCO/BCP) <ATIPR-DAIPRP@pco-bcp.gc.ca>
02 Sep, 26 11:54:02 AM
Re: FW: Clarification Required for Access to Information Request File A-2025-00421

Hello again Mr. Lemieux and all,

We just exchanged emails about another *ATIA* request I have filed. As a result, I am hoping you can also quickly respond today to this email. In your email to me of May 19th, set out below, the latest PCO email in my long and ongoing exchange of emails with PCO officials dating back to last September, you wrote:

"our subject matter experts have identified relevant records. These records require consultation as part of the processing, which can take some additional time.

I apologize that your request was not completed by the extended due date, and want to reassure you that we are continuing to work on it as a priority and will respond as soon as possible."

Three-and-a-half months have passed, and none of the records I requested have been disclosed.

It is simply impossible that some of the records I requested have not been fully processed by now. Please send those fully processed records to me now, and please send all future records to me as soon as they are fully processed.

In other words, stop blatantly violating the *ATIA*.

Duff

On Tue, 19 May 2026 15:52:56 +0000 "Lemieux, Jonathan" wrote:

Hi Duff Conacher,

Thank you again for reaching out.

Please be assured that your request is important to us.

I wanted to clarify that we have identified records responsive to your request. Under the Act, our role is to provide access to existing records under the control of the institution, rather than to create new records or provide direct answers to questions.

To help address the questions in your request, our subject matter experts have identified relevant records. These records require consultation as part of the processing, which can take some additional time.

I apologize that your request was not completed by the extended due date, and want to reassure you that we are continuing to work on it as a priority and will respond as soon as possible.

Thank you again for your note, and please don't hesitate to reach out if you have any questions.

Warmly, Jonathan

Jonathan Lemieux

Deputy Director, Access to Information and Privacy
Privy Council Office / Government of Canada
Tel: 613-957-5812 / Cel: 343-551-7283

Directeur adjoint, Accès à l'information et protection des renseignements personnels
Bureau du Conseil Privé / Gouvernement du Canada
Tél: 613-957-5812 / Tél. cell: 343-551-7283

From: info@democracywatch.ca <info@democracywatch.ca>**Sent:** Friday, May 15, 2026 1:35 PM**To:** Lemieux, Jonathan <Jonathan.Lemieux@pco-bcp.gc.ca>**Cc:** ATIP request / demande AIPRP (PCO/BCP) <ATIPR-DAIPRP@pco-bcp.gc.ca>; Pitre, Gracen <Gracen.Pitre@pco-bcp.gc.ca>**Subject:** Re: Clarification Required for Access to Information Request File A-2025-00421

Hello again Mr. Lemieux and all,

In your email of Feb. 17th Mr. Lemieux, you wrote:
"Please don't hesitate to reach out if you have any questions — I'm here to help.
Warmly,
Jonathan"

I reached out on April 13th by sending the email below. Neither you nor anyone else has responded since. You are now almost four months past your own self-selected extension deadline of January 25th.

Again, there can't be that many records covered by my request as I only requested one record confirming each of the pieces of information that I requested (the answers to the list of questions), and no consultations are required to clear the disclosure of personal or proprietary information in any of the records because I clearly stated in my request that I did not request any of those kinds of information.

Will you now send me the records that you have processed. You have no legal or valid reason or right to refuse to do this. You can, fully legally, disclose records as they are processed.

If you refuse to send me the records you have processed and cleared for disclosure by tomorrow, I will conclude that you have decided to continue to deliberately violate the*ATIA* . While all of you may feel fine about violating the law, given that there are no penalties for violating the*ATIA*, I am sure you must be at least a little bit aware of how badly you and the PCO will look when the public becomes aware of the ongoing violation and denial of the public's right to know.

Duff

On Mon, 13 Apr 2026 09:27:55 -0400 info@democracywatch.ca wrote:

Dear Mr. Lemieux and all,

I hope all is well. I am getting in touch as I have not heard anything from anyone at PCO concerning my ATIA request , PCO File #A-2025-00421, even though almost two full months have passed since you sent your email below on February 17th.

You said in your email that you had received records, and that "processing of your request is continuing, and your file remains a priority for us."

Given those statements, I would have expected to have received at least some of the requested records by now. There can't be that many records covered by my request as I only requested one record confirming each of the pieces of information that I requested (the answers to the list of questions), and no consultations are required to clear the disclosure of personal or proprietary information in any of the records because I clearly stated in my request that I did not request any of those kinds of information.

As you noted, you violated your own extension deadline of January 25, 2026. Will you now send me the records that you have processed. You have no legal or valid reason to refuse to do this. You can, fully legally, disclose records as they are processed.

If you refuse to send me the records you have processed and cleared for disclosure by tomorrow, I will conclude that you are continuing to deliberately violate the*ATIA*.

