

OFFICE OF THE SENATE ETHICS OFFICER



Inquiry Report

**under the *Conflict of Interest Code for Senators*
concerning Senator Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu**

June 25, 2014

REQUEST FOR INQUIRY

By letter dated June 19, 2013, Senator Céline Hervieux-Payette (“Senator Hervieux-Payette”), a senator appointed for the province of Quebec (Bedford), made a request under subsection 44(2) of the *Conflict of Interest Code for Senators* (the “Code”)¹ that I conduct an inquiry into certain alleged contraventions of the *Code* by Senator Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu (“Senator Boisvenu”), a senator also appointed for the province of Québec (La Salle).

In her written submission, Senator Hervieux-Payette argues that Senator Boisvenu had intervened on behalf of a “family member”, namely Ms. Isabelle Lapointe (“the employee”), who was also employed in his office for a period of time, in order to find employment for her in the Senate Administration. Senator Hervieux-Payette argues that, in doing so, this “family member” was provided with preferential treatment contrary to section 8 of the *Code*. She also contends that Senator Boisvenu made representations to officials in the Senate in order to obtain financial benefits -- namely, special treatment with respect to leave -- for the employee, again contrary to section 8 of the *Code*.

She further alleges that Senator Boisvenu used his position as a senator to influence the decision of other persons -- namely the Clerk of the Senate and the then Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration -- in order to further his own private interests and those of his “family member”, contrary to section 9 of the *Code* when he allegedly made representations to these officials to obtain special treatment with respect to leave for the employee.

Lastly, she argues that Senator Boisvenu did not abide by the advice provided by the Senate Ethics Officer concerning the relationship between him and the employee for a number of months. She alleges that, in delaying doing so, he appears to have avoided complying with his obligation under paragraph 2(1)(c) of the *Code* to arrange his private affairs so that foreseeable real or apparent conflicts of interest may be prevented from arising and, where such a conflict does arise, to resolve it in a manner that protects the public interest. She contends that it was only when the fact of the relationship became a matter of public knowledge that Senator Boisvenu took measures to comply with the Senate Ethics Officer’s advice. In her complaint letter of June 19, 2013, Senator Hervieux-Payette raises the following question with respect to this particular issue: What are the consequences for a senator who fails to take the advice of the Senate Ethics Officer?

She argues that the above allegations are based on Senator Boisvenu’s own public statements, as reported by the media. In support of her complaint, she enclosed a number of media articles concerning the above-noted matters.

¹ All references to the *Conflict of Interest Code for Senators* in this report are to the version of the *Code* that was adopted by the Senate on May 1, 2012, which came into force on October 1, 2012.

PROCESS

Once I received Senator Hervieux-Payette's request for an inquiry under subsection 44(2), I forwarded that request to Senator Boisvenu on June 25, 2013, pursuant to subsection 44(4) of the *Code*, and provided him with a reasonable opportunity to respond. He did so on July 17, 2013. I was then required to conduct a preliminary review of the matter under subsection 44(5) of the *Code* in order to determine whether an inquiry was warranted. I determined that it was warranted and, by letter dated August 23, 2013, I notified both Senator Boisvenu and Senator Hervieux-Payette of my decision in this respect. In that letter, I explained that I had concerns about Senator Boisvenu's compliance with sections 8 and 9 of the *Code*.

This was the first inquiry undertaken by this office since its establishment in 2005. We followed the process that was outlined in the *Code* and, where the *Code* was silent, we applied the standards that are generally applied by other conflict of interest commissioners in Canada.

My office interviewed twelve people, listed in Schedule A to this report. We also requested and obtained documents from various parties that were germane to this matter, including excerpts of the discussions of the Steering Committee of the Standing Senate Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration that related to this matter, e-mail exchanges between officials in the Senate, and the personnel file of the employee.

Senator Boisvenu was given opportunities to make representations to my office, both orally and in writing. He was interviewed twice, both at the outset of the inquiry as well as at the end of the process. He was also given an opportunity to comment on a partial draft of the inquiry report before it was finalized, namely, the sections entitled Request for Inquiry, Process, Findings of Fact and Senator Boisvenu's position.

FINDINGS OF FACT

In an interview with me, Senator Boisvenu told me that he first met the employee in 2010 as a result of his dealings with la Fondation Lucie et André Chagnon, in which she was employed. Before this meeting, she had been one of his 5,000 followers on a social network account concerning victims of crime issues, but there were no personal communications between Senator Boisvenu and the employee in this context.

He also stated that, at that time, in 2010, he was looking for an Executive Assistant for his office and had considered a number of candidates without success. Officials from the Senate Human Resources Directorate who were interviewed for the purposes of this inquiry confirmed that Senator Boisvenu had considered a few candidates for the position but had not yet filled it. Senator Boisvenu told me that he eventually interviewed and offered the employee the position, primarily based on the fact that her experience and background would be useful given the Senator's interest in law and order and public safety issues.

The employee was employed in the office of Senator Boisvenu from August 2010 to March 2013 in the position of Executive Assistant.² The employment contracts of staff of senators are term contracts that must be renewed if the employee is to continue his or her employment in the senator's office. The employee's contract was renewed in 2011 and 2012, but was not renewed in 2013.

The Executive Assistant positions in the offices of senators are all classified at the same level. The employee was no exception in this respect.

During the time that the employee was employed in the office of Senator Boisvenu, she continued to hold the position of Executive Assistant at the same classification level and at the same salary, with the exception of the standard annual salary increases to which all employees are entitled. I found no evidence that she was provided with any special benefits or preferential treatment during her approximately two and a half years in Senator Boisvenu's office.

Senator Boisvenu was not in a relationship with the employee when he first hired her. He gave evidence, both orally and in writing, that he did not know her personally at that time. I found no evidence to the contrary. Both Senator Boisvenu and the employee told me that the relationship began after the employee had been working in his office. This relationship was on and off. Again, I found no evidence to contradict this.

It is Senator Boisvenu's recollection that, in March 2012, he sought the advice of the then Senate Ethics Officer, Mr. Jean T. Fournier, who served in this position from April 2005 until the end of

² Some of the details concerning the employment contracts of the employee involve personal information. As such, where not relevant to the issues, they have not been published in this report in order to protect the privacy interests of the employee.

