



Office of the Conflict  
of Interest and Ethics  
Commissioner

Commissariat aux  
conflits d'intérêts et à  
l'éthique

## Referral from the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner: The Clement Report

made under the  
*CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT*



July 18, 2012

Mary Dawson  
Conflict of Interest and  
Ethics Commissioner

Referral from the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner:  
The Clement Report

made under the  
*CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT*

For additional copies of this publication, please contact:

Office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner  
Parliament of Canada  
66 Slater Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6

Telephone: (613) 995-0721  
Fax: (613) 995-7308  
Email: [ciec-ccie@parl.gc.ca](mailto:ciec-ccie@parl.gc.ca)

*Ce document est également publié en français.*

This publication is also available online at the following address: <http://ciec-ccie.gc.ca>

© Office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner, Parliament of Canada, 2012  
072012-33E



## **PREFACE**

The *Conflict of Interest Act*, S.C. 2006, c.9, s. 2 (Act) came into force on July 9, 2007.

Pursuant to section 68 of the Act, if a matter is referred to the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner by the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner pursuant to subsection 24(2.1) of the *Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act*, the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner must provide a report to the Prime Minister setting out the facts in question as well as the Commissioner's analysis and conclusions in relation to the referral. A copy is provided to the public office holder or former public office holder who is the subject of the report and to the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner. The report is also made public.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>THE REFERRAL .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>PRIOR REQUESTS FOR EXAMINATION AND ADVICE GIVEN.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>THE PROCESS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>INFORMATION GATHERED.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Lord & Partners and the Promotional Video.....	5
Awarding Government Contracts to Lord & Partners.....	6
Appointment of Mr. George Young to the Canadian Tourism Commission.....	7
<b>ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>9</b>
Role in Making Promotional Video: Sections 7 and 9.....	9
Role in Awarding of Federal Contracts to Lord & Partners: Subsection 6(1).....	10
Role in Appointing Mr. George Young to the Canadian Tourism Commission: Subsection 6(1).....	11
<b>SCHEDULE I – PROCESS FOR REFERRALS FROM THE PUBLIC SECTOR INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SCHEDULE II – TRANSCRIPT: TONY CLEMENT IN LORD &amp; PARTNERS’ PROMOTIONAL VIDEO.....</b>	<b>14</b>



## OVERVIEW

This report, issued under the *Conflict of Interest Act* (Act), deals with three matters related to the conduct of the Honourable Tony Clement, Member of Parliament for Parry Sound–Muskoka, when he was Minister of Health and Minister of Industry.

The first concerns his participation in a promotional video for Lord & Partners Ltd., in which he identified himself as a minister of the federal government. The second involves three federal contracts awarded to that company. The third pertains to the appointment of Mr. George Young, who produced the video, to the Canadian Tourism Commission. It was alleged that Mr. George Young and Mr. Barry Young, the President of Lord & Partners, were friends of Mr. Clement. Mr. George Young and Mr. Barry Young are not related.

These matters were raised in a disclosure that was referred to me by the then interim Public Sector Integrity Commissioner. When I receive a referral in this manner, the Act requires that I issue a public report setting out the facts in question as well as my analysis and conclusions.

The information disclosed to me in the referral did not provide me with reason to believe that Mr. Clement had contravened the Act. However, in order to issue the report and also because I believe that it is appropriate to address the concerns that have been publicly raised by media reports and left unanswered, I sought further information relating to Mr. Clement's involvement in these matters and his relationships with Mr. George Young and Mr. Barry Young.

I have no reason to believe, on the basis of the information I have, that Mr. Clement was a friend, within the meaning of the Act, of either Mr. Barry Young or Mr. George Young.

In the matter of Mr. Clement's participation in the promotional video, I found no evidence to suggest that he appeared in the video for any reason other than to assist a company based in his riding. Given that Mr. Clement identified himself in the video as the Minister of Health, I am taking the opportunity to observe that ministers, in carrying out their duties as Members, should exercise some caution. When representing constituents, they should not use their positions as ministers to provide greater assistance to their constituents than to other Canadians in relation to their own department or larger portfolio.

In the matter of the three government contracts awarded to Lord & Partners, I found no evidence to indicate that Mr. Clement was involved in the awarding of any contracts to the company.

In the matter of Mr. Clement's role in the appointment of Mr. George Young to the Canadian Tourism Commission, as noted above, I have concluded that Mr. Clement and Mr. George Young were not friends within the meaning of the Act and therefore have found nothing to suggest that Mr. Clement's involvement placed him in a conflict of interest within the meaning of the Act.