Duff

On Tue, 17 Feb 2026 16:09:08 +0000 "Lemieux, Jonathan" wrote:

Hi Duff Conacher,

Thanks for your note.

I apologize for any confusion caused by my previous email — I realize I was not clear enough about the purpose of the correspondence.

I'm pleased to let you know that we have begun processing your request and have received records. You are correct that last year we applied an extension, as external consultations are required before any disclosure.

The purpose of my earlier email — which I did not articulate properly — was to let you know that an additional tasking with a Secretariat was flagged to ensure we provide a complete and accurate response. The subject matter experts in that Secretariat needed some clarity on how the request text was phrased, so to help them locate and retrieve responsive records within a reasonable timeframe, we reformatted the request text slightly for clarity. This did not change the intent or theme of your original request. We simply did not want to proceed with even minor wording adjustments without your awareness and agreement.

We are pleased to confirm that processing of your request is continuing, and your file remains a priority for us.

I regret to inform you that we have now exceeded the extended legislated due date. As you know, you are entitled to submit a complaint to the Office of the Information Commissioner, as the request is now in deemed refusal due to the delay.

Please don't hesitate to reach out if you have any questions — I'm here to help.

Warmly,
Jonathan

Jonathan Lemieux
Deputy Director, Access to Information and Privacy
Privy Council Office / Government of Canada
Tel: 613-957-5812 / Cel: 343-551-7283

Directeur adjoint, Accès à l'information et protection des renseignements personnels
Bureau du Conseil Privé / Gouvernement du Canada
Tél: 613-957-5812 / Tél. cell: 343-551-7283

From:info@democracywatch.ca <info@democracywatch.ca>**Sent:** Friday, February 13, 2026 10:22 AM **To:** ATIP-AIPRP < ATIP-AIPRP@pco-bcp.gc.ca>**Cc:** ATIP request / demande AIPRP (PCO/BCP) <ATIPR-DAIPRP@pco-bcp.gc.ca>; Lemieux, Jonathan < Jonathan.Lemieux@pco-bcp.gc.ca>; Pitre, Gracen <Gracen.Pitre@pco-bcp.gc.ca>**Subject:** Re: Clarification Required for Access to Information Request File A-2025-00421

Dear Mr. Lemieux and all,

Thank you for your email, and I hope all is well.

I am very surprised to receive this email, and at the same time not surprised at all given that the PCO routinely and regularly violates the *ATIA* by failing to disclose records within the legally required deadlines.

The letter I received from PCO on September 27, 2025 signed by Patrick Farley on behalf of David Neilson stated that you were granting yourselves an extension to January 25, 2026 for a consultation (which, in fact, was completely unjustifiable because I did not request any records containing any information that is covered by any exemption or exclusion in the *ATIA*).

Now you write to me on January 21, 2026 saying that you have not even begun to process my *ATIA* request? And your email says the same thing that the email from PCO in October re: my request File A-2025-00516?

This is an ongoing, completely unjustifiable, delay that blatantly violates the *ATIA*.

I very clearly stated in my initial request that I was requesting records of the items listed in my request. I approve the change to the wording of my request as you have proposed, unnecessary as the change in wording is.

Please confirm by reply email receipt of this email, and please also confirm exactly what new time extension you are unjustifiably (and illegally) granting to yourselves to further delay disclosing the requested records.

Thank you, and take care,
Duff Conacher, Co-founder
Democracy Watch
P.O. Box 821, Stn. B
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5P9
Tel: 613-241-5179
Fax: 613-241-4758
Email: info@democracywatch.ca
Internet: http://democracywatch.ca
Twitter: @DemocracyWatchr
Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/DemocracyWatch

On Wed, 21 Jan 2026 21:23:37 +0000 ATIP-AIPRP wrote:

Dear Duff Conacher,

This is further to your request under the Access to Information Act for the following information:

"After becoming Prime Minister (PM) on March 14, 2025, Prime Minister Carney stated on March 24, 2025 that he had set up two ethics screens, as reported in this Toronto Star article at: https://www.thestar.com/politics/federal/mark-carney-says-he-has-created-ethics-screens-to-avoid-conflicts-of-interest/article_61e72a88-3a68-4c6f-a71b-174b00abf321.html, both administered by the Clerk of the Privy Council, John Hannaford, and PM Carney's chief of staff in the Prime Minister's Office, Marco Mendicino. Please disclose via email, for each of the questions listed below, a record that contains the answer to each question listed below (to be clear, one record per question, not one record that answers all the questions (unless such a record exists)), with all information covered by the s. 19 "personal information" and/or by the s. 20 "third party information" exemptions in the Access to Information Act (ATIA) redacted so that no consultations are required with any individual or third party concerning disclosure of their personal or proprietary information. In addition, please disclose each record that answers each question as it is reviewed and cleared for disclosure under the ATIA – do not wait to disclose all together all the records that answer all the questions: 1. On what date did each of Prime Minister Mark Carney's two ethics screens come into force? 2. What did the two ethics screens say? (Please disclose both screen statements). 3. Did the PM's Chief of Staff and/or the PCO Clerk delegate the task of flagging discussions, decisions and/or votes for review to ensure compliance with either ethics screen? 4. If so, who were the people delegated this task and what are/were their job titles? 5. How many discussions, and separately how many decision-making processes, and separately how many votes, took place that involved or could have involved Mr. Carney during the time period these two ethics screens were in force? 6. For each of the two ethics screens, the number of times that a discussion was flagged for review to ensure compliance with that ethics screen? 7. For each of the two ethics screens, the number of times that Mr. Carney was prevented from participating in a discussion because the terms of the screen prohibited him participating in the discussion? 8. For each of the two ethics screens, the number of times that a decision was flagged for review to ensure compliance with that ethics screen? 9. For each of the two ethics screens, the number of times that Mr. Carney was prevented from participating in a decision because the terms of the screen prohibited him participating in the decision? 10. For each of the two ethics screens, the number of times that a vote was flagged for review to ensure compliance with that ethics screen? 11. For each of the two ethics screens, the number of times that Mr. Carney was prevented from participating in a vote because the terms of the screen prohibited him participating in the vote?"

Please note that before we can continue with the processing of your request, we require clarification.

Under the Access to Information Act, a request must be specific enough to allow the institution to locate and retrieve records that are under its control. The Act does not require institutions to answer questions or create new records.

To support this requirement, we have revised your request so that it focuses solely on records, rather than questions. Please let us know whether you agree with the proposed wording or if you would like to suggest any changes.

> **"Records (emails, memos, briefings, directives, logs, reports, notes, tracking documents, and any other materials—whether in draft or final form) held by your institution relating to Prime Minister Mark Carney's two ethics screens that contain:**
>
> **1. The full text of each ethics screen statement.**
>
> **2. Records documenting any delegation by the Prime Minister's Chief of Staff and/or the Clerk of the Privy Council assigning responsibility for identifying or flagging discussions, decision making processes, or votes for review under either ethics screen.**
>
> **3. Records identifying the individuals to whom such responsibilities were delegated, including their names and job titles.**
>
> **4. Records indicating the number of discussions, the number of decision-making processes, and the number of votes that involved or could have involved the Prime Minister during the period in which each ethics screen was in force.**
>
> **5. For each of the two ethics screens, records showing the number of instances in which a discussion was flagged for review under the terms of the screen.**
>
> **6. For each ethics screen, records showing the number of instances in which the Prime Minister was prevented from participating in a discussion because of the screen.**
>
> **7. For each ethics screen, records showing the number of instances in which a decision was flagged for review.**
>
> **8. For each ethics screen, records showing the number of instances in which the Prime Minister was prevented from participating in a decision because of the screen.**
>
> **9. For each ethics screen, records showing the number of instances in which a vote was flagged for review.**

10. For each ethics screen, records showing the number of instances in which the Prime Minister was prevented from participating in a vote because of the screen.

This request includes any logs, tracking spreadsheets, records of decision, compliance records, summaries maintained by ministerial or PCO staff, or any other documents used to record compliance with the ethics screens."

Please note that your file is on hold and we will resume the processing of your request once we receive your clarification.

Should you have any questions concerning your request, please contact us at ATIP-AIPRP@pco-bcp.gc.ca.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Lemieux

Deputy Director, Access to Information and Privacy
Privy Council Office / Government of Canada
Tel: 613-957-5812 / Cel: 343-551-7283

Directeur adjoint, Accès à l'information et protection des renseignements personnels
Bureau du Conseil Privé / Gouvernement du Canada
Tél: 613-957-5812 / Tél. cell: 343-551-7283

NOTE:

In October 2025, Democracy Watch received a letter from the federal Cabinet Privy Council Office (PCO) extending PCO's legally required September 25, 2026 disclosure deadline to January 25, 2026 for responding to an *Access to Information Act* (*ATIA*) request DWatch filed on August 28, 2025, PCO File A-2025-00421. DWatch's request asked for disclosure of basic records that provide basic details that PCO officials must have on hand every day if they actually enforced Prime Minister Mark Carney's initial two ethics "screens".

As set out above in the initial email from PCO on January 21, 2026, this *ATIA* request by DWatch applies to the time period of Prime Minister Carney's initial two ethics screens that he claims established for himself when he became PM in March 2025 until that screen was replaced by an equally loophole-filled "screen" approved by federal Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner Konrad von Finckenstein. The exact date the Ethics Commissioner-approved screen came into force has not been publicly disclosed, but it was made public on July 11th.