March 2012, concerning his relationship with the employee.³ Senator Boisvenu stated, in his interview with me, that Mr. Fournier told him that the matter was not governed by the *Conflict of Interest Code for Senators* since the *Code* concerns conflicts involving financial matters. Senator Boisvenu also stated that Mr. Fournier went on to say that the relationship could, however, potentially constitute an apparent conflict of interest and, as such, he advised Senator Boisvenu that the relationship should end.

No formal written opinion was provided by the then Senate Ethics Officer in this matter. With respect to whether any verbal advice was provided, I was unable to make a final determination in this respect. In an interview with Mr. Fournier, he stated that he had no recollection about the discussion.

Senator Boisvenu told me that, sometime after he had had this alleged conversation with Mr. Fournier, he discussed it with the employee. However, she continued to be employed in his office and the relationship appears to have continued on and off after this time.

The relationship became a matter of public knowledge in March 2013 due to the fact that Senator Boisvenu had claimed living expenses when he stayed at the employee's residence for a few days at a time throughout the summer of 2012, for a total of 31 days. Though he reimbursed these expenses to the Senate,⁴ the issue of his on and off relationship with the employee continued to garner significant media attention because she remained employed in his office.

As already mentioned above, the employee's employment in Senator Boisvenu's office terminated in March 2013. She was then hired by the Senate Administration in the Legislative Systems and Broadcasting Directorate reporting to the Director, Ms. Diane Boucher ("the Director of Legislative Systems"), for a six-month term that commenced in April 2013 until October 2013 in the position of Officer, Special Projects.⁵ Such positions are filled from time to time on a six month basis in order to assist with special short-term projects. In interviews with my office, the Director of Legislative Systems, as well as officials from the Senate Human Resources Directorate, stated that the employee's skills and experience were assessed and evaluated and it was determined that she had the qualifications that were necessary to carry out the duties and responsibilities of this position.

The departure of the employee from Senator Boisvenu's office and her subsequent employment in the Senate Administration came about following the media controversy in March 2013

³ Since any advice that is provided by the Senate Ethics Officer under the *Code* is confidential, Senator Boisvenu has provided me with consent in writing to release any communications he alleges took place between himself and the former Senate Ethics Officer with regard to the seeking and obtaining of advice under the *Code* in relation to this matter.

⁴ See the Statement of the Standing Senate Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration, dated March 7, 2013: "Senator Boisvenu Repays Senate Living Allowance".

⁵ Again, some of the details concerning the employee's employment contract with the Senate Administration involve personal information. As such, where not relevant to the issues, they have not been published in this report in order to protect the privacy interests of the employee.

surrounding the matter of Senator Boisvenu's housing expense claims. The Steering Committee of the Standing Senate Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration ("the Steering Committee") discussed the matter in relation to the expense issue involving Senator Boisvenu, with which the Standing Senate Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration ("the Internal Economy Committee") was seized at the time.

It was in this context that the then Chair of the Internal Economy Committee, Senator David Tkachuk ("Senator Tkachuk"), first raised the matter with Senator Boisvenu by recommending that the employee be hired in the Senate Administration for a short term in order to provide her with an opportunity to find alternate, suitable employment.

The first discussion with Senator Tkachuk about this matter took place in early March 2013,⁶ at which time Senator Tkachuk proposed to Senator Boisvenu that the employee leave Senator Boisvenu's office as soon as possible in order to resolve the ethical issue of Senator Boisvenu continuing to employ someone with whom he was having or had had a relationship. Senator Boisvenu told me that Senator Tkachuk explained to him that the Senate Administration would attempt to find temporary employment for the employee but that she should leave Senator Boisvenu's office until a position in the Administration for which she was qualified was identified. In his interview with me, Senator Tkachuk stated that he told Senator Boisvenu at this meeting that the employee should contact the Human Resources Directorate about this matter. There did not appear to be any discussions at this meeting about the conditions of this early termination from Senator Boisvenu's office.

As such, the hiring of the employee in the Senate Administration was only a transitional measure, recommended to Senator Boisvenu by Senator Tkachuk. The evidence is clear that this was done in an effort to ensure that the Senate was acting as a responsible employer.⁷ In their respective interviews with me, both Senator Tkachuk and the Clerk of the Senate, Mr. Gary O'Brien ("the Clerk") told me that they were concerned that the employee not be treated unfairly under the circumstances and not be penalized for the events that had transpired.

In addition, both Senator Carolyn Stewart-Olsen ("Senator Stewart-Olsen") and Senator George Furey ("Senator Furey") -- the then members of the Steering Committee, along with Senator Tkachuk -- confirmed this in interviews with me. They told me that the Steering Committee was concerned about the impact of the controversy on the employee. Senator Furey stated that the Steering Committee felt that it had a responsibility to assist her in finding alternate employment, though both Senator Stewart-Olsen and Senator Furey told me that the Steering Committee did

⁶ Neither Senator Tkachuk nor Senator Boisvenu could recall the specific date on which this first meeting occurred. Both advised me that they were unable to find any record of this meeting in their respective agendas.

⁷ The Senate, rather than any individual senator, is the employer, not only for staff of the Senate Administration, but also for staff in a senator's office: see s.3.3, p.21, last para. of *Senators' Handbook on the Use of Senate Resources*, published by the Senate Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration, September 2012.

not specifically discuss her being provided with temporary employment in the Senate Administration.

Senator Boisvenu had also had some discussions with Senator Claude Carignan, the then Deputy Leader of Government in the Senate (“Senator Carignan”) about the matter. In an interview with me, Senator Carignan told me that, while he advised Senator Boisvenu that the employee should not continue to remain employed in Senator Boisvenu’s office, he too was concerned about the impact of the controversy on the employee and the need to assist her in finding alternate employment and expressed this concern to Senator Boisvenu.⁸

I am satisfied that Senator Boisvenu had no discussions with officials of the Senate Administration about finding the employee employment in the Senate Administration. Any such discussions occurred between Senator Tkachuk and Senator Boisvenu, and these discussions were initiated by Senator Tkachuk, not Senator Boisvenu.

Senator Boisvenu told me that he relayed Senator Tkachuk’s proposal to the employee but that she preferred not to leave the Senator’s office immediately and asked instead to be allowed to conclude any outstanding matters so that the office would be left in good working order for her successor. The employee’s evidence was consistent with this. In addition, she told Senator Boisvenu that she wanted take two weeks of leave before commencing her employment in the Senate Administration in order to recover from the difficult period that she had undergone due to the controversy surrounding this matter. She stated that the media and public scrutiny of her day-to-day life and that of her children was extremely difficult on her and her family.