Based on the information that I gathered, I concluded that there was no reason for further investigation of these matters.



## THE REFERRAL

On July 28, 2011 the then interim Public Sector Integrity Commissioner referred to me under subsection 24(2.1) of the *Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act* a disclosure that his office had received from a member of the public in relation to the conduct of the Honourable Tony Clement, Member of Parliament for Parry Sound–Muskoka, during his tenure as Minister of Health and, later, as Minister of Industry.

Without formulating any specific allegations, the disclosure raised three related concerns and included a link to a related media report from May 2010.

The first concern was that in August 2008 Mr. Clement took part in a promotional video for a company based in his riding, Lord & Partners Ltd., in which he identified himself as Canada's Minister of Health and extended greetings to the people of China on behalf of himself and the Government of Canada. The media report described the President and Chief Executive Officer of Lord & Partners, Mr. Barry Young, as a friend of Mr. Clement.

The second matter pertained to three federal contracts awarded to Lord & Partners worth a total of \$41,000.

The third matter pertained to Mr. Clement's appointment of Mr. George Young to the Canadian Tourism Commission. Mr. George Young had produced the video for Lord & Partners and had been identified as a longtime supporter of Mr. Clement.

The disclosure identified section 4 of the *Conflict of Interest Act* (Act), which defines what constitutes a conflict of interest for the purposes of applying the Act, as being relevant to these three concerns.



## PRIOR REQUESTS FOR EXAMINATION AND ADVICE GIVEN

In May 2010, the media reported that Mr. Clement had participated in a promotional video for Lord & Partners Ltd., a company based in his riding. The producer of the video, Mr. George Young, was identified as a political supporter and friend of Mr. Clement, and the President of Lord & Partners, Mr. Barry Young, was also identified as a friend of Mr. Clement.

It was also reported that Lord & Partners was the recipient of three contracts with the Department of National Defence, and that Mr. Clement had appointed Mr. George Young to the Canadian Tourism Commission.

At that time I received two separate requests for examination from Members of the House of Commons related to these matters.

After reviewing our files, my Office found that on August 12, 2008 a member of Mr. Clement's staff called my Office to discuss the fact that Mr. Clement had been asked by a constituent to participate in a promotional video for Lord & Partners. The official asked if it was acceptable under the *Conflict of Interest Act* (Act) for Mr. Clement to participate. My Office was told that Mr. Clement would not be receiving any monetary compensation for his participation and that he would not directly endorse the company or its products.

My Office provided Mr. Clement's staff member with confidential advice to the effect that, on the basis of what we had been told, the Act did not prevent Mr. Clement from participating in the video. At that time, there was no discussion of Mr. Clement's relationship with either Mr. Barry Young or Mr. George Young.

After obtaining Mr. Clement's consent, I communicated the confidential advice to the two Members who had requested an examination. I informed them that I would not investigate Mr. Clement's participation in the promotional video unless I received information to substantiate the allegations.

I also informed the Member who had raised the concern about the appointment of Mr. George Young in his request for an examination that I would require further factual information that might substantiate the allegations against Mr. Clement.

I did not receive additional information from these Members.



## THE PROCESS

The *Conflict of Interest Act* (Act) requires that I issue a public report stating my analysis and conclusions whenever I receive a referral from the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner. If the subject matter of the referral falls within the jurisdiction of my Office and I have reason to believe that a contravention of the Act has occurred, I may initiate an examination under section 45 of the Act. However, section 68 of the Act requires that I issue a report regardless of whether I initiate an examination. A description of the process for referrals from the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner and the relevant statutory provisions are set out in further detail in Schedule I.

The information disclosed to me in the referral did not provide me with reason to believe that Mr. Clement had contravened the Act. However, in order to issue the report and also because I believe that it is appropriate to address the concerns that have been publicly raised by media reports and left unanswered, I sought further information relating to Mr. Clement's involvement in these matters and his relationships with Mr. George Young and Mr. Barry Young.

On August 30, 2011 I wrote to Mr. Clement to notify him of the referral and to advise him that I would be looking into the matter and preparing a report under section 68 of the Act. I informed him that the provisions of the Act that could be applicable were subsection 6(1), which prohibits public office holders from making decisions that would place them in a conflict of interest; section 7, which pertains to preferential treatment; and section 9, which pertains to using one's position to influence a decision so as to improperly further the private interest of another person.

