

Leader of the Government
in the House of Commons



Leader du gouvernement
à la chambre des communes

Ottawa, Canada K1A 0A5

PROTECTED B - SENSITIVE
PERSONAL INFORMATION
SUBJECT TO RECUSAL BY THE
PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Jagmeet Singh
Leader of the New Democratic Party
c/o Mr. Guy Caron, M.P.
Parliamentary Leader of New Democratic Party
in the House of Commons
Room 541-S, Centre Block
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Dear Mr. Singh:

In accordance with the *Parliament of Canada Act* (the Act), I am writing with regard to its requirement for consultation on the appointment of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner. As you are aware, the Prime Minister and certain senior officials in his office have recused themselves from all matters related to the appointment of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner and they have deliberately not participated in any matters related to this appointment. In that respect, I am writing to you in my capacity as the Minister delegated by the Prime Minister as responsible for this appointment.

Following an open, transparent and merit-based selection process, I propose the nomination of Mario Dion as the next Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner for a term of seven years. Mr. Dion not only meets the stringent statutory requirements for the position, but he also has previously served as an Agent of Parliament. His biography is enclosed. As stipulated in the Act, the proposal to appoint Mr. Dion must be submitted to Parliament for approval by resolution of the House of Commons.

Mr. Dion is a lawyer, who has served with distinction in a number of senior positions in the public service including at Justice Canada, Corrections Canada, the Privy Council Office, Indian Residential Schools Resolution of Canada, and the National Parole Board. Mr. Dion also served as Commissioner of Public Sector Integrity. Mr. Dion was most recently appointed under the previous government to his current role as Chairperson of the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada.

.../2

Canada

Democracy Watch

- 2 -

Sincerely,

Democracy Watch

Please let us

As you know, this is a critical role, and it is important that we have a permanent Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner in place. I would appreciate your thoughts on this proposed nomination by no later than Monday, December 11, 2017, at 12:00 p.m. EST. I would also appreciate your cooperation in dealing with this matter in confidence prior to the announcement of the nomination.

Sincerely yours,

Bardish Chagger

The Honourable Bardish Chagger, P.C., M.P.
Leader of the Government in the House of Commons

required to be disclosed under section 18(3) of the Access to Information Act documents from those investigations (including the final finding letters) are not investigations, and therefore it would also be illegal for the Office to claim that administrative reviews listed in Democracy Watch's initial request letter were not in other words, it would be illegal for the Office to claim that any of the

that letter) letter also contained concerning the subpoenaed administrative reviews listed in clearly investigations (as Democracy Watch's initial October 25, 2016 request the administrative reviews that took a year or more in the past, as those were all given this statement by Commissioner Bélanger, the Office must disclose all of

submitted into an investigation and a report to Parliament. at the first level of an administrative review, more serious breaches will go. Now the preliminary assessment consists of the work that would be done

investigation. do fact-finding and then interview a number of witnesses, you are review level two was in fact, an investigation, and Bélanger. When you investigations, I tell that a lot of the work that was being done in this admin. When I came in with my letter background and my experience in

report to Parliament. review, the process might go further into a formal investigation and a witnesses. Depending on what was determined at a second-level admin. prohibited that reduce a more in-depth study and interviews with report finding of a second-level review, for issues like lobbying while the first level for less serious infractions such as a late communication OGC staff classify the issue as one requiring an administrative review as to determine the severity of the breach, this process, which would not. Previously, all breaches cases were subject to a preliminary assessment