Senator Boisvenu relayed this request from the employee to Senator Tkachuk at a subsequent meeting, again, in March 2013.⁹ Senator Boisvenu told me that when he discussed this period of leave with Senator Tkachuk, he explained that the employee needed a few days in between employment positions and he asked Senator Tkachuk if she could have them “sans pénalité”, or “without penalty”. However, both Senator Boisvenu and Senator Tkachuk told me that they did not discuss the exact nature of this leave.

Senator Tkachuk stated that, when Senator Boisvenu made this request, he agreed to it and again told Senator Boisvenu that the employee should meet with officials from the Senate Human Resources Directorate to sort out the details. Senator Tkachuk told me that he thought a two-week leave period before commencing her new responsibilities was reasonable in light of the circumstances, but left the details to the Senate Administration to work out. He stated that whether the leave would be in the nature of “vacation leave” advanced to her by the Senate Administration, or “sick leave”, was not a detail with which he was concerned in the discussions

⁸ Neither Senator Carignan nor Senator Boisvenu could recall the exact dates on which these discussions took place as they were informal in nature.

⁹ Neither Senator Tkachuk nor Senator Boisvenu could recall the specific date on which this second meeting took place, nor were they able to find any record of this meeting in their respective agendas.

he had had with Senator Boisvenu relating to the employee's possible employment with the Senate Administration. He explained that, as Chair of the Internal Economy Committee, it was not his responsibility to direct the Clerk at that level of detail on how to manage the Senate Administration.

Senator Boisvenu stated -- both in his written and oral submissions -- that he was under the impression that the leave that would be provided to the employee at the outset of her employment with the Senate Administration would be in the nature of "sick leave", not "vacation leave". He told me that, when he used the phrase "sans pénalité" or "without penalty" with Senator Tkachuk, he meant that this leave should not come out of the employee's vacation leave. I accept that this was his understanding at the time he had had his first discussions with Senator Tkachuk about the Senate Administration employing her temporarily. Having said that, in his interview with me, he acknowledged that Senator Tkachuk may not have had the same understanding about the nature of the leave at the time they had these first discussions since this issue was never actually discussed.

The employee's understanding, based on her evidence, was that these two weeks of leave would not come out of her vacation leave -- neither that earned and accumulated in Senator Boisvenu's office, nor that that would be earned during her term with the Senate Administration -- but rather would be in the nature of 'sick leave'. However, her only discussions about these matters were with Senator Boisvenu. She did not have direct communications about this with Senator Tkachuk, with any other senator, or with anyone in the Senate Administration, until she was already employed in the Administration and had already taken the said leave at the commencement of her term.

The employee stated that she had only had two communications with Senate officials prior to her commencing employment in the Senate Administration. These occurred at the end of March 2013 and were respectively with the then Director of the Senate Human Resources Directorate, Ms. Linda Dodd ("the Director of Human Resources") and the Director of Legislative Systems. The employee told me that, in these conversations, the nature of the two weeks of leave was never discussed, though the employee did tell the Director of Legislative Systems that she would be on leave for the first two weeks of April in their conversation.¹⁰

The Clerk told me that, in granting the two weeks of leave, the Senate Administration was effectively advancing the annual vacation leave that the employee would be entitled to earn in her six month term in order to provide her with an opportunity to recharge in light of the difficult circumstances she had faced.¹¹ The Clerk was categorical that the two weeks of leave, as far as

¹⁰ The details of these conversations have not been published in this report in order to protect the privacy interests of the employee since they involve personal information about the employee, the disclosure of which is not necessary because they are not relevant to the issues.

¹¹ Article 13.04 on p.5 of the *Guide of Terms and Conditions of Employment of Unrepresented Employees within the Senate Administration* (April 1, 2006) provides that an employee who has completed six months of continuous

the Administration was concerned, was intended to be in the nature of advanced vacation leave -- not sick leave, or any other type of 'special leave' that had not been or would not be earned.

The employee was on leave for the first two weeks of her term, which began in April 2013. There was still no discussion at this time between the employee and officials of the Senate Administration about the nature of this leave. It was only when the employee had a conversation with the Director of Legislative Systems about the system used by the Senate Administration for recording leave -- which took place a few days after she had already commenced her new duties -- that it became clear to her that she and the officials of the Senate Administration (i.e. the Clerk, the Human Resource officials dealing with her file, and her immediate supervisor) had a different understanding about the nature of this two-week leave period.

When the employee became aware of the fact that the Administration considered the two weeks of leave as an advance on her vacation leave, rather than sick leave, she contacted Senator Boisvenu by telephone.¹² In an interview, she stated that she did so in light of the fact that the understanding that she would be provided with two weeks of sick leave was between Senator Boisvenu and Senator Tkachuk when the issue of her temporary employment in the Senate Administration was discussed. She said that, since Senator Boisvenu was relaying to her the essence of the discussions he was having with Senator Tkachuk concerning these matters, it made sense to raise the issue with Senator Boisvenu. She was never present during these exchanges between the two senators and, as already noted above, she did not have any direct discussions with Senator Tkachuk.

Senator Boisvenu told me that, during this same telephone conversation between him and the employee, she also raised concerns about her working conditions in the Senate Administration. She relayed to him that she was located in a small working space with no windows and that she felt isolated. An e-mail exchange between the Clerk and the Director of Human Resources corroborates this evidence and also provides evidence that Senator Boisvenu spoke to the Clerk about this on April 18, 2013. The Clerk then contacted the Director of Human Resources by e-mail and inquired about it.

This evidence was consistent with the information the Director of Legislative Systems provided in an interview with my office. She stated that the Director of Human Resources had contacted her to advise her that Senator Boisvenu was concerned about the working conditions of the employee. As a result, the Director of Legislative Systems met with Senator Boisvenu to discuss this matter.¹³ She stated that this meeting was the only one she had had with him and that no

employment (as defined in article 13.03) may receive an advance of credits equivalent to his or her anticipated credits for the vacation year.

¹² Senator Boisvenu stated that this discussion took place a few days after the employee began employment in the Senate Administration. The employee confirmed this, though neither Senator Boisvenu nor the employee could provide an exact date on which this conversation took place.