I informed Mr. Clement that I would consider sections 7 and 9 in relation to his participation in the promotional video and subsection 6(1) in relation to both the awarding of federal contracts to Mr. Barry Young's company, Lord & Partners, and the appointment of Mr. George Young to the Canadian Tourism Commission.

On November 2, 2011 I received a letter from Mr. Arthur Hamilton, counsel to Mr. Clement, setting out Mr. Clement's response to the allegations. On February 2, 2012 I conducted an interview with Mr. Clement. In March 2012, my Office interviewed Mr. Barry Young and Mr. George Young.

After these interviews and after considering all the information before me, I determined that I still had no reason to believe the Act had been contravened and therefore did not initiate an examination. However, I am issuing this report as required under section 68 of the Act.

In keeping with the practice I have established, Mr. Clement had an opportunity to comment and make further representations on the factual sections of this report (The Referral, Prior Requests for Examination and Advice Given, The Process, Information Gathered, and the Schedules) before it was finalized.

## **INFORMATION GATHERED**

The three issues raised in the referral—Mr. Clement’s appearance in a promotional video, the federal contracts awarded to Lord & Partners, and Mr. George Young’s appointment to the Canadian Tourism Commission—touched upon possible friendships between Mr. Clement and both Mr. Barry Young and Mr. George Young, which had been suggested by media reports in 2010. I therefore sought to understand not only Mr. Clement’s involvement in the issues raised, but also his relationships with these two individuals.

### **Lord & Partners and the Promotional Video**

Lord & Partners, established in 1990 in Huntsville, Ontario, is a manufacturer and supplier of environmentally responsible commercial and industrial solvents, cleaners and specialty products.

Mr. Barry Young is the President and Chief Executive Officer of Lord & Partners. In 2008 he was looking to expand his business to China. He engaged Mr. George Young, who also lives in Huntsville and operates a video production company there, to produce a promotional video that would be used during an upcoming business trip to China. Mr. Barry Young and Mr. George Young are not related.

Mr. Barry Young contacted Mr. Clement’s constituency office to request his participation in the promotional video. Mr. Barry Young told my Office that he asked Mr. Clement to participate in the video as he believed it was important for the people of China to know that the Government of Canada knew of Lord & Partners.

Mr. Clement described his relationship with Mr. Barry Young as one of elected official and constituent. Both Mr. Clement and Mr. Young told my Office that they met sometime in late 2008, after Mr. Clement was re-elected to the House of Commons for the riding of Parry Sound–Muskoka. Mr. Barry Young told my Office that he introduced himself to Mr. Clement at a community event organized by Mr. Clement in Huntsville and spoke to him about his business, Lord & Partners.

Both Mr. Clement and Mr. Young told my Office that they do not see each other socially and are not friends. Both Mr. Clement and Mr. Young also told my Office that neither Mr. Clement nor any members of Mr. Clement’s family hold any financial interest in Lord & Partners.

Mr. George Young, in his capacity as the producer of the video, told my Office that he had also approached Mr. Clement and requested his participation in the video. Mr. George Young said that Mr. Clement told him that he would first need to receive clearance from my Office before agreeing to participate.

As noted above, on August 12, 2008 a member of Mr. Clement’s staff called my Office seeking advice and, based on the information provided, was advised that the Act did not preclude Mr. Clement from participating in the video.



In the video Mr. Clement introduced himself as the Member of Parliament for Parry Sound–Muskoka and as the Minister of Health for Canada. He extended greetings to the people of China on behalf of the Government of Canada as a Member of Parliament and the Minister of Health. Mr. Clement spoke of the environmental challenges faced by both countries and the link between the environment and health care. He also spoke of a new link that could be created between Canada and China in the environmental field. Mr. Clement then introduced Mr. Barry Young and his company, Lord & Partners. A transcript of Mr. Clement’s introduction in the video is set out in Schedule II.

Mr. Clement and Mr. Barry Young both confirmed with my Office that Mr. Clement did not receive any monetary compensation for his appearance in the video. Mr. Clement told me that, based on the advice of my Office, he agreed to appear in the video as he believed it is good for his riding and for Canada when Canadian companies expand their economic activity.

### *Letters of Support*

Mr. Clement told me that, as a Member of Parliament, he also wrote two letters of introduction for Mr. Barry Young at his request.

One letter, dated August 12, 2008, which accompanied the company’s promotional video, extended greetings to the People’s Republic of China on behalf of the Government of Canada and introduced Mr. Barry Young and his company, Lord & Partners.