¹³ Neither Senator Boisvenu nor the Director of Legislative Systems could provide an exact date as to when this meeting occurred.

further steps were taken by her in this regard. She also stated that they did not, at this meeting, discuss the matter of the two weeks of leave.

In an interview, the Clerk confirmed that Senator Boisvenu had raised this matter with him. He also stated that he was aware that Senator Boisvenu had met with the Director of Legislative Systems about it because she had briefed him, but that he had had no further communications with Senator Boisvenu about this and that no further action was taken in this regard.

Turning back to the leave issue, after Senator Boisvenu was advised of the situation relating to the leave by the employee in the telephone call referred to above, he approached Senator Tkachuk informally about the matter in an effort to resolve it.¹⁴ Senator Boisvenu's recollection is that Senator Tkachuk suggested that he speak directly with the Clerk on this matter. I found no evidence to the contrary on this point. Senator Tkachuk could not recall for certain but he acknowledged that he may in fact have made the suggestion.

As a result, Senator Boisvenu raised the matter verbally with the Clerk on two occasions in an effort to ensure that his understanding and that of the employee concerning the nature of the two weeks of leave, as a result of his earlier discussions with Senator Tkachuk, would be respected.¹⁵ Both Senator Boisvenu and the Clerk told me that these exchanges were brief and informal and that the Clerk did not, during these exchanges, relay the details of the Senate Administration's position on this matter to Senator Boisvenu.

When the matter continued to remain unresolved, the employee again contacted Senator Boisvenu about this.¹⁶ After some further attempts to informally raise the matter with Senator Tkachuk, Senator Boisvenu wrote a letter to the Clerk, dated May 23, 2013, setting out his understanding of the nature of the two weeks of leave and insisting that the Administration adhere to the original agreement on this, as he understood it to be.

Upon receiving this letter, the Clerk sent it to the Steering Committee of Internal Economy. The Clerk told me that he was of the view that this letter was inappropriate. He explained that, where an employee of the Senate Administration takes issue with a matter, he or she is expected to follow the ordinary procedures that are available to him or her within the Senate Administration in order to resolve it.¹⁷

In response to Senator Boisvenu's letter of May 23rd, the Steering Committee sent Senator Boisvenu a letter, dated June 4, 2013, on which I was copied, requesting that he refrain from any further interventions on behalf of the employee. The Committee advised Senator Boisvenu that

¹⁴ Neither Senator Boisvenu nor Senator Tkachuk could provide an exact date as to when this communication occurred.

¹⁵ Neither the Clerk nor Senator Boisvenu could provide exact dates as to when these conversations took place.

¹⁶ Neither Senator Boisvenu nor the employee could provide the exact date on which this conversation took place.

¹⁷ Article 27 of the *Guide of Terms and Conditions of Employment of Unrepresented Employees within the Senate Administration* sets out a grievance procedure for unrepresented employees of the Senate Administration.

it was inappropriate for him to continue to inquire about the terms and conditions of an employee of the Senate Administration.¹⁸ The last paragraph of this letter reads as follows:

*Please be advised that since Ms. Lapointe is employed by the Administration, it is inappropriate for you to be involved in the management of employees of the Senate which are not under your direction and to continue to raise questions about her terms and conditions of employment. The Steering Committee is most emphatic that you cease to do so immediately.*¹⁹

In interviews I held with Senator Tkachuk, Senator Stewart-Olsen and Senator Furey respectively, all three senators stated that they were of the view that Senator Boisvenu's interventions on behalf of the employee, as referred to in the June 4th letter, were inappropriate.

In the June 4th letter, the Steering Committee also stated that the employee was entitled to present a grievance to her immediate supervisor or to the manager responsible for employee relations in the Human Resources Directorate if she felt that she had been treated unjustly or considered herself aggrieved by any action or lack of action by the Administration.

Once he received the June 4th letter, Senator Boisvenu told me that he had no further communications with the Clerk or with anyone else in the Senate Administration about this matter. This evidence was uncontradicted. However, he acknowledged in his interview with me that his insistence in attempting to resolve the matter, before he received the letter from the Steering Committee of June 4th, may have gone too far.

¹⁸ In this respect, see the *Senate Administrative Rules* (adopted on May 6, 2004), Chapter 2.03, s.3(1), which provides that the Clerk is the head of the Senate Administration and is accountable to the Senate through the Internal Economy Committee. See also the *Senators' Handbook on the Use of Senate Resources*, at page 4, which provides that the Clerk is the chief administrative officer of the Senate and is responsible for the direction of the Senate Administration.

¹⁹ The Internal Economy Committee was informed at a meeting on June 13, 2013 of the contents of this letter of June 4, 2013 to Senator Boisvenu from the Steering Committee.

SENATOR BOISVENU'S POSITION

In his written submissions, Senator Boisvenu argues that the circumstances of this case are not governed by the *Code*. He contends that he and the employee were not “family members” because they were neither “spouses” nor “common-law partners” as defined in subsections 3(1) and (2) of the *Code*. As such, it could not be said that he had furthered the private interests of a “family member”.

He also argues that he did not improperly further the employee's private interests when he hired her given that he did not know her at that time. He contends that Senator Tkachuk proposed that she be hired in the Senate Administration and, under this arrangement, she would be allotted nine days (working days) of sick leave before commencing the responsibilities of her position with the Senate Administration.

He also contends that, when he raised questions with Senator Tkachuk and the Clerk concerning the two weeks of leave that were granted to the employee at the commencement of her employment in the Senate Administration, he did so in the context of his position as her former employer and because he had, in his capacity as her then employer, negotiated the terms of her employment in the Senate Administration with Senator Tkachuk. He believes that any responsible employer would have done the same on behalf of a valued employee under these extremely difficult circumstances.

He also asserts that, as her employer, he felt that what he referred to as the “media's relentlessness” in pursuing both her and her family was both emotionally and psychologically difficult. As such, he stated that she was more than entitled to a period of sick leave to recover from this. He claims that, when he raised questions with the Clerk about the nature of the two weeks of leave, he did not improperly further the employee's private interests, nor his own. He states that he had no intention to increase his own revenues, nor those of the employee. It was his contention that he raised the matter with Senate officials to ensure that the terms that he and Senator Tkachuk had agreed to, as he understood them to be, were adhered to. He is of the view that there is nothing improper about this.

In his interview with me, he also stated that Senator Tkachuk told him to speak directly with the Clerk on the matter of the two weeks of leave and that when the Steering Committee wrote the letter of June 4th, 2013 and asked him to refrain from further interventions on behalf of the employee, he did so.

He also told me that he had not been aware of the fact that there are processes available to employees of the Senate Administration for resolving disputes until he had received the letter from the Steering Committee of June 4, 2013.

Finally, he argues that the *Code* must be interpreted in its entirety and, in this respect, referred to subsection 2(2), which provides that the *Code* must be interpreted and administered so that

senators and their families are afforded a reasonable expectation of privacy. He believes that this matter does not give rise to a real conflict of interest but rather concerns his private life alone and that his private life should not be scrutinized under “apparent” conflicts of interest.

RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF THE CODE

The following are the provisions of the *Code* that are relevant to this matter.

3.(1) The following definitions apply in this Code.

...

“common-law partner” means a person who is cohabiting with a Senator in a conjugal relationship, having so cohabited for at least one year.

...

“spouse” means a person to whom a Senator is married but does not include a person from whom the Senator is separated where all support obligations and family property have been dealt with by a separation agreement or by a court order.

(2) The following are the family members of a Senator for the purposes of this Code:

(a) a Senator’s spouse or common-law partner; and

....

8. When performing parliamentary duties and functions, a Senator shall not act or attempt to act in any way to further his or her private interests, or those of a family member, or to improperly further another person’s or entity’s private interests.

9. A Senator shall not use or attempt to use his or her position as a Senator to influence a decision of another person so as to further the Senator’s private interests, or those of a family member, or to improperly further another person’s or entity’s private interests.

11.(1) In sections 8 to 10, furthering private interests of a person or entity, including the Senator’s own private interests, means actions taken by a Senator for the purpose of achieving, directly or indirectly, any of the following:

- (a) an increase in, or the preservation of, the value of the person’s or entity’s assets;
- (b) the elimination, or reduction in the amount, of the person’s or entity’s liabilities;
- (c) the acquisition of a financial interest by the person or entity;
- (d) an increase in the person’s or entity’s income from a contract, a business or a profession;

- (e) an increase in the person's income from employment;
- (f) the person becoming a director or officer in a corporation, association, trade union or not-for-profit organization; or
- (g) the person becoming a partner in a partnership.

2.(1) Given that service in Parliament is a public trust, the Senate recognizes and declares that Senators are expected

....

(c) to arrange their private affairs so that foreseeable real or apparent conflicts of interest may be prevented from arising, but if such a conflict does arise, to resolve it in a way that protects the public interest.

45.(8) If the Senate Ethics Officer concludes that a Senator has not complied with an obligation under this Code but that the Senator took all reasonable measures to prevent the noncompliance, or that the non-compliance was trivial or occurred through inadvertence or an error in judgement made in good faith, the Senate Ethics Officer shall so state in the report and may recommend that no sanction be imposed.

ISSUES

The circumstances of this case raise the following issues.

Section 8

(1) Was Senator Boisvenu acting in the course of his parliamentary duties and functions in his dealings concerning his Senate staff?

(2) Was the employee a “family member” within the meaning of subsection 3(2) of the *Code*?

(3) Did Senator Boisvenu act or attempt to act in any way to further his own private interests or those of a “family member”?

(4)(a) Did Senator Boisvenu act or attempt to act in any way to further another person’s (the employee’s) private interests:

- (i) when he hired the employee;
- (ii) while the employee was employed in his office;
- (iii) when employment was found for the employee in the Senate Administration;
- (iv) when he engaged in negotiations with Senator Tkachuk to obtain two weeks of sick leave for the employee;
- (v) when he made inquiries with Senate officials about the employee’s working environment while she was employed in the Senate Administration; and
- (vi) when he made inquiries with Senate officials about the nature of the two weeks of leave that the employee was granted and had taken at the outset of her employment in the Senate Administration?

(b) If Senator Boisvenu did act or attempt to act in any way to further the employee’s private interests in any of the above circumstances, was this ‘improper’ within the meaning of section 8 of the *Code*?

Section 9

(1) Did Senator Boisvenu use or attempt to use his position as a senator to influence Senate officials:

- (a) to hire the employee in the Senate Administration;
- (b) to grant the employee two weeks of sick leave at the outset of her employment in the Senate Administration; or
- (c) to characterize the two weeks of leave that the employee took at the outset of her employment in the Senate Administration as ‘sick leave’ instead of vacation leave?

(2)(a) If Senator Boisvenu used or attempted to use his position as a senator to influence the decision of Senate officials in any of the above ways, was this done in order to further his own private interests or those of a “family member”?

(b)(i) If Senator Boisvenu used or attempted to use his position as a senator to influence the decision of Senate officials in any of the above ways, was this done in order to further another person’s (the employee’s) private interests?

(ii) If so, was this ‘improper’ within the meaning of section 9 of the *Code*?

ANALYSIS

Section 8

Issue 1: Definition of ‘parliamentary duties and functions’

For the purposes of section 8 of the *Code*, I must first determine whether Senator Boisvenu was acting in the course of his parliamentary duties and functions in his dealings concerning staff employed in his Senate office.

In this respect, the definition of “parliamentary duties and functions” in subsection 3(1) of the *Code* is relevant. It reads as follows:

“parliamentary duties and functions” means *duties and activities related to the position of Senator, wherever performed*, and includes public and official business and partisan matters.
(Emphasis added)

I am of the view that when Senator Boisvenu had dealings concerning his Senate staff, he was in fact acting in the course of his parliamentary duties and functions because these activities form part of his “duties and activities related to the position of senator”. If he were not a senator, he would not have a Senate office and access to Senate resources, including Senate staff.

Issue 2: Definition of ‘family members’

Second, I must determine whether the employee was a “family member” within the meaning of subsection 3(2) of the *Code*.

Senator Boisvenu and the employee were not “spouses” nor were they “common-law partners” within the meaning of these terms as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Code*. As noted in my findings of fact, they were in an on and off relationship. They were not married, nor did they cohabit in a conjugal relationship for at least one year.

Since she was neither his “spouse” nor his “common-law partner”, she was not a “family member” within the meaning of subsection 3(2) of the *Code*.

Issues 3 and 4: ‘improperly’ furthering of private interests

What is left to be determined under section 8 of the *Code* is whether Senator Boisvenu acted or attempted to act in any way to further his own private interests, those of a family member, or to improperly further the private interests of another person.