The second letter, dated March 30, 2010, encouraged an individual in Dubai to explore working with Mr. Barry Young in the future. It stated that Lord & Partners was a company based in Mr. Clement’s riding and that Mr. Clement had known Mr. Barry Young and his company for the previous couple of years.

Mr. Clement told me that, while he does not often receive requests to appear in promotional videos, he receives requests from constituents several times a year asking for different kinds of support, including letters. Mr. Clement could recall appearing in a video for Toronto’s Hospital for Sick Children when he was Minister of Health.

### **Awarding Government Contracts to Lord & Partners**

In 2010, media reported that Lord & Partners was awarded three federal government contracts worth a total of \$41,000. According to the procurement disclosure website of Public Works and Government Services Canada, Lord & Partners was awarded three contracts totalling \$50,226 from the Department of National Defence between 2009 and 2010. In 2009, two contracts were awarded following a non-competitive procurement process because of their low value. The combined value of the contracts was \$29,226. In 2010 the company was awarded a \$21,000 contract following a competitive procurement process.

Mr. Clement said that neither he nor anyone in his ministerial office lobbied for or encouraged the awarding of these contracts to Lord & Partners and that he did not have any knowledge of them until they were reported in the media in 2010. Mr. Barry Young told my Office that he was not aware of any involvement by Mr. Clement in the awarding of any

government contracts to Lord & Partners. None of the information appearing in media reports, the requests I received from Members in 2010 or the referral I received from the then interim Public Sector Integrity Commissioner indicated that Mr. Clement had had any direct or indirect involvement with these procurement processes.

### **Appointment of Mr. George Young to the Canadian Tourism Commission**

Mr. Clement told me that he met Mr. George Young following his election to the House of Commons in 2006. At that time, Mr. Young was a municipal councillor for the Town of Huntsville. Mr. Clement and Mr. Young both said that they would often see and interact with each other at municipal and federal political events.

In 2009, Mr. Clement was Minister of Industry, responsible for the Canadian Tourism Commission. On October 15, 2009 Mr. Clement announced the four-year appointment of Mr. George Young to the Board of Directors of the Canadian Tourism Commission. The part-time appointment does not include a salary.

Mr. Young was appointed by Order in Council. As set out in its terms, Mr. Young's appointment was approved by the Governor in Council on Mr. Clement's recommendation, in his capacity as Minister of Industry, pursuant to section 11 of the *Canadian Tourism Commission Act*.

Mr. Young told my Office that Mr. Clement contacted him and asked if he would be interested in a position with the Canadian Tourism Commission. He believed that Mr. Clement was recommending him for the position because of his past experience and his interest in sports and tourism.

Mr. Clement told me that Mr. George Young was identified for an appointment with the Canadian Tourism Commission based on his qualifications and experience as a reporter with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and his experience covering previous Olympic Games. Mr. Clement believed that Mr. Young would be a good fit with the Canadian Tourism Commission in connection with the 2010 Vancouver Olympics and the G8 Summit in Huntsville.

Mr. Clement and Mr. George Young both confirmed that Mr. Young is politically supportive of Mr. Clement in that they are Huntsville-based politicians—Mr. Clement as Member of Parliament for Parry Sound–Muskoka and Mr. Young as a municipal councillor for the Town of Huntsville—who share similar political views. However, Mr. Young told my Office that he has never made any financial contributions to the Parry Sound–Muskoka Conservative Electoral District Association, nor has he participated in any election campaigns for Mr. Clement.

Mr. Clement told me that, while he and Mr. Young have a professional relationship, they are not friends. They do not have a personal relationship and do not see each other socially. Mr. Young said that, while he considers Mr. Clement to be a friend, the extent of their relationship is professional.



Mr. Clement told me that he prepared the recommendation for Mr. George Young's candidacy for consideration by the Prime Minister's Office, which ultimately made the decision to appoint Mr. Young. Mr. Young told my Office that Mr. Clement did not make any promises to him regarding the potential appointment.

Mr. Clement told me that as a minister he regularly recommends individuals for various appointments and that he becomes involved at various stages of the appointment process.



## ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

### Role in Making Promotional Video: Sections 7 and 9

#### *Section 7*

Section 7 prohibits preferential treatment to a person or organization based on the identity of a representative in the following terms:

*7. No public office holder shall, in the exercise of an official power, duty or function, give preferential treatment to any person or organization based on the identity of the person or organization that represents the first-mentioned person or organization.*

In my view, by introducing himself as the Minister of Health and extending his greetings to the people of China and the People's Republic of China on behalf of himself and the Government of Canada, Mr. Clement can be understood to have been exercising an official power, duty or function within the meaning of section 7.