There is no evidence that Senator Boisvenu acted or attempted to act in any way to further his own private interests in this matter as this phrase is defined in subsection 11(1) of the *Code*. He in no way acted or attempted to act in a manner that would result in an increase in the value of his own assets or a decrease of his own liabilities. He did not act or attempt to act in any way that would, directly or indirectly, result in any of the circumstances listed in subsection 11(1) of the *Code* for his own advantage.

Moreover, given that, as I have already noted above, the employee was neither his spouse nor his common-law partner, Senator Boisvenu could not be said to have acted or attempted to act in any way to further a “family member’s” private interests either.

With respect to whether he acted or attempted to act in any way to further the private interests of another person, I will first address the hiring of the employee in Senator Boisvenu’s office. I am of the view that by offering the employee an employment position in his office, Senator Boisvenu did act in a way to further her private interests within the meaning of paragraphs 11(1)(a), (c), (d) and (e) of the *Code*. There is no doubt that any employer who offers an employment position to a person is increasing the value of that person’s assets, their income from a contract, business or a profession, and their income from employment. An employment position is effectively a financial interest.

However, under section 8 of the *Code*, the furthering of private interests of another person is only prohibited where it is ‘improper’ to do so. In other words, there are some cases in which a senator may further the private interests of another person because there is nothing ‘improper’ about it. The *Code* does not define the term ‘improper’. As such, the determination as to whether any impropriety exists must be made on a case-by-case basis.

Having considered the evidence related to this issue, I am of the view that there was nothing ‘improper’ about Senator Boisvenu offering the employee a position in his office since he was not, at that time, in a relationship with her. I am satisfied that he hired her because she was qualified for the position. As such, he did not advance the private interests of someone with whom he was in a personal relationship when he hired her.

With respect to her term of employment in Senator Boisvenu's office, I found no evidence that he provided the employee with any special benefits or preferential treatment, such as salary increases over and above the standard annual increases to which all employees are entitled.

However, to the extent that he renewed her employment contract twice after he had hired her -- once in 2011 and again in 2012 -- I am of the view that he did act in a way to further her private interests within the meaning of paragraphs 11(1)(a), (c), (d) and (e) of the *Code*. A renewal of an employment contract effectively results in an increase in the value of a person's assets, their income from a contract, business or profession, and their income from employment. There is no doubt that a renewal of an employment contract is a financial interest.

Moreover, I am of the view that this furthering of the employee's private interests was 'improper' within the meaning of section 8 of the *Code*. This is because when the employment contract was renewed, both in 2011 and 2012, Senator Boisvenu had had a personal relationship with the employee, whether or not that relationship was still ongoing at that time.

In terms of the process by which she was hired in the Senate Administration, as noted above in my findings of fact, the evidence is clear that it was not at Senator Boisvenu's request that the employee was hired by the Senate Administration. Rather, finding her temporary employment in the Administration was first proposed by Senator Tkachuk. As already noted above, Senator Tkachuk raised the matter with Senator Boisvenu in an effort to resolve the ethical issue of the relationship between Senator Boisvenu and an employee in his office. Both Senator Tkachuk and the Clerk told me that they were concerned about the impact of the controversy on the employee and the need to offer her a temporary solution that would be fair and would not penalize her unnecessarily.

However, when he engaged in negotiations with Senator Tkachuk to obtain two weeks of sick leave on the employee's behalf, I am of the view that he was acting in a way to further her private interests within the meaning of paragraphs 11(1)(a), (c), (d), and (e) of the *Code*, though he was ultimately unsuccessful in doing so. There is no doubt that, had he succeeded in securing two weeks of paid sick leave for the employee for her to take prior to her commencing her new responsibilities in the Senate Administration, she would effectively have been placed in a better financial position than she would otherwise be if these two weeks of leave were advanced vacation leave, instead of sick leave, because her vacation leave would have remained intact.

Moreover, I believe that this attempt at furthering her private interests was 'improper' within the meaning of section 8 of the *Code*. Senator Boisvenu argues that he was making representations with respect to this two-week leave period on behalf of the employee in the context of his position as her employer and that there is nothing 'improper' about that. However, at the time these discussions took place, she was not just an employee in his office, but she was also someone with whom he was having or had had a personal relationship. This fact made any such representations or negotiations on her behalf 'improper'. When the proposal to provide her with

a temporary position in the Senate Administration was first made to him by Senator Tkachuk, I am of the view that Senator Boisvenu should have recused himself from any negotiations or discussions concerning the terms and conditions of her employment therein. He should have left these matters to be negotiated directly between the employee and the Senate Administration.

With respect to her term of employment in the Senate Administration, I am of the view that when Senator Boisvenu made inquiries with the Clerk and, as a result, met with the Director of Legislative Systems about the employee's working environment, he did not act or attempt to act in any way to further her private interests within the meaning of subsection 11(1) of the *Code*. In inquiring about her working conditions, he did not take any action for the purpose of increasing her assets, decreasing her liabilities, increasing her income, or assisting her in any way in acquiring a financial interest of a nature described in subsection 11(1).

However, when Senator Boisvenu made inquiries with the Senate officials about the nature of the two weeks of leave that the employee took at the outset of her employment with the Senate Administration, he was, in my view, acting in a way to further her private interests within the meaning of paragraphs 11(1)(a), (c), (d) and (e) of the *Code*.

Senator Boisvenu argues that he was not doing so when he made these inquiries. He contends that he was only attempting to ensure that the original terms on which the employee accepted the position in the Senate Administration -- which he himself had negotiated on her behalf as her then employer -- were respected. However, and as I have already noted above, I am of the view that, in entering into these negotiations with Senator Tkachuk in the first place, Senator Boisvenu acted in a way to further the employee's private interests. He continued to do so when he made inquiries with Senate officials about the nature of the two weeks of leave, though I accept that his purpose was to clarify what he understood to be the terms of the agreement that he thought he had with Senator Tkachuk about this.

Though Senator Boisvenu was ultimately unsuccessful in these attempts to further the employee's private interests, I am of the view that they were 'improper' for two reasons. First, it is inappropriate for a senator to intervene on behalf of an employee of the Senate Administration. The *Senate Administrative Rules* are clear that the Clerk is the head of the Senate Administration and is accountable to the Senate through the Internal Economy Committee.²⁰ Moreover, the *Senators' Handbook on the Use of Senate Resources* provides that the Clerk is the chief administrative officer of the Senate and is responsible for the direction of the Senate Administration.²¹ Where employees of the Senate Administration have issues that they would like to raise concerning their terms and conditions of employment, there are processes available to them for resolving disputes. The *Guide of Terms and Conditions of Employment of*

²⁰ *Supra*, note 18.

²¹ *Ibid.*

Unrepresented Employees within the Senate Administration sets out a grievance procedure for unrepresented employees of the Senate Administration.²²

Indeed, and as already noted in my findings of fact, in his interview with me, the Clerk told me that when he received Senator Boisvenu's letter of May 23, 2013 concerning the issue of the two weeks of leave, he considered this to be inappropriate and referred the letter to the Steering Committee. Moreover, in the Steering Committee's letter of June 4, 2013 to Senator Boisvenu in response to his May 23rd letter, the Steering Committee advised Senator Boisvenu that it was inappropriate for him to be involved in the management of employees of the Senate Administration which were not under his direction and to continue to raise questions about his former employee's terms and conditions of employment. The Steering Committee was emphatic that Senator Boisvenu cease to do so immediately. Moreover, the Committee brought this letter to my attention by copying me on it. Finally, both the Steering Committee, in its letter of June 4th, as well as the Clerk in his interview with me, made reference to the fact that there are procedures available to employees of the Senate Administration for resolving disputes.

Senator Boisvenu argues that, at the time he made inquiries with Senate officials about the nature of the two weeks, he was unaware of the fact that there are such processes in place for resolving disputes. However, as I noted earlier, I am of the view that he should not, in the first place, have engaged in negotiations with Senator Tkachuk in order to attempt to secure two weeks of leave for the employee that would not impact on her vacation leave. He should have recused himself from any such negotiations altogether both before she became employed in the Senate Administration and after. Whether or not he was aware of the dispute processes available to employees of the Senate Administration does not alter my view that these attempts at furthering the employee's private interests were 'improper'.

Second, Senator Boisvenu had had a relationship with the employee, irrespective of whether or not that relationship was still ongoing at the time he made these interventions. In other words, and as I already pointed out earlier, he was not just acting on behalf of a former employee but he was also acting on behalf of someone with whom he was having or had had a personal relationship. Under these circumstances, he should have recused himself from the matter and, when the employee contacted him about it, he should have advised her that he could not be involved.

²² *Supra*, note 17.

Section 9

Issue 1: use of influence

Under section 9, I must first determine whether Senator Boisvenu used or attempted to use his position as a senator to influence the decision of Senate officials to hire the employee in the Senate Administration. I found no evidence of this. As already noted above, the evidence demonstrates that the notion of temporary employment in the Senate Administration was raised by Senator Tkachuk. It was not a request from Senator Boisvenu.

Second, I must establish whether Senator Boisvenu used or attempted to use his position as a senator to influence Senate officials to grant the employee two weeks of sick leave at the outset of her employment in the Senate Administration. I am of the view that Senator Boisvenu did attempt to use his position to do so when he engaged in negotiations with Senator Tkachuk about this matter. He was attempting to use his position as a senator to influence the decision of the Senate Administration by raising the matter with Senator Tkachuk, the then Chair of the Internal Economy Committee, to grant her two weeks of leave that would not impact on her vacation leave.

Third, I must determine whether Senator Boisvenu used or attempted to use his position as a Senator to influence Senate officials to characterize the two weeks of leave that the employee took at the outset of her employment in the Senate Administration as ‘sick leave’ instead of ‘vacation leave’. Based on the evidence before me, I am of the view that Senator Boisvenu did in fact attempt to do so, notwithstanding that he did it to ensure that his understanding about the nature of the two weeks -- as a result of his discussions with Senator Tkachuk -- was respected. He approached Senate officials (both Senator Tkachuk and the Clerk) about this matter on several occasions. When he was advised by the employee what the clear position of the Senate Administration was about the two weeks, i.e. that it was granted as advanced vacation leave, he continued to intervene by attempting to influence the Clerk to alter the Senate Administration’s position on the basis of what he believed to be an agreement he had negotiated with Senator Tkachuk. This is clear from the May 23rd letter Senator Boisvenu wrote to the Clerk in which he insisted that the matter be corrected.

Issue 2: ‘improperly’ furthering private interests

I have already established that Senator Boisvenu did not act or attempt to act in any way to further his own private interests under section 8 of the *Code*. Moreover, the employee was not a “family member” of Senator Boisvenu within the meaning of the *Code* for the purposes of my analysis under section 8. As such, he could not have acted or attempted to act in any way to further a “family member’s” private interests under section 8. These findings are equally applicable with respect to my analysis under section 9.

I have also already disposed of the issue as to whether Senator Boisvenu acted or attempted to act in any way to ‘improperly’ further another person’s private interests under section 8 and, again, this analysis is also applicable to section 9.

In other words, I am of the view that when Senator Boisvenu attempted to use his position to influence the decision of the Senate officials to grant the employee two weeks of sick leave at the outset of her employment with the Senate Administration, he did so in order to further her private interests within the meaning of paragraphs 11(1)(a), (c), (d), and (e) of the *Code*. As already noted in my analysis under section 8, if the employee had been granted this type of leave, she would ultimately have been placed in a better financial position than she would otherwise be.

This attempt by Senator Boisvenu was ‘improper’ because, as already noted above, he was not just her supervisor at the time; he was also someone with whom she was having or had had a personal relationship.

Furthermore, I am of the view that when Senator Boisvenu attempted to use his position to influence Senate officials to characterize the two weeks of leave that the employee had taken at the outset of her employment in the Senate Administration as ‘sick leave’ and to alter the decision the Administration had already taken in this respect, he was again doing so in order to further the employee’s private interests within the meaning of paragraphs 11(1)(a), (c), (d), and (e) of the *Code*, as already noted in my analysis under section 8. He was following up with Senator Tkachuk and the Clerk on his negotiations with Senator Tkachuk in order to ensure that the employee would be secured two weeks of leave that would not impact on her vacation leave. Had he succeeded in doing so, she would have been placed in a better position financially than she would otherwise have been if the decision of the Senate Administration to advance the leave as ‘vacation leave’ was allowed to stand.