On the issue of preferential treatment, I found no evidence to suggest that Mr. Clement appeared in the video for any reason other than to assist a Canadian company based in his riding. In this connection, Mr. Clement provided examples of other situations in which constituents had asked for his support.

Mr. Clement told me that he agreed to appear in the video because he believes it is good for his riding and for Canada when Canadian companies expand their economic activity. I accept that this was his motivation for participating in the video.

#### *Section 9*

Section 9 prohibits public office holders from using their positions to influence decision-making where to do so would place them in a conflict of interest. This provision reads as follows:

*9. No public office holder shall use his or her position as a public office holder to seek to influence a decision of another person so as to further the public office holder's private interests or those of the public office holder's relatives or friends or to improperly further another person's private interests.*

The video does not appear to have been intended to influence the decision of any particular person or even to have been made in reference to any particular decision-making process. Rather, the video appears to have been designed to promote general awareness of the business carried out by Lord & Partners across a broad cross-section of the Chinese public.



Moreover, I have no reason to believe, on the basis of the information I have, that Mr. Clement and Mr. Barry Young were friends within the meaning of the Act, or that Mr. Clement was motivated by personal or private considerations when he agreed to appear in the video. Nor do I believe there was anything improper in Mr. Clement assisting a Canadian company in promoting its products internationally under these circumstances. For these reasons, I have no reason to believe that Mr. Clement contravened section 9 in connection with his appearance in the promotional video on behalf of Lord & Partners.

Based on the information that I have, there is no reason for further investigation of Mr. Clement's appearance in this video.

I would, however, add a note of caution. In the promotional video, Mr. Clement introduced himself not only as Member of Parliament for Parry Sound–Muskoka but also as the Minister of Health for Canada. Mr. Clement believed that it would be beneficial to both his riding and to Canada to promote a Canadian company wishing to expand its economic activity. In this case, the company in question was based in Mr. Clement's riding.

I noted in the *Paradis Report* that I understand that ministers, as Members, have duties towards their constituents. However, in carrying out these duties, ministers should exercise some caution. When representing constituents, they should not use their positions as ministers to provide greater assistance to their constituents than to other Canadians in relation to their own department or larger portfolio.

### **Role in Awarding of Federal Contracts to Lord & Partners: Subsection 6(1)**

Subsection 6(1) prohibits public office holders from making decisions that would place them in a conflict of interest:

*6. (1) No public office holder shall make a decision or participate in making a decision related to the exercise of an official power, duty or function if the public office holder knows or reasonably should know that, in the making of the decision, he or she would be in a conflict of interest.*

Section 4 defines the circumstances in which a public office holder may be understood to be in a "conflict of interest" within the meaning of the Act. It reads as follows:

*4. For the purposes of this Act, a public office holder is in a conflict of interest when he or she exercises an official power, duty or function that provides an opportunity to further his or her private interests or those of his or her relatives or friends or to improperly further another person's private interests.*

As noted above, Lord & Partners secured two sole-source contracts in 2009 from the Department of National Defence and successfully bid on a third in 2010. Mr. Clement said that neither he nor anyone in his ministerial office lobbied or encouraged the awarding of contracts to





Lord & Partners by the Department of National Defence, and added that he did not have any knowledge of the contracts until they were reported in the media in 2010. Mr. Barry Young confirmed with my Office that he was not aware of any involvement by Mr. Clement in the awarding of any government contracts to Lord & Partners. None of the information appearing in media reports, the requests I received from Members in 2010 or the referral I received from the then interim Public Sector Integrity Commissioner indicated that Mr. Clement had had any direct or indirect involvement with these procurement processes.

I have found no evidence that would give me reason to believe that Mr. Clement had any involvement in awarding any of these contracts. I therefore conclude that there is no foundation for examining this matter further.

### **Role in Appointing Mr. George Young to the Canadian Tourism Commission: Subsection 6(1)**

As noted above, Mr. Clement recommended Mr. George Young for appointment to the board of directors of the Canadian Tourism Commission pursuant to section 11 of the *Canadian Tourism Commission Act*. He was therefore clearly exercising an official power, duty or function in doing so.