And again, as already noted earlier, this attempt was ‘improper’ because the employee was no longer an employee with his office; she was an employee of the Senate Administration. It is inappropriate for a senator to intervene on behalf of an employee of the Senate Administration.²³ There are processes available to employees of the Senate Administration for resolving disputes.²⁴ Indeed, both the Steering Committee in its letter of June 4th to Senator Boisvenu, as well as the Clerk in his interview with me, made reference to the processes that are in place for employees of the Senate Administration to resolve issues. As already stated above, the Clerk was categorical that Senator Boisvenu’s May 23rd letter was inappropriate and, for this reason, he referred it to the Steering Committee. The Committee also felt that it was inappropriate and said so in its letter of June 4th. Moreover, all three senators who were members of the Steering Committee at that time confirmed this in their respective interviews with me.

²³ *Supra*, note 18.

²⁴ *Supra*, note 17.

These interventions by a senator on behalf of an employee of the Senate Administration were even more problematic because Senator Boisvenu and the employee had been involved in a personal relationship, whether or not that relationship had ended by that time.

Paragraph 2(1)(c)

Having disposed of sections 8 and 9 of the *Code*, I am left with an issue Senator Hervieux-Payette raised in her complaint letter of June 19, 2013 concerning paragraph 2(1)(c) of the *Code*. She argues that Senator Boisvenu appears to have avoided complying with his obligation under paragraph 2(1)(c), one of the principles in the *Code*, when he delayed acting on the advice that was allegedly provided to him by the then Senate Ethics Officer concerning his relationship with an employee in his office.

As a preliminary comment, I should note that the principles in the *Code* help to inform the interpretation of the various rules of conduct. They are not, in and of themselves, rules of conduct, though they are important because they reflect the spirit of the *Code* and I have certainly considered paragraph 2(1)(c) in my application of sections 8 and 9 to the particular circumstances of this case.

However, and as already noted in my findings of fact, I was unable to make a final determination as to whether or not the former Senate Ethics Officer did provide verbal advice to Senator Boisvenu concerning his relationship with the employee. As such, I am unable to answer Senator Hervieux-Payette's question concerning the consequences of not abiding by the advice of the Senate Ethics Officer in the context of this particular case.

Having said that, I think it is important to make a general comment concerning this matter. Where a failure to comply with the advice of the Senate Ethics Officer results in a breach of the *Code*, this could lead to an investigation under the *Code* and, as a result, the imposition of penalties or sanctions by the Senate. Moreover, section 34 of the *Code* could also be engaged where a senator disregards the advice of the Senate Ethics Officer because he or she, depending upon the circumstances, may be purposely evading his or her obligations under the *Code*.

CONCLUSION

As already outlined above, I am of the view that Senator Boisvenu breached sections 8 and 9 of the *Code*. He breached section 8 when he renewed the employee's employment contract with his office in 2011 and 2012. He breached sections 8 and 9 when he attempted to negotiate certain terms and conditions for the employee that would be favourable to her, i.e., two weeks of sick leave prior to commencing her new responsibilities in the Senate Administration. He again breached sections 8 and 9 when he intervened with Senate officials and attempted to influence

them to characterize the two weeks of leave that she had taken at the outset of her employment in the Senate Administration as ‘sick leave’ instead of ‘vacation leave’.

Having said that, there are a number of circumstances that mitigate against a sanction being imposed in this case. First, I have found that there was, in fact, an understanding between Senator Boisvenu and Senator Tkachuk that the employee would be permitted to take two weeks of leave at the outset of her employment with the Senate Administration, though the nature of this leave was never specifically discussed or agreed upon. Senator Boisvenu stated that he was involved in negotiating the terms of her employment in the Senate Administration as her employer and that he would have done this for any other valuable employee in this difficult situation. Though the circumstances of this case, namely the personal relationship that existed or had existed between them, made this involvement on his part ‘improper’, I accept that the fact that he was the employee’s manager prompted him to act on her behalf at this stage.

Second, Senator Boisvenu was under the impression -- albeit a mistaken impression -- that part of the agreement in question was that the two weeks of leave would be in the nature of ‘sick leave’, not ‘vacation leave’. As such, I find that the purpose of his later interventions on the employee’s behalf was to ensure that his understanding of the agreement was respected, notwithstanding that, in doing so, he was continuing to act in a way to further her private interests and, as already noted above, this was ‘improper’ under the circumstances.

Third, he first spoke with the Clerk about the matter at the suggestion of Senator Tkachuk, who at the time was the Chair of the Internal Economy Committee.

As such, though I am of the view that Senator Boisvenu contravened sections 8 and 9 of the *Code*, I am also of the view that these contraventions occurred as a result of an error in judgment made in good faith. Subsection 45(8) of the *Code* addresses mitigating circumstances and I believe that this provision is applicable in the circumstances of this case. As such, I would recommend that no sanction be imposed.

Lyse Ricard
Senate Ethics Officer

June 25, 2014

SCHEDULE A²⁵

1. Senator Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu, member of the Senate appointed for the province of Quebec (La Salle)
2. Senator David Tkachuk, member of the Senate appointed for the province of Saskatchewan, and Chair of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration
3. Senator Carolyn Stewart-Olsen, member of the Senate appointed for the province of New Brunswick, and member of the Steering Committee of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration
4. Senator George Furey, member of the Senate appointed for the province of Newfoundland and Labrador and member of the Steering Committee of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration
5. Senator Claude Carignan, member of the Senate appointed for the province of Quebec (Mille Isles), and Deputy Leader of Government in the Senate
6. Mr. Gary O'Brien, Clerk of the Senate
7. Ms. Linda Dodd, Director of the Human Resources Directorate in the Senate
8. Ms. Diane Boucher, Director, Legislative Systems and Broadcasting in the Senate
9. Ms. Isabelle Lapointe, Executive Assistant to Senator Boisvenu (from August 2010 to March 2013, and Officer, Special Projects in the Legislative Systems and Broadcasting Directorate in the Senate from April 2013 to August 2013)
10. Ms. Reina Bernier, Senior Advisor, Services to Senators and Special Events, Human Resources Directorate in the Senate
11. Ms. Suzanne Poulin, Manager, Human Resources Operations, Diversity and Official Languages, Human Resources Directorate in the Senate
12. Mr. Jean T. Fournier, Senate Ethics Officer from April 2005 to March 2012

²⁵ The positions identified with the individuals listed in this Schedule reflect the positions they held at the time of the events that are the subject of this inquiry.