As to whether Mr. Clement's role in the appointment of Mr. George Young placed him in a conflict of interest, I have concluded that Mr. Clement and Mr. Young were not friends within the meaning of the Act. Although several media articles identified them as friends, those reports did not substantiate that information in any way. I have found nothing to indicate that the relationship between Mr. Clement and Mr. George Young extended beyond their professional interactions as Huntsville-based politicians—Mr. Clement as Member of Parliament for Parry Sound–Muskoka and Mr. Young as a municipal councillor for the Town of Huntsville.

As Minister of Industry, Mr. Clement was responsible for recommending candidates for appointment to the Canadian Tourism Commission, pursuant to section 11 of the *Canadian Tourism Commission Act*. Mr. Clement told me that Mr. George Young's appointment was based on his qualifications as a reporter with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, his experience covering past Olympic Games as well as his perceived "fit" with the Canadian Tourism Commission and there was no evidence to suggest that Mr. Clement departed in any way from the typical process governing Governor in Council appointments.

Both Mr. Clement and Mr. George Young confirmed that Mr. Young is politically supportive of Mr. Clement, in that they share similar political views. I do not believe that this, in and of itself, provides me with sufficient grounds to believe that Mr. Clement improperly furthered Mr. Young's private interests in recommending him for appointment to this position.

I therefore conclude that there is no reason to believe Mr. Clement's involvement in Mr. George Young's appointment to the Canadian Tourism Commission placed him in a conflict of interest within the meaning of the Act and, therefore, no reason to believe that he may have contravened subsection 6(1).



**SCHEDULE I**  
**PROCESS FOR REFERRALS FROM THE PUBLIC SECTOR**  
**INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER**

(from page 4)

Subsection 24(2.1) of the *Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act* requires the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner to refer to my Office any disclosures received, the subject-matters of which, in his or her opinion, fall within my mandate. That subsection reads as follows:

**24.(2.1)** *The Commissioner must refuse to deal with a disclosure or to commence an investigation if he or she is of the opinion that the subject-matter of the disclosure or the investigation is within the jurisdiction of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner under the Conflict of Interest Act and must refer the matter to the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner.*

Section 68 of the *Conflict of Interest Act* (Act) provides that where a matter is referred to my Office by the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner under subsection 24(2.1) of the *Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act*, I must issue a report setting out the facts in question as well as my analysis and conclusions. Section 68 reads as follows:

**68.** *If a matter is referred to the Commissioner under subsection 24(2.1) of the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act, the Commissioner shall*

*(a) provide the Prime Minister with a report setting out the facts in question as well as the Commissioner's analysis and conclusions;*

*(b) provide a copy of the report to the public office holder or former public office holder who is the subject of the report;*

*(c) provide a copy of the report to the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner; and*

*(d) make the report available to the public.*

Although section 68 of the Act requires a report, I do not interpret section 68 to require a complete examination in respect of every referral. In my view, I must deal with information I receive from the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner in the same way as I would treat any information received from any other agent of Parliament or from the public about a possible contravention of the Act.

Where, as a result of information provided to my Office by a member of the public or in a referral under the *Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act*, I have reason to believe that a contravention has occurred and I determine that an examination is warranted, I will initiate an examination under section 45 of the Act.

If I do not have reason to believe that a contravention has occurred, I may, where appropriate, seek further information, including from the individual who made the disclosure, the individual who is the subject of the disclosure or anyone else who may have relevant information. On the basis of any information received, I then reassess whether I have reason to believe that a contravention of the Act has occurred and, if so, whether an examination is warranted.

Section 68 requires that I issue a report whether or not I proceed to an examination.



**SCHEDULE II**  
**TRANSCRIPT: TONY CLEMENT IN LORD & PARTNERS’**  
**PROMOTIONAL VIDEO**

(from page 6)

“I’m Tony Clement. I’m a Member of Parliament for Parry Sound–Muskoka and the Government of Canada and I’m Minister of Health for Canada.

First of all I want to extend my greetings to the people of China and the Peoples’ Republic of China on behalf of myself and the Government of Canada.

You know, we know in both of our countries, that we have some environmental challenges and that people care about environmental security. Indeed, one of the things that I have said is that the environment and health care are inextricably linked together. You can’t really talk about the environment without talking about how we can improve the health and safety of either Canadians or the Chinese.

This is an area that can be a win-win. We get to improve the health and safety of people not only in Canada but in China and we also get to see a great new linkage between Canada and China in the environmental field. So let me have the honour to introduce to you Mr. Barry Young who is the President and CEO of Lord & Partners. He will tell you a little bit more about his company